

## **DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE MINUTES**

Minutes of a Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> February 2013 at 2:30pm.

### **P R E S E N T**

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

### **OTHER ATTENDEES**

Lorraine Brown - Conservation Officer  
Katie Child – Principal Forward Planning Officer  
Darren Hill – Business Development Manager  
Chris Hodson – Forward Planning Officer  
Giles Hughes – Head of Planning & Sustainable Development  
Adrian Scaites-Stokes – Democratic Services Officer

#### **111. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The following was received from Mr Moffatt:

My name is Stewart Moffatt, Fordham resident, and I hold a vested interest as owner of Site 11 in the Fordham Vision and whilst this item is not on your agenda I request your patience to revisit it today very briefly. Please see the attached pages all extracted from report M45 July 03<sup>rd</sup>, clearly depicting suggested development boundaries, an expanded map and an initial sustainability appraisal.

It was decided in the last meeting, after information supplied from the Planning Office, much discussion and a Scrutiny Meeting of this Committee's decision, that sites 8, 11 and 16 should be developed and it was Councillor Stevens who made the point that it was not the whole of Site 11 but the western end, i.e. the site detailed in report M45 (see map) and discussed since July 3<sup>rd</sup>. After the series of mistakes around Site 11, it would appear very strange that after all the focus on it

even more 'errors' appear to have occurred. The first publication of the Draft Plan on Feb 11<sup>th</sup> inexplicably left Site 11 completely outside the new development boundary. This has now been corrected after I pointed it out. After the Jan 10<sup>th</sup> D&T meeting Ms Child and Councillor Morgan (FPC) met and decided between themselves to reduce the area of Site 11 (as agreed by this Committee) by approximately 25% to 0.5 hectare, to reduce the road frontage by 50 yards and extend the northern boundary beyond the development line agreed in this chamber and beyond that depicted in the consultation document.

It is interesting to note that Site 8 also has 10 houses allocated but it has not been similarly reduced in area, the full site displayed in M45 is supported in the Draft Vision. Has any other site in the Draft Plan for East Cambs been reduced in size and modified in shape in this manner after being approved by this Committee or is this once again special treatment? It is clear that Site 11 and 16 have caused debate, however, much of the information supplied by the Planning Office in the Jan 10<sup>th</sup> meeting over the choice of Site 16 was incorrect. This Committee was informed that on Jan 10<sup>th</sup> meeting Site 16 was introduced as a result of its suggestion on the 3<sup>rd</sup> July to increase the site options from Fordham. This was not the case, Site 16 was already included in the report M45 submitted at that meeting – please see the maps. The owner of Site 16 was not approached as a result of the instruction of this Committee on 3 July as described in the minutes. It is clear from report M45 that Site 16 was already included and was being promoted by the Planning Office before July 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting took place and that landowner was treated individually as a special case prior to that date.

It is clear from the minutes of FPC Aug 29<sup>th</sup> that influence was exerted by the Planning Office which is contrary to what this Committee was told in Jan 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. Minutes Jan 10<sup>th</sup> meeting – “The Parish Council (Aug 29<sup>th</sup>) 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.” Minutes Fordham Parish Council 29<sup>th</sup> Aug – PFPO asks “FPC to seriously consider Site 16” as initial advice that only one site to be approved is not correct. “FPC have been told by the PFPO Site 11 will not be developed (reported 04 Oct) because it does not meet planning criteria”. Please recall that Site 11 was one of two Parish Council preferred sites (see map) until this meeting. “The Principal Forward Planning Officer explained that the Development and Transport Committee of 3<sup>rd</sup> 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.” But Site 16 had already been included in report M45 on the 3 July and detailed investigation had already taken place as described in the sustainability report (page 9 M45 July 3<sup>rd</sup>). This information is completely contrary to what this Committee was told by the Planning Office in 10 Jan meeting and that advice which ultimately led to the reintroduction of Site 16.

I realise that this meeting does not include Vision of Fordham on its agenda but you will be asked to approve the minutes of Jan 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. The minutes no doubt truthfully reflect the meeting but will they reflect the truth? I suggest all the above is further evidence that there is a concerted bias against the inclusion and now interference in Site 11 and promotion of Site 16 to the extent that “errors” are policy

being made in a particular direction. Will this Committee please ensure the decision reached in the meeting of 10 Jan is properly implemented and that the site as described and discussed in M45 is put forward correctly by the Planning Office for inspection in the draft document East Cambridgeshire Local Plan?

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development did not know the full details of the issues, so could not respond at this point. However, a response would be given later to all the points made.

112. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies were received from Councillor David Ambrose Smith. Councillor Joshua Schumann substituted for him for this meeting.

113. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Joshua Schumann revealed that, with regard to agenda item 9, he was the owner of a property near to the potential Soham Station site.

114. **MINUTES**

Councillor Tom Kerby, referring to minute number 97, noted that the Committee had visited the Fordham Vision numerous times and had agreed to 3 sites being included in the Local Plan. However, the diagram in it for Fordham had not included Site 11 inside the development boundary, which it should be, and had changed the size of the site. These changes appeared to be following a meeting held with officers and Fordham Parish Council, which wanted to preserve the views. These changes had occurred without any notification to this Committee and was against what it had agreed. The landowner had not been told and the land had not been included in the Local Plan. This had not happened anywhere else so why here?

Councillor Peter Moakes reminded the Committee that it had taken a decision on 10<sup>th</sup> January to include 3 sites and Site 11 had been chosen based on the site shown on the drawing provided. The Committee should insist that its decision be adhered to.

Councillor Mike Rouse wanted to know why the changes had been made after the Committee had made its decision, as this was a serious matter. This Committee's decision must be adhered to.

Councillor Robert Stevens reminded the Committee that the problem with Site 11 was that it was a big field with no defined development boundaries. The Committee had agreed to use some part of the field for housing. However, there should have been no changes as it was going out to public consultation.

Councillor Tony Goodge thought the officers should have shown more sensitivity over Site 11, which had been agreed for inclusion but only for part of the site. Now the Site plan showed it had gone out of the boundary of that area. There had been no consultation on this so the plan was wrong.

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development stated that he had not viewed the map in the draft Local Plan before publication. The original Site 11 had been bigger than what was needed, so there was a need to define its size to account for the number of dwellings suggested for it. All the final changes to the Local Plan were as the resolution of this Committee and the Chairman and Ward Councillors had been notified. At this point there was not an understanding how the precise changes had happened for Fordham. This issue would need a further full investigation. A response would be made to Mr Moffatt's queries and the Committee Members would receive a copy of that response.

Councillor Allen Alderson, in referring to minute number 105, revealed that Councillor David Brown had explained that there was an idea to provide a road from Factory Road in Burwell to the marina. Councillor Peter Moakes explained that there would be 2 possible alternative routes to create access.

Councillor Robert Stevens, in referring to minute number 105, clarified his comments from the previous meeting explaining his concerns about the A142/A14 junction, as it would not just be affected by the new houses to be built in Burwell and that it needed to be improved for other reasons as well.

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held 10<sup>th</sup> January 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

#### 115. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman informed the Committee that agenda item number 8 had been withdrawn, as officers had insufficient time to complete the necessary work on the appendices to the report. This would be deferred until the next Committee meeting.

#### 116. **BUILDINGS OF LOCAL INTEREST**

The Committee considered a report, reference M343, previously circulated, which proposed the production of a draft List of Buildings of Local Interest Supplementary Planning Document. Additional information was tabled at the meeting relating to current relevant legislation.

The Conservation Officer advised the Committee that there was a change to the recommendations: (i) That a consultation exercise be carried out on the proposed draft criteria and methodology for the Local List, as set out in Appendix 1 of this report; (ii) That the results of this consultation exercise be brought back to this Committee with further recommendations to establish a Local List.

There was a national policy framework that set out planning policies for England, which included one where heritage assets were defined. This encompassed both designated and undesignated objects. So buildings or features of architectural interest or historical significance could be included in a local list of Buildings of Local Interest. This was referred to in the Council's Local Plan and English Heritage had produced guidance that could be used to determine when something could be included on this list.

The building or feature could be from anywhere in the district and Appendix 1 gave descriptions of the types being sought. Any building or feature accepted onto the list would mean that it would have to be given consideration in the planning process and there was the opportunity to undertake Article 4 directions if necessary, to help protect particular buildings.

The recommendations were for the proposed criteria to go out to consultation. Nomination forms would be sent out to parish councils and the public, to check that they would be usable.

Councillor Peter Moakes asked whether milestones, old advertisements or finger signposts could be included. The Conservation Officer stated they could be but this might mean that any associated buildings might have to be included.

Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith queried whether open spaces, particularly if of local importance, would be eligible for inclusion. The Committee was advised that these could be designate through other legislation instead.

Councillor Mike Rouse thought this was a good idea as it would help inform the planning process. This could become a community exercise by getting young school children involved, primary schools could be contacted, so their views could be used. The wider the consultation, the more valuable it would be.

Councillor Robert Stevens asked if there would be an age criteria, as some old buildings had been upgraded with sympathetic uPVC windows. Buildings should not be excluded just because of this. The Conservation Officer stated that the wording could be changed to recognise accumulative changes to buildings.

Councillor Joshua Schumann thought that any Panel set up should include a fair representative spread across the district. Councillor Peter Moakes would like to see a much wider membership of the Panel, with people outside the Council. The Conservation Officer assured the Committee that she would confer with the Legal department about setting up the Panel. The Committee were reminded that the Local List would not affect any permitted building rights, but this did not include built extensions which would still need planning permission.

It was resolved:

- (i) That a consultation exercise be carried out on the proposed draft criteria and methodology for the Local List, as set out in Appendix 1 of this report;
- (ii) That the results of this consultation exercise be brought back to this Committee with further recommendations to establish a Local List.

#### 117. **BELL ROAD MASTERPLAN, BOTTISHAM**

The Committee considered a report, reference M344, which set out draft Terms of Reference for a liaison group to guide the preparation of a Masterplan for the land east of Bell Road, Bottisham. A map of the site was tabled at the meeting.

The Forward Planning Officer tabled a plan of the site and asked the Committee to consider setting up a Liaison Group for the Masterplan. Previously the Committee had agreed the allocation of this land and the production of a Masterplan for it. The developers had agreed to fund the Group and wanted to involve the local community.

Appendix 1 set out its Terms of Reference, which had been agreed by Bottisham Parish Council. The Group would start in March with the intention of consulting the local community on the Masterplan. The draft Masterplan would be brought back to this Committee for consideration.

Councillor Robert Stevens through the boundary of site BOT1 would be too small for 50 houses, allotments and related open space. Had the boundary been defined? The Committee was advised that the Masterplan would define the boundary.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the formation of a Liaison Group to guide the preparation of a Masterplan for land east of Bell Road, Bottisham be endorsed;
- (ii) That the Draft Terms of Reference be noted.

#### 118. **SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT ON DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS**

*This item was withdrawn.*

#### 119. **SOHAM STATION**

The Committee considered a report, reference M346, previously circulated, which updated on progress with Soham railway Station.

The Business Development Manager advised the Committee that following the meeting with Network Rail and the Department for Transport, Atkins would undertake a study which would build on the modelling work completed. One issue they would have to consider was comparing a rail link to a bus link to Soham. Atkins' report was expected back mid-April. This would then be reported to this Committee in May. The work undertaken would allow a business plan to be submitted. Network Rail had already included the station in its strategic plan.

Councillor Mike Rouse was concerned about the construction of the rail link in engineering terms and asked how much investigation had been done on its construction. The link needed to go to Newmarket and be a dual line.

Councillor Peter Moakes thought that the original line was dual and the current line needed doubling to help the increasing freight traffic. The line carried heavy freight trains now, so the land should be able to carry two tracks. A link would also be needed to Newmarket and thence on to Cambridge as the bulk of the people using the train service would work in Cambridge.

It was resolved:

That the contents of this report be noted.

The meeting concluded at 3:05pm.