

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE MINUTES

Minutes of a Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Thursday 10th January 2013 at 2:00pm.

P R E S E N T

Councillor Peter Moakes (Chairman)
Councillor Allen Alderson
Councillor David Ambrose Smith
Councillor Kevin Ellis
Councillor Colin Fordham
Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith MBE
Councillor Tony Goodge
Councillor Tom Kerby
Councillor Neil Morrison
Councillor Joshua Schumann (as Substitute for Councillor Mike Rouse)
Councillor Robert Stevens

OTHER ATTENDEES

Sally Bonnett - Infrastructure & Projects Officer
Lorraine Brown - Conservation Officer
Katie Child – Principal Forward Planning Officer
Oliver Cook - Development & Enabling Officer
Rachel Doyle - Energy Efficiency Officer
Louise Duffield - Accountancy Assistant
John Hill – Chief Executive
Giles Hughes – Head of Planning & Sustainable Development
Stacey Miller - Forward Planning Officer
Stewart Patience - Forward Planning Officer
Adrian Scaites-Stokes – Democratic Services Officer
Members of the Public - 7

97. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

A statement had been received from Januarys and this was read out by the Chairman:

Agenda Item No.9 refers to the Draft Burwell Masterplan Consultation Feedback. Page 39 of the Report comments on our representations to the draft Burwell Masterplan in respect of the DS Smith site. Our representations set out in detail the marketing that has been undertaken for the site to attract an occupier for employment purposes. The report is factually incorrect in stating that marketing information was requested from the agents marketing the site; we have received no

such request. There has been no deliverable interest from potential occupiers for industrial use at the site. The site has been unoccupied for 15 years. Government policy advises that vacant employment sites should be reused for other uses, and also that brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield sites. Can you explain why this site is proposed to be retained for employment purposes in the draft Burwell Masterplan, when there is clearly no demand for it? We can provide additional marketing information if required.

The Chairman stated that this would be considered under agenda item number 9.

Mr Moffatt stated that he was a Fordham resident and had a vested interest in site 11 in Fordham. He then submitted the following statement:

The result of the Scrutiny Committee deliberation is clear but when analysed the purpose and implication of that decision is not. Who will benefit and what purpose will be served by its implementation? The FPC stated in the scrutiny meeting they do not want a new consultation. This Committee has already decided it does not want a new consultation. The Community in Fordham do not want another consultation, they have already stated their view and by doing so they rightly expect to be heard. The only group to benefit from a new consultation will be the owner and proponents of Site 16 who are the root cause of this dispute.

Every person in this room is aware of the concept of a deadline be it a competition entry, a train departure, the start of a meeting, or as in this case a consultation date and yet every twist in this story seems to favour this particular landowner who knowingly chose to miss this deadline and then change his mind.

In the meeting Councillor Roper described how difficult it was to vote for some people surely does that not lend extra weight to the view of those who managed to complete the process. Everyone in Fordham gets the Parish Magazine through the door and had the opportunity to vote and indeed some did not get a form to the door, myself included. Councillor Roper was keen to exploit the small number of votes that separated Site 8 and Site 11. Does it matter how many votes win an election? He failed to describe the manner in which the votes were cast. FPC has claimed all the votes for whole of Site 8. The larger more easily identified and landmark part of Site 8, i.e. corner of School, Church and Graveyard, was excluded despite the fact that many people clearly voted for that. FPC knew they owned and would choose the eastern part of Site 8 only yet they claim all the votes for the whole site.

Councillor Morgan described concern over multiple driveways opening onto Mildenhall Road from Site 11. Site 11 like the others needs one access road but due to its frontage at least that position can be selected unlike Site 16.

Benefits of Site 8 included being closer to the village centre. What about the west side of Site 8 is that not closer to the centre? Surely the document asked about development sites at the edge of the village not the centre, that argument favours Site 11. The Planning Office say that the edge of the village edge is the edge of the development envelope, at least that's what they meant in the questionnaire. The rest of the world might imagine that the edge of the village meant exactly that.

Please remember Site 11 was one of two FPC preferred sites until the intervention of the Planning Office.

We heard much about the inadequacies of the consultation but surely this was the same process for every village in ECDC, are all those to be re-run? The process was acceptable for those villages. Why must a higher standard apply to Fordham over every other village? The answer is the confusion that the inclusion of Site 16 has created. The consultation was not without flaws but it represents an honest and unbiased view from the community and the votes cast for site 11 at least were made without influence or vested interests. Those votes represented the unbiased view of the community, nobody has contended that. That will not be available in a new consultation. If another consultation goes ahead the declining cricket club will mobilise its remaining members to vote for Site 8 and get a new pavilion and the rest of the community will rightly be apathetic over yet another opportunity to have their views ignored. The result will be great for the cricket club and a dismal failure for Fordham and for Localism. This failure is a direct result of the in of Site 16. Site 16 clearly has considerable influence behind it and will better its standing by receiving a single vote from its owner. The real losers will be the community who voted in good faith in what they believed to be a fair and open process but are finding that is not the case. If this vote is to be binding and Site 8 is voted down by the community, FPC will be marginalised in a different manner and will complain again. If the vote is not binding FPC will simply ignore it as they have done and select Site 8. What is the purpose in running a new consultation?

FPC failed to declare interests correctly and they failed to support their community against the wishes of the Planning Office. Had they done either this situation would not have occurred. Surely the specific role of this committee is to do precisely what is had already done, that is to examine all the issues and adjudicate over complex matters particularly where vested interests exist and parties concerned are unable to reach an accommodation. If this committee's considered decision can be overturned over a matter of protocol then it appears the tail is wagging the dog. Whilst respecting the views of the Scrutiny Committee if the considered decision of the D&T committee is not to be respected and implemented then what is the purpose in debating this?

The original consultation was flawed without doubt, but in respect of Site 11 was within those limitations an honest test of the village opinion (which was good enough for 45 other villages). The result of that consultation was a clear village preference for Site 11, would you please continue to show your support for that view?

The Chairman stated that this would also be considered under agenda item number 9.

Councillor Malcolm Roper, of Fordham Parish Council, then put the following to the Committee:

I am Councillor Malcolm Roper of Fordham Parish Council and along with Councillor Morgan, who cannot be here today, made representations to the Scrutiny Committee concerning the Development and Transport Committee's last minute

inclusion of Site 11 in the draft Local Plan. Other Fordham Councillors present at the Committee were Councillors Palmer, Patel, Metcalfe and Hedderwick.

The draft minutes of the Scrutiny Committee cover the broad scope of our representations so I do not wish to repeat their contents but I hope that you will have understood our reasoning. However I would like to emphasise that a misleading impression has been given in referring to 84%, when what is meant is 84 people out 133 respondents.

We are grateful to Scrutiny Committee for the decision they reached and based on what happened on Monday two possible courses of action are proposed. Our preferred course is that the Development & Transport Committee's decision to include just Sites 8 and 16 and based on officers' recommendations is reinstated, and that Site 11 is not included in the draft Local Plan. However, in the light of the recommendation from the Scrutiny Committee we would be willing to co-operate with a targeted re-consultation in Fordham, with the sites to be included to be agreed between Council officers Giles Hughes and Katie Child and the Parish Council. The re-consultation would draw on the results of the previous consultation and include more useful information on the suitability and ownership of each site. It would not include as many sites as on the original list but would be given to every household in the village.

The content of the questionnaire would have to be agreed as soon as possible and, to ensure that everyone in the village quickly receives a copy, the Parish Council may look to the District Council for some assistance in distribution if they are unable to field sufficient councillors on the day needed. In addition arrangements will need to be put into place for the collection of the questionnaire and a suggestion is that this could include the provision of a pre-paid envelope addressed to the District Council.

We are sorry that due to the limited notice many Parish Councillors are unable to attend today. We have a Parish Council meeting on Monday evening when we will discuss what we would like to see in the questionnaire based on ALL the information available. We would very much welcome the attendance of Katie Child and Giles Hughes if they can attend, otherwise we will ask two parish councillors to meet them at their convenience.

I trust that the Committee find these recommendations helpful and respectfully request their support for the Parish Council's suggestions.

The Chairman again stated that this would also be considered under agenda item number 9.

98. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies were received from Councillor Mike Rouse.
Councillor Joshua Schumann substituted for him for this meeting.

99. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were of no declarations of interest made.

100. **MINUTES**

Councillor Robert Stevens proposed two amendments in the 20th November minutes for clarification:

- page 8, 4th paragraph – the word “bus” be inserted between the words “no current” and “service directly from Soham...”

- page 8, 4th paragraph – the words “train service” be inserted between the words “for this” and “and would it be affected...”

These amendments were agreed.

Councillor Neil Morrison, in referring to the 3rd December minutes, noted that he had not heard back from officers about his query relating to Hempfield Road, Littleport car park. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development agreed to follow that up.

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the meetings held 20th November 2012, as amended, and 3rd December 2012 be confirmed as correct records and be signed by the Chairman.

101. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcement:

Following the Scrutiny Committee meeting held earlier this week, it has made some recommendations regarding the process for drafting the Fordham Village Vision, as part of the Local Plan. This will be dealt with under Agenda Item no. 8.

If the Committee decide to adopt the Scrutiny Committee's recommendations this will mean that an additional 2 Committee meetings will be needed. To fit in with the very tight timetable to prepare the Local Plan and accounting for the availability of the Council Chamber, the following dates and times have been set:

Friday 8th February 2013 at 10:00am – to consider the Fordham Village Vision.
Tuesday 19th February at 2:30pm – to consider the draft Local Plan.

Councillor Ian Allen joined the meeting at this point, 2:20pm.

If the Committee do not agreed to the Scrutiny recommendations only the second date will be required.

102. **GREEN DEAL BUSINESS DEAL**

The Committee considered a report, reference M193, previously circulated, which gave details of the work carried out to date on the Green Deal by officers across Cambridgeshire and included the plan to work to procure a Green Deal provider for Cambridgeshire.

The Energy Efficiency Officer gave a presentation and reminded the Committee that the Green Deal was a framework to be used to help householders make energy efficiency measures in their homes. Loans would be made under the scheme and would be paid back via energy savings. The scheme would improve the warmth of homes and make people's finances more secure and resilient.

Currently 52% of the energy generated was wasted. To help address this, 45 different measures could be used in homes. Householders had to go through different stages to gain a Green Deal, which ultimately would help reduce fuel bills. Tenants would also be able to access the scheme, as landlords from 2016 would not be able to refuse reasonable requests from their tenants. However, from 2018 any rental property below band E would not be allowed to partake of the scheme.

There was a lot of potential for investment in the district. This Council would work with the other Cambridgeshire local authorities and work out what had to be done. Working alongside local Green Deal providers could potentially generate 3000 jobs locally. The Councils would be looking to ensure that local installers and assessors would be used.

It was recommended that the procurement exercise be undertaken in conjunction with the County Council and other district councils in the county.

Councillor Ian Allen had noticed in the press that some providers would look to make an initial assessment charge. Some of the work would need a 25-year payback period, so who would be responsible for paying this back and how would this be affected if the energy supplier was changed?

The Energy Efficiency Officer agreed that appeared the case, but the councils wanted assessments done independently from the providers. This point would be picked up during the procurement process. The councils would put in some money to help pay for those assessments. The charges and re-payments remained with the house, so any new owners would be told beforehand and they would take responsibility for the repayments.

The Chairman noted that this was the next stage in the process and the Committee confirmed it was content to accept the officer's recommendation.

It was resolved:

That the conduct of a procurement exercise and award of contract(s) to one or more Green Deal Providers to be let on a county-wide basis and in collaboration with Cambridgeshire Local Authorities be approved.

103. **COMMUNITY LAND TRUSTS**

The Committee considered a report, reference M194, which sought to provide a programme of support to roll out Community Land Trusts in the district.

The Chief Executive advised the Committee that the report showed the next phase of the Council's agenda on Community Land Trusts (CLTs). A programme of support was being brought forward to enable other communities to consider instigating their own CLTs. There was currently one in Stretham/Wilburton, which the Council had assisted in taking the CLT forward. The process for that CLT was halfway through and it was the time to reflect on its success and use it as an example for other communities.

In review, the CLT had proved to be very resource intensive and had been dependent on volunteers for its success. However, professional advice and expertise had also been needed. This had meant that upfront costs had been incurred, though Foundation East had offered a loan and repayment plan to assist in this.

The Council could lend start-up money and provide a framework for others to take advantage of. The loans would be available for CLTs in their inception. There would be some risks attached to this, as some CLTs might not be able to deliver a scheme. So, to protect the Council, a phased approach would be taken. The funds would be recouped at a later stage. It was anticipated that the loan fund would become self-sustaining over time, would be controlled by the Council and would help avoid complex procurement processes. Due to the upfront costs and risks, it was suggested that only 1 or 2 CLTs be supported each year. A user-friendly 'toolkit' had also been brought together, which would be delivered as part of the initial Council support.

This issue, in a detailed plan, would be taken forward to the Finance and Governance Committee for support.

Councillor Peter Moakes queried whether the CLT was up and running and whether it could create another CLT afterwards. Councillor Robert Stevens followed up by asking if the Stretham and Wilburton CLT had identified land inside or outside the development envelope and whether the housing development would include market housing. In reply the Development & Enabling Officer informed the Committee that the CLT was legally constituted, was a membership organisation, the development would usually be outside the development envelope and, although including market housing, it would contribute to social housing. Any proposed developments had to meet current needs.

Councillor Ian Allen questioned whether there would be safeguards with CLTs relating to the offers of tenancies and how they would be allocated. He would not like to see a situation where the CLTs decided which people could access the new housing, as this might not help those people most in need.

The Development & Enabling Officer stated that each development would have a Section 106 agreement and the homes would have to be affordable. CLTs would

have relevant policies and these could be included as part of planning consent. Allocations could be made to match the Council's priorities.

Councillor Neil Morrison made an enquiry about who ran the CLTs and was informed that they were run by Trustees, who were different from Members of the scheme.

It was resolved:

That the Chief Executive be instructed to report to the next Finance and Governance Committee recommending the necessary funding to implement a programme of support to Community Land Trusts as detailed in paragraph 4.2.

Councillor Ian Allen left at this point, 3:05pm.

104. **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – DRAFT FORDHAM VILLAGE VISION**

The Committee considered a report, reference M195, previously circulated, which reminded the Committee of the situation regarding the draft Fordham Village Vision and the recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee of 7th January 2013.

The Principal Forward Planning Officer referred to the draft minute and the recommendations from Scrutiny Committee, which had been previously circulated. If the Committee agreed to those recommendations then a draft questionnaire had been prepared for consideration.

Councillor Tom Kerby asked when and who had put forward Site 16 and when had Fordham Parish Council been aware of that fact. The residents of Fordham were unaware of the suggestion for Site 16, but it appeared the Parish Council had taken the Council officers' view to include it. This Committee should have looked at the recommendations they went to the Parish Council.

The Principal Forward Planning Officer explained that the Development and Transport Committee of 3rd July had recommended that officers did further work relating to Mildenhall Road in Fordham, which had been completed during August. It was apparent from this work that Site 16 had become available, whereas Site 9 was confirmed as being unavailable. The Parish Council meeting held 29th August had discussed this before the Development and Transport Committee meeting of 6th September. The Parish Council had been presented with the technical impact report which had looked at all of Mildenhall Road, outlining each site's pros and cons. In this assessment Site 8 was considered the best, followed by Site 16. The Parish Council had held an open discussion on the issues, without any undue influence from Council officers. The report written for this Committee had been based on the view of the Parish Council.

Councillor Joshua Schumann asked about the initial consultation with regard the number of sites or dwellings. The Principal Forward Planning Officer stated that there had been 104 responses to the questionnaire, which had looked at small scale sites capable of delivering up to 10 dwellings. Usually this could be delivered by one site from a settlement, but this was not always the case. Fordham Parish Council had

expressed a wish for two sites to be considered and this was not an unusual request. Therefore Site 8 had been suggested, which could deliver between 8 and 10 dwellings, with Site 16 delivering 6.

Councillor Peter Moakes reminded the Committee that its last decision had been referred to the Scrutiny Committee. It had debated the issues thoroughly, allowing the various interested parties to put across their points of view. It had recommended that the residents of Fordham be re-consulted on sites in Mildenhall Road. This Committee did not have to follow its advice but Scrutiny Committee had looked at the matter dispassionately.

Councillor Tony Godge thought there had been a problem with the consultation but the Council could not change what it had consulted on. He pointed out that Site 16 had not been consulted on. It was very frustrating as this Committee had made a decision but now another site had been thrown in which had caused confusion and embarrassment.

Councillor Robert Stevens considered Site 8 to be eminently suitable to provide housing, as could Site 11. The number of potential dwellings was perfectly reasonable as in total there would only be 16 houses. The Committee had enough information to make a decision.

Councillor Neil Morrison had difficulty in accepting the case of appeasement, as he was happy with the original decision for two sites. Lots of extra work would be involved if accepting the Scrutiny Committee recommendations, which he was not in favour of.

Councillor Joshua Schumann acknowledged that the process had been flawed and the only way to correct it would be to go out to further consultation. This Committee had decided to look at the issue again, after the initial consultation, and Site 16 had come up. Fordham Parish Council had the right to analyse the results and had wanted Sites 8 and 16 to go forward. It would be unfair just to overturn this view without further consultation.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith felt that the Scrutiny Committee had debated the issues thoroughly and had made a unanimous decision. It had decided the fairest way would be to re-look at the issue via a new questionnaire, which would give more information about the various sites, so a decision could be made on an informed basis.

Councillor Tom Kerby proposed that the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee be rejected. This was seconded by Councillor Neil Morrison. When put to the vote this proposal was declared lost.

Councillor Michael Allan advised the Committee that any decision it took would affect 2000 people for the next 20 to 30 years. He asked if the Committee knew Fordham better than Fordham Parish Council.

Councillor Joshua Schumann proposed that the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee be accepted. This was seconded by Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith.

Councillor David Ambrose Smith reminded the Committee that Sites 8, 11 and 16 would not add up to a lot of houses. He suggested that all three sites could go forward and market forces should be left to prevail. He therefore proposed an amendment that sites 8, 11 and 16 in Fordham be included in the Fordham Village Vision and no further consultation be undertaken on that matter at this stage. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development pointed out that further consultation would go ahead as part of the Local Plan process. This was seconded by Councillor Kevin Ellis and when put to the vote was declared carried.

It was resolved:

That sites 8, 11 and 16 in Fordham be included in the Fordham Village Vision and no further consultation be undertaken on that matter at this stage, although there will be consultation as part of the Local Plan.

Councillor Michael Allan left the meeting at this point, 3:34pm.

105. **DRAFT BURWELL MASTERPLAN CONSULTATION FEEDBACK**

The Committee considered a report, reference M196, previously circulated, which detailed the draft Burwell Masterplan for recommendation to full Council and the Burwell Village Vision for public consultation as part of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

The Infrastructure & Projects Officer re-read the statement from Januarys and told the Committee that the D S Smith site had been included in the 20-year Masterplan, as things could change in the future. The site had only been marketed since 2011. People had expressed interest in the site but had been concerned over its valuation. There was very strong support within the community to retain this as a commercial site.

A revised recommendation and changes to the draft Burwell Masterplan, as agreed by the Burwell Masterplan Working Party at its meeting on 9th January, was tabled.

Councillor Allen Alderson had a number of concerns: the site of the marina did not appear to have an access road to it. Anyone going to the marina would need to use a car. It was also the other side of the lode but there was no bridge to it. Traffic through Burwell would grow year-on-year and this would be affected by the houses suggested being built on Newmarket Road. Cars parking along the Station Gate development were causing problems for lorries using that route. On new developments an inadequate amount of parking would be provided.

The Infrastructure & Projects Officer responded by assuring the Committee that there was an access road to the marina, by the side of the Anchor pub. Any developer of that site would need to consider the provision of a bridge to it for access. Traffic assessments for any new developments would look at the potential impact on the B1102 in total.

Councillor Robert Stevens thought that, if 350 new houses were built in the village, the D S Smith site would be viable for employment purposes, so perhaps part of the site could be marketed for that purpose. Building those houses would affect the A142/A14 junction, which

already had traffic problems, and the traffic levels going through Swaffham Bulbeck through to Quy. This needed to be looked at and improved. The Infrastructure & Projects Officer stated that the B1102 and A1303 could be included in the Masterplan.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development suggested that, with regard the D S Smith site, that officers could explore the options available to bring forward the delivery of the D S Smith site as an employment site in line with the Burwell Masterplan and report back to this Committee. People saw this as an important issue and it was worth exploring.

The Chairman put the recommendations relating to the draft Burwell Masterplan, as amended, plus the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development's suggestion to the Committee and these were agreed.

The Infrastructure & Projects Officer reminded the Committee that the Burwell Village Vision was part of the draft Local Plan and had been reviewed. The D S Smith site had been removed from this document, but this would not affect its status. Burwell Parish Council had been concerned about the numbers in the housing trajectory. The amended recommendation sought to consult the Parish Council to address their concerns. The District Council had been asked to invite the County Council to conduct a traffic count along Swaffham Road during peak times and it was understood that they would be prepared to do this. The Committee agreed to the Burwell Village Vision recommendations as amended.

It was resolved to RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL:

- (i) That the draft Burwell Masterplan, as amended by the Burwell Masterplan Working Party on 9th January 2012, be approved as the Council's long term vision for the future of Burwell;

It was resolved:

- (ii) That any other minor editorial amendments be delegated to the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development in consultation with the Chairman of the Development and Transport Committee;
- (iii) That the draft Burwell Village Vision be approved for public consultation as part of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan consultation, as amended by Members during this meeting, subject to a further meeting with Burwell Parish Council representatives to clarify the infill housing figure calculations;
- (iv) That officers be instructed to explore the options available to bring forward the delivery of the D S Smith site as an employment site in line with the Burwell Masterplan and report back to this Committee.

106. **DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT ON DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS**

The Committee considered a report, reference M197, previously circulated, which set out the Council's approach to seeking planning contributions from developers towards infrastructure needed to address the effects of new development.

The Forward Planning Officer reminded the Committee that the Council had adopted its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule, so there was a need to

review the existing guidance on Section 106 (S106) contributions. The guidance aimed to clarify planning objectives and CIL. It gave details about the split between S106 and CIL contributions and looked at the infrastructure requirements that would be needed due to development. It also covered circumstances where there was indirect impact of development, such as transport matters. The clarity on what the Council would collect from Section 106 would be included in the Supplementary Planning Document, which would benefit the developers, applicants, the public and parish councils.

Councillor Allen Alderson wanted an explanation about the lack of CIL charge on retail development less than 100m² and other businesses. The Forward Planning Officer stated that developers would contribute through S106 rather than CIL. They would be required to pay but this would be subject to negotiation.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith was concerned about health provision, as previous developments had not led to any further health facilities. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development thought this would depend on big proposals, where it could be built as part of the scheme but some certainty would be needed to get the facilities delivered. The thresholds for S106 agreements had to be tweaked so the table in the report needed amending, so work had to be done on this. For example, any 20 unit developments should provide a proper play space, as the Council wanted to avoid the provision of small open spaces.

Councillor Neil Morrison recalled that the consultants, when talking about the north Ely development, had been asked to include burial grounds. There was nothing in this document about that. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development would look to add this to the list, but thought this would only be relevant to major developments. Councillor David Ambrose Smith stated that this issue should cover different faiths.

Councillor Tony Goodge noted that reference to a surgery for north Ely had been removed from the relevant documents, so what was the danger that it would be removed from this document. Councillor Peter Moakes reminded the Committee that the Council could only allocate land for specific uses and then it become incumbent on the landowner to work with the health authorities to provide the facilities.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the draft Supplementary Planning Document on Developer Contributions (attached as Appendix 1) be approved for consultation purposes with key stakeholders subject to changes to include reference to burial grounds and to amend thresholds regarding open space;
- (ii) That any subsequent changes to the above document prior to publication be approved by the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development in consultation with the Chair of this Committee.

The Committee meeting was adjourned, at 4:13pm, and reconvened at 4:21pm.

107. **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2012**

The Committee considered a report, reference M198, previously circulated, which detailed the Annual Monitoring Report 2012.

The Forward Planning Officer advised the Committee that the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) looked at how the district had performed in various matters between April 2011 and March 2012. In Housing the number of houses completed, 370, was higher than the target set. Employment figures had decreased because of the change in Lisle Lane where Sainsbury had replaced the Ely Chemical Company. If this was discounted then there had been an increase of 700 jobs. The number of vacant retail premises was below the national rate, though the Ely and Littleport rates were increasing. Ely and Soham had seen a lot of 'churn', whereas Littleport was struggling to attract retailers.

Councillor Peter Moakes asked if there were any statistics on 'churn' which could be compared against national statistics. The Forward Planning Officer offered to look at this as part of the retail study.

Councillor Allen Alderson queried the local authority figure for households and tenure in East Cambridgeshire, as it was only 1.3%. He noted that only 2% of employed residents were travelling to London to work, but seemed low. He asked whether there were figures for the Ely area only. The Committee was reminded that the Council did not own its own houses, but the 1.3% figure might include for parish council properties. It was revealed that the data for employed residents was from 2001 and 2011 data would not be out until 2014. There was some information available about the people in the new estates in Ely, which was available on the Council's website.

Councillor Robert Stevens noted that, although the statistics on the density of dwellings was set as a key indicator for urban areas, it was not that important when considering there was a lot of land that could be used to build on. In the future houses should be built that had access to light.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith did not think the retail figures gave the right impression, as the vacancy rates shown did not show the whole picture. Littleport and Soham had low vacancy rates but the town centres were struggling. Ely had a higher rate but it was buzzing.

Councillor Joshua Schumann asked how old the data was on retail vacancy rates and whether this included retail that had undergone a change of use. The Forward Planning Officer explained that the data was from the 2012 retail study and that vacant units did not include buildings that were occupied.

Councillor Neil Morrison noted that the 20% target for dwellings to meet the Lifetime Homes standards had not been achieved as no relevant dwellings had been completed. Was anything being done in planning to meet this target? The Principal Forward Planning Officer stated that the target was in the Core Strategy and related to large sites. It had also been included in the draft Local Plan.

Councillor David Ambrose Smith left the meeting at this point, 4:37pm.

Councillor Morrison continued and queried whether there was any expectations for more affordable housing for Ely and what the Council was doing about it. Councillor Peter Moakes was expecting further provision once the north Ely development started. It would depend on the developers to provide the affordable housing. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development pointed out that sites in Lynn Road and off Carey Close would provide some affordable housing.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the content of the AMR (attached as Appendix 1 to this report) be noted;

It was resolved to RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL on 21st February 2013:

- (ii) That the Annual Monitoring Report 2012 be adopted.

108. **SUTTON CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARY REVIEW AND APPRAISAL**

The Committee considered a report, reference M199, previously circulated, which requested consent to take the Conservation Area boundary review for Sutton, Cambridgeshire, and the corresponding Character Appraisal out to public consultation.

The Conservation Officer requested that the Committee agree to take the boundary review and character appraisal for Sutton out to public consultation. The main objectives were to tidy up the conservation area boundary and ask the public whether it wanted to include Sutton Park in the conservation area.

It was resolved:

That the boundary review and character appraisal be taken to public consultation during January and February 2013 with a further report being brought to this Committee in March 2013.

109. **HIGHWAY ADOPTION ON DEVELOPMENT SITES**

The Committee considered a report, reference M200, previously circulated, which outlined the mechanisms available to the Council and to County Highways to manage the delivery and adoption of roads on development sites.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development reminded the Committee that there had been big problems over the years with adoption of the highways on development sites. The report outlined the issues that had to be dealt with. Unfortunately there were limitations on what the County Council could do within the adoption process, as it was tied by legislation, so it could not force the developers to do the necessary work. This Council was trying to pick up this issue within its Design Guide, as it was important that the developers do not just sell houses without the roads being done. The infrastructure should be done in a phased and timely manner. So, if the developers went bust, there would still be some houses left to give value to

someone taking over. The Council had to get its policies and tests in place, and make the process more effective, to avoid these problems.

Councillor Kevin Ellis agreed with the approach being taken but suggested the recommendation be stronger. In referring to Appendix 2, Councillor Ellis suggested that some of the wording in paragraph 4 be used to instruct officers how to proceed. This was duly proposed and agreed.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith emphasised how important this matter was and mentioned the issue of bonds. In the past developers had got out of their responsibility and the Council had been left to deal with the problem. Anything this Council could do to avoid similar situations should be done.

Councillor Tony Godge suggested that planning conditions should be put in place and legal agreements had to be adequate. Developers could be very cute so the agreements had to provide some protection. Bonds would tie up the financial agreements and until such a bond was in place then there should be no development.

Councillor Joshua Schumann suggested that prospective purchasers of the houses should be warned about the unadopted roads issue and residents be made aware of the risks. This was agreed, with a report to be brought back to the Committee.

Councillor Robert Stevens thought that the matter of adoption of open spaces was a similar issue and this too should be looked at.

It was resolved:

- (i) That officers investigate how the Council could provide information for potential purchasers on the issues brought up by the Committee and to report back to the Committee;
- (ii) That officers are instructed to ensure that on new developments roads are built to a specific standard and that a specified constructional level of both road and footway be reached prior to occupation of frontage dwellings.

110. **BUDGET MONITORING REPORT**

The Committee considered a report, reference M201, previously circulated, which gave an update on Council's current financial position for 2012/13, based on the reporting period to the end of October 2012.

The Accountancy Assistant requested the Committee to note the underspend since the last report and the overall overspend against the original budget. It was confirmed that the overspend mainly resulted from the homelessness problem. Planning fees had increased, as had income from the car parks. The last piece of income had been received relating to the sale of Club Mews.

It was resolved:

To note that since the last report a projected underspend of £11,833 had been identified, giving an overall overspend across the Committee's services of £279,546 against the original budget and that with funding from the Council's earmarked reserves when taken into account the true financial position was a projected overspend of £265,218.

The meeting concluded at 5:05pm.