



EAST
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of East Cambridgeshire District
Council held in the Council Chamber, The Grange, Nutholt
Lane, Ely on Thursday 5 October 2017 at 6.00pm

P R E S E N T

Councillor Allen Alderson	Councillor Elaine Griffin-Singh
Councillor Christine Ambrose-Smith	Councillor Richard Hobbs
Councillor David Ambrose-Smith	Councillor Mark Hugo
Councillor Sue Austen	Councillor Bill Hunt
Councillor Anna Bailey	Councillor Chris Morris
Councillor Derrick Beckett	Councillor Andy Pearson
Councillor Ian Bovingdon	Councillor Charles Roberts
Councillor Mike Bradley	Councillor Hamish Ross
Councillor David Brown	Councillor Mike Rouse
Councillor David Chaplin	Councillor Daniel Schumann
Councillor Steve Cheetham	Councillor Joshua Schumann
Councillor Paul Cox	Councillor Carol Sennitt
Councillor Peter Cresswell (Chairman)	Councillor Alan Sharp
Councillor Lorna Dupré	Councillor Mathew Shuter
Councillor Lavinia Edwards	Councillor Stuart Smith
Councillor Lis Every (Vice-Chairman)	Councillor Lisa Stubbs
Councillor Mark Goldsack	Councillor Jo Webber
Councillor Coralie Green	Councillor Christine Whelan

30. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

6 Questions were submitted by members of the public and the questions and responses are detailed in the Appendix at the end of these Minutes.

31. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Allan, Hitchin and Huffer.

32. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Declarations of Prejudicial Interests were made by the following Councillors as detailed in respect of Agenda Item 12 Local Plan – Proposed Submission Version:

- Councillor Hunt – as Chairman of Asset Development Committee
- Councillor Bovingdon – as agent of landowner of particular sites
- Councillor Ross – as trustee of Bishop Laney Charity

Councillor J Schumann – as Chair of Cambs County Council
Community Investment Committee

Councillors Bailey and Roberts – as Directors of East Cambs Trading
Company Board

Councillor Hugo – as Chair of Haddenham CLT

Declarations of Prejudicial Interests were made by the following
Councillors in respect of Item Agenda 15 - Transfer of Tourism, Town Centres
and Events Function to City of Ely Council, as City of Ely Councillors:

Councillors Austen, Every, Hobbs, Rouse Whelan.

33. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Council meeting held on 13 July 2017 were
received. Councillor Bailey highlighted a correction required to Minute 25 on
the Corporate Plan – End of Year Report.

It was resolved:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2017 be confirmed as
a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the
amendment of the third sentence of the fourth paragraph of Minute 25
on page 5 relating to the Corporate Plan – End of Year Report, to read:

‘New lane markings had been created at Angel Drove, Ely.....’

34. **ELY SOUTH WARD BY-ELECTION RESULT**

Council considered a report, S142 previously circulated, detailing the
result of the Ely South By-Election held on 7 September 2017 and the
allocation of seats on Committees, etc, arising therefrom. Members noted
that Councillor Christine Whelan had been elected to the vacancy and had
given notification that she wished to join the Liberal Democrat Group. As a
result, there was no change to the overall allocation of places on Committees,
etc, in accordance with the requirements of the Proportionality rules. The
Liberal Democrat Group had given notification of changes to the membership
of Committees, etc, detailed in Appendix 3 to the submitted report.

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Whelan as a new Member of the
Council and Members endorsed the Chairman’s welcome with a round of
applause.

It was resolved:

That the election of Councillor Christine Whelan as a District Councillor
for the Ely South Ward and the allocation of seats on Committees, etc,
to her arising therefrom, detailed at Appendix 3 to the submitted report,
be noted.

Councillor J Schumann left the meeting at 6.35pm

35. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

Alteration of Order of Business

Due to the volume of public in attendance for this item, the Chairman stated that he had agreed to an amendment to the order of business to take Agenda Item 12 on Local Plan – Proposed Submission Version before Agenda Item 11 on New Council Corporate Plan 2017-19.

Civic Events

My first three announcements this evening relate to forthcoming events:

Our Civic Service is fast approaching. It will take place on Sunday 22nd October, at St Andrews Church, Soham, at 3.00pm. I hope you will be able to join us on that occasion. If you have not, as yet, responded to the invitation, I would be grateful if you would do so, by emailing my PA Lynne Smart.

As you are aware, during my term of office I am organising visits to local businesses for Members. The next of these will be to CP Foods on the morning of Friday 27th October. Further details will be sent to you within the next few days.

If you already have access to a 2018 diary, you may care to note that my Chairman's Reception will take place towards the end of the civic year, on Friday 20th April 2018. The venue will be Granary Barns, Woodditton, which offers very impressive facilities. As well as the opportunity to socialise, the evening will include entertainment provided by the Viva Theatre Company, which was founded by our colleague Councillor Dan Schumann.

Unauthorised Traveller Encampment

Members may be aware of the traveller unauthorised encampment that arrived in St Margarets Field in Burwell last Friday afternoon. The travellers had been evicted from both Cromer and Newmarket. Jo Brooks, Director of Operations, and Angela Parmenter, Housing Manager, co-ordinated a multi agency approach to evict the travellers quickly. They worked with Burwell Parish Council to give legal advice, carried out checks at the site including welfare, black sack distribution and co-ordinating the eviction, which involved the Police from two counties and the bailiffs. I'm pleased to advise that the travellers vacated the field on Tuesday afternoon.

Unfortunately the mess the travellers have left behind is considerable. Under normal circumstances the land owner is responsible for the site clear up. However, Jo Brooks has advised me that the Council will provide this (as we did at Kennett a few weeks ago) and waste operatives were on site by 9am yesterday morning.

The travellers have now moved to Godmanchester and I know Jo Brooks and her team are keeping a watching brief. Communications are continuing with the Parish Councils, businesses and farmers on securing their land. Interventions such as concrete blocks have been distributed where appropriate.

On behalf of you all I would like to thank Jo Brooks, Angela Parmenter and the Waste Department for all their hard work in resolving the situation. In particular, I know Councillor David Brown will wish to be associated with these thanks.

Las Vegas Shootings

Finally on a very sad note, I am sure all Members of the Council will have been appalled by the atrocity which took place in Las Vegas earlier this week. Our hearts go out to the relatives and friends of the bereaved, and to those who suffered such dreadful injuries. We regard Americans as our friends. On behalf of the residents of East Cambridgeshire, I have sent heartfelt messages of sympathy to the Commanding Officers at RAF Alconbury, Lakenheath and Mildenhall.

36. **PETITIONS**

No Petitions had been received.

37. **MOTIONS**

No motions were received.

38. **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

Question from Cllr Lorna Dupré:

1. *Air quality: as at Thursday 7 September, the Director of Public Health for Cambridgeshire had still not signed off the annual air quality report for East Cambridgeshire for 2016-17 (Air Quality in Cambridgeshire: Update – paper to Cambridgeshire County Council Health Committee, 7 September 2017). Has East Cambridgeshire District Council now submitted its annual air quality report for 2016-17, and if so on what date? Has its annual report been signed off by the Director of Public Health for Cambridgeshire, and if not why not?*

2. *Fly-tipping: how many prosecutions for fly-tipping have been brought by East Cambridgeshire District Council in (a) 2014-15, (b) 2015-16, and (c) 2016-17? How many of these prosecutions have resulted in conviction?*

Response from Director Operations:

1. Air quality:

The Air Quality report for ECDC has not yet been submitted to the County for sign-off. The timetable for completion of the draft report by the Council's scientific officer is the end of October. Once the report has been signed-off by the Director of Public Health and submitted to DEFRA, Members will be informed.

Local authorities have been issued with a new formatted template by DEFRA to submit their 2017 Annual Status report. This will include air quality data collected from the additional monitoring site throughout the district. From the data collected during this reporting period, there are no exceedances or likely exceedances of the statutory air quality objectives applicable to Local Air Quality Monitoring (LAQM) in England for ECDC.

2. Fly-tipping:

During the years in question (2014/15, 15/16 and 16/17) there were no prosecutions for fly tipping offences. During this time investigations were routinely carried out, some resulting in low level enforcement actions, including verbal warnings & directions to remove waste from public land, but none were formally progressed. Other related enforcement measures included stop & search operations with Cambridgeshire Police of vehicles suspected of being unlicensed waste carriers & checks on businesses to ensure that trade waste disposal arrangements were in place, but again, none resulted in formal enforcement action being taken.

Departure of the Clean Neighbourhoods Enforcement Officer in March of this year provided an opportunity to reconsider the provision of enforcement services. These functions have been moved into the Environmental Services Team. Two Technical Officers have been trained to undertake a range of Enforcement Functions & the Dog Warden role has been extended to enforce in relation to dog fouling issues. Expanding the Dog Warden's role to include fouling issues will give greater emphasis to this emotive issue, which it is believed will be widely supported. New arrangements have been in place since completion of necessary training at the end of June.

39. **SCHEDULE OF ITEMS RECOMMENDED FROM COMMITTEES AND OTHER MEMBER BODIES**

Council considered a report, S143 previously circulated, detailing recommendations from Resources and Finance Committee:

a. **RESOURCES AND FINANCE COMMITTEE – 21 JULY 2017**

Corporate Risk Management

It was resolved:

That approval be given to the proposed amendments to the Corporate Risk Register and Risk Management Policy detailed in the submitted report.

b. **RESOURCES AND FINANCE COMMITTEE – 21 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Amendments to Constitution – Contract Procedure Rules

It was resolved:

That approval be given to the revised Contract Procedure Rules, as attached as Appendix 1 to the submitted report, and for these to be incorporated into the Council's Constitution.

40. **EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN – PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION**

Further to the declaration of Prejudicial Interests on this item, Councillors Hugo, Bailey, J Schumann, and Hunt exercised their public speaking right and then all Members who had declared Prejudicial Interests left the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting on this item.

Council considered a report, S145 previously circulated, requesting Members to determine whether to approve the proposed Submission Version of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan to enable the final round of consultation and also to seek approval, post-consultation, for submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination. In that connection, the Chairman highlighted a revised set of recommendations tabled at the meeting which included the withdrawal of the WFD.M1 site at Witchford from the proposed Submission Version.

Councillor J Schumann returned to the meeting at 6.40pm

The Strategic Planning Manager, Richard Kay, explained the background to and consultation undertaken in relation to preparation of the, Submission Version and the next stage of consultation which would take place, subject to approval by full Council, prior to the submission of the Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate to undertake the 'examination' process. Mr Kay highlighted that the Submission Version included the latest Government guidance on Housing Need calculations published very recently; new text on

homes for the elderly; and new policies on residential annexes and trees and woodland. Some new sites had been recommended for allocation to give a wide range of allocations to ensure a robust plan for the future, whilst some sites in previous versions had been deleted as a result of the consultation process. If the Council approved the recommendations, it would be able to declare that it had a 'five year land supply' to more easily and robustly refuse inappropriate development outside of settlement boundaries.

The revised recommendations were moved by Councillor Green and seconded by Councillor Brown.

Councillor Green stated that she was delighted to move the revised recommendations as Member Champion for Strategic Planning and Chair of the Local Plan Working Party. This represented the culmination of 2 years of detailed and challenging work and Councillor Green commended Richard Kay and the Strategic Planning Officers, as well as the Members and Officers serving on the Local Plan Working Party. She also thanked Councillors for engaging with the process on behalf of their communities. Councillor Green was pleased to state that the Plan now was ready to be submitted to Central Government and, subject to approval, that the Council could declare that it had a five year land supply to end the 'free for all' on Planning applications and take back control to prevent inappropriate development outside of settlement envelopes.

Councillor Brown stated that, whilst he had been unable to support the previous draft version of the Local Plan due to issues relating to his Ward, he was delighted to second the revised recommendations tabled and to commend the further work undertaken.

With regard to the ensuing proceedings, the Chairman reminded Members that they could speak once as part of the debate and that first he would be calling those who had declared Prejudicial Interests to exercise their speaking right, if they wished to do so, to enable all those Members to leave the Chamber before the discussion and voting took place.

Councillor Hugo commended the excellent work that had gone into the preparation of this final version of the Plan and the level of involvement of local people. He welcomed the proposed removal of site WFD.M1 and commented that this would have effectively doubled the size of that village and if it had not been removed, he would have made representations as part of the examination process for its removal as a local Ward Member.

Councillor Bailey also thanked the Local Plan Working Party and Strategic Planning team for the huge amount of work they had done on the Local Plan, in an incredibly impressive timescale that was much quicker than neighbouring Councils. She also commended Planning Officers, who had been required to deal with a massive increase in Planning applications due to the lack of a five year land supply. Approval of the Submission Version would put back development envelopes that developers would be required to

respect. Councillor Bailey stated that she was proud of the work undertaken and the emphasis placed on CLTs as the preferred method for the delivery of affordable housing. She commended the work of the Leader of the Council on the Stretham and Wilburton CLT, which had been driven by the local community and meant that there were affordable properties provided in perpetuity available for allocation to local families. The range of community facilities, including a doctors' surgery, edible planting, and the high quality of the development, made this an exemplar scheme. She urged parishes resistant to growth to consider CLTs as a way of controlling development and to help local people who cannot afford to buy in the locality to gain truly affordable local housing.

Councillor Joshua Schumann stated that this had not been an easy process but the consultation had been conducted in an exemplary manner. Understandably, there would be resistance to growth in particular areas, but this needed to be put where it was most sustainable. The Submission Version would not be the end of the process, as there was still the inspection stage when the Planning Inspector would consider representations and make a determination. So Councillor Schumann encouraged interested parties to engage with the next stage. He thanked the Planning Manager Rebecca Saunt and her Team for their resilience and hard work in dealing with the surge of Planning applications in recent months and Councillor Coralie Green, the Local Plan Working Party and Strategic Planning Team for steering the process so ably.

The Chairman endorsed the above thanks of Councillors to all of those engaged in the Local Plan and Planning processes, and full Council acknowledged these commendations with a round of applause.

Councillor Hunt reiterated the fact that over recent months there had been a 'free for all' in the Planning system locally, which was why it was essential to approve this Submission Version of the Local Plan to protect the local community from the unregulated demands of speculative developments. Councillor Hunt also stated that CLTs such as Stretham and Wilburton and Haddenham needed the adoption of a Local Plan containing clear policies on such bodies.

Councillor Roberts thanked Councillor Bailey for her positive comments on the 'flagship' Stretham and Wilburton CLT. He believed that the Submission Version gave this Council a robust Local Plan to provide certainty for the future, to spread development evenly across the District in the most sustainable locations, and to give the opportunity to those who were not already fortunate to do so to become homeowners.

All those who had declared Prejudicial Interests had left the meeting at this point.

Councillor Chaplin thanked Councillor Green for her determination and leadership which had achieved a Submission Version of the Local Plan in such a short timescale.

Councillor Shuter endorsed all of the comments expressed by Members so far and acknowledged the specific local issues that had caused significant angst in certain communities. This had been the case in the village of Cheveley in his Ward, where one particular allocation had resulted in local discontent and anger in the manner in which it had been handled. Whilst Councillor Shuter stated that he would be supporting the overall Local Plan, he asked officers to reflect on how they engaged with small villages such as Cheveley, where allocations could have a disproportionate effect on the local community due to the limited infrastructure such as schools and bus services. Councillor Shuter reiterated that this was not the end of the process and that he would engage with that village to assist them in making a case to the Planning Inspector for removal of the allocation referred to. The Chairman endorsed Councillor Shuter's remarks as a fellow Ward Member.

Councillor Bradley endorsed the comments made so far and acknowledged the difficulties in producing a Local Plan that met the Housing Needs targets for the District. However, he also was glad that the significant level of representations from Witchford had been listened to.

Councillor Dupré, as a Member of the Local Plan Working Party, stated that a prolonged period of hard work had gone into preparation of the Submission Version and she commended Members and Officers for this. However, she expressed disappointment at the loss of Councillor Beckett as a Member of the Working Party part way through the process, as he had a wealth of knowledge and experience on Planning to contribute to the Working Party. She stated that there was a lot to commend in the Submission Version such as reference to health and electric charging points, and she also had actively engaged in the process on behalf of her Ward in relation to particular sites/issues. The Local Plan had to be led by transport links and the capacity to move around the District, and housing needed to be located where this was readily possible. However, Councillor Dupré expressed regret that this approach did not seem to have been followed, with piecemeal development allocations located all over the place, which would not help with the provision of rationalised infrastructure. If the Council had been bolder and had fewer in number but larger sites, more concentrated infrastructure could have been delivered. Councillor Dupré welcomed the proposed removal of site WFD.M1 at Witchford as, if it had been retained, the A10 would have seen further congestion both to the north and south of Ely. She congratulated the Parish Council and local residents of Witchford for maintaining the pressure for the deletion of this site. Councillor Dupré referred to the deluge of Planning applications during the period when the Council could not demonstrate a five year land supply as highlighting the need to get the Local Plan right, but she did not believe that the Submission Version achieved this, due to the piecemeal nature of allocations. She commented that CLTs were good in principle, but led to increasingly large developments outside village envelopes

with no more affordable housing provided than could be achieved by other means within the development envelope. Therefore, overall, Councillor Dupré believed that the Local Plan remained fundamentally flawed and urged Members to step back and consider further the impact on individual settlements.

Councillor Cheetham commended Councillor Green for her work on the Local Plan Working Party and stated that he was pleased with the proposal to remove site WFD.M1 for the residents of Witchford, as a local Ward Councillor. In contrast, Councillor Hobbs also commended Councillor Green, but expressed his disappointment at the proposed removal of site WFD.M1, as an Ely Ward Councillor.

Councillor David Ambrose-Smith stated that, as a Littleport Ward Councillor, he was pleased with the allocations for that area and commended the work of the Local Plan Working Party and Strategic Planning Officers in engaging with Littleport Parish Council.

Councillor Beckett commented that he was pleased that the Submission Version would now close many loopholes and grey areas and commended the sections on sustainable drainage and green developments. However, he expressed concern at the repeated applications by developers for the same sites, as demonstrated at the Planning Committee on the preceding day, and at the number of sites in the District that had been granted Planning permission but still remained undeveloped. Therefore, he had reservations as to whether the large allocations in the Local Plan would be delivered within the defined timescales. This was an important issue that needed to be looked at in more detail.

Councillor Goldsack, on behalf of himself and fellow Soham Ward Members Councillors Sennitt and Ross, thanked Councillor Green, the Local Plan Working Party and the Strategic Planning Team for their work. He highlighted the high level of growth proposed for Soham, which generated local concern, but he acknowledged the willingness for meaningful engagement with the Town Council and therefore would support the Submission Version.

Councillor Alderson commented that the south of the District, including the villages of the Swaffhams and Reach in his Ward, had seen a large amount of inappropriate developments come forward recently. Therefore, he was pleased that the approval of this Submission Version would help to prevent this.

Councillor Sharp commented that difficult choices had needed to be made, but a decision was required this evening to approve the Submission Draft to give us a five year land supply to prevent indiscriminate developments. Councillor Brown concurred with this view and reiterated that this did not mark the end of the process, as there was still the examination stage by the Planning Inspector. Councillor Brown also highlighted the fact

that two sites in Burwell previously refused Planning permission had come back to the Planning Committee this week, so the Council needed to send a strong message to developers that we now had a Local Plan and they should go elsewhere.

In concluding, Councillor Green thanked the Council for their commendations and emphasised that approval tonight would allow the Council to declare that it had a five year land supply and she had great confidence in Officers that they then effectively could defend the Council against speculative challenges by developers. She acknowledged that compromises had been required in the detailed process to achieve the objective of ensuring that balanced growth across the District took place in sustainable and accessible locations. Therefore, Councillor Green urged Members to support approval of the recommendations before them.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was declared to be carried by a majority.

It was resolved:

That the Council:

1. Withdraws the site allocation (WFD.M1, Land North of Witchford) from the Proposed Submission ('Publication Draft') Local Plan.
2. Approves the Proposed Submission ('Publication Draft') Local Plan as attached at Appendix 1, for the purpose of both its final consultation for six weeks (likely during November-December 2017); AND its subsequent submission to the Secretary of State for the purpose of independent examination, as amended.
3. Approves the Policies Map (including associated inset maps) as set out as part of the agenda papers, for the purpose of consultation alongside the Local Plan consultation AND for subsequent submission to the Secretary of State for consideration alongside the examination of the Local Plan, as amended.
4. Delegates to the Director Commercial any presentational improvements or other inconsequential changes (e.g. correcting typographical errors or factual inaccuracies) to the Plan or Policies Map prior to the consultation commencing.
5. Delegates to the Strategic Planning Manager the ability to agree and consult upon a set of proposed modifications during the examination process (most likely at the very end of the examination process), if asked by the Inspector to do so.
6. Notes, subject to agreement of the above recommendations, that the Council can now declare it has a 'five year land supply' for accommodating new homes.

The meeting was adjourned at 7.29pm for a comfort break, resumed at 7.35pm and all the Councillors with Prejudicial Interests returned to the meeting at this point.

41. REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LDS)

The Chairman stated that he had agreed to a further amendment to the order of business to take this Agenda Item before Agenda Item 11 on New Council Corporate Plan 2017-19, due to its relevance to the preceding item.

Council considered a report, S146 previously circulated, containing an updated timetable (in the form of an updated LDS) for preparation of the Local Plan. The Strategic Planning Manager explained that this needed to be revised in the light of the approval of the Submission Version of the Local Plan under the preceding item.

Councillor Dupré stated that she could not vote for the revised timetable as she had voted against the Submission Version of the Local Plan. Councillor Brown expressed surprise at such an approach, as this was merely a procedural matter.

It was resolved:

That approval be given with immediate effect to the Local Development Scheme (LDS) attached to the submitted report, which sets out a timetable for the ongoing production of a district wide Local Plan.

42. CORPORATE PLAN 2017-19

Council considered a report, S144 previously circulated, containing the new Corporate Plan 2017-2019 for East Cambridgeshire District Council. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Roberts, proposed a motion to approve the Corporate Plan which was seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor Bailey.

Councillor Every particularly highlighted one promise in the section on New Jobs and Funding regarding promoting apprenticeships with local businesses. She referred to the difficulties experienced by local businesses in recruiting suitably experienced employees, particularly in high-tech areas, and the mismatch regarding the employability of young people leaving school. Therefore, the Economic Development Team had worked with the local Skills Forum on a post 16 review, which had identified the need for vocational training for local young people, rather than looking to employ people from further afield.

Councillor Brown highlighted the promise in the section on Improving Local Transport to deliver up to 80 additional commuter car spaces in Littleport and 128 at Ely, and commented that the demand for these had been clearly demonstrated to him by his experience on two days in the preceding week when he had needed to travel by rail and he saw how well-used the Ely Commuter Car park was.

Councillor Dupré stated that the Corporate Plan contained 31 'promises' and 20 'commitments and actions', some of which were good but some of which were unexceptional. Having looked-up the dictionary definitions of promises and commitments, she stated that that promises seemed more definite than commitments. However, not every promise was accompanied by a commitment or action. The document appeared repetitious and some of the promises and commitments/actions were impossible to measure. Councillor Dupré expressed disappointment at the promise to work with partners towards reducing and slowing traffic on A1123 only, when other parts of the District also were suffering from inappropriate traffic levels and speeding. She also suggested that the Leader, as Portfolio Holder on the Combined Authority for Transport and Infrastructure, could promote a lorry ban on A1123. Councillor Dupré also expressed disappointment at the fact that there was no promise in relation to air quality and that the Member seminar on health and well-being had been re-scheduled 3 times, with no new date at present for this.

Councillor Beckett requested an explanation of the promise on the development of a District CLT and of the commitment and action to establish 8 new ECDC supported apprenticeships. On the District CLT, it was explained that this would provide guidance and support to communities to deliver local CLT schemes. It also would provide capacity for smaller parishes which did not have the resources to run their own CLT. On apprenticeships, Councillor Every explained that the Council would be acting to 'pump-prime' to enable small companies, that otherwise would be unable to do so, to take on an apprentice. The Council also would facilitate a support network of other businesses.

Councillor Bradley commended the vision to look to the future within the Corporate Plan and the commitments and actions contained therein to achieve this. With regard to the promise and commitment/action relating to The Grange Council Offices, Councillor Bradley commented that the current facilities for staff were not a good environment to work in and that this needed to be addressed to protect the greatest asset of this Council, its employees.

Councillor Rouse concurred with Councillor Bradley and paid particular tribute to the Housing Team who had been outstanding in preventing homelessness within the District in recent years, helping those people in the greatest need to avoid the desperate situation of having nowhere to sleep. He commented on the need for a commitment to people with mental health issues to prevent them being in a position where they had to sleep on the streets.

In that connection, the Chairman asked that the thanks of the Council be conveyed to all staff for their work and commitment and Members endorsed this with a round of applause.

Councillor Hugo stated that he was pleased to see that CLTs remained a flagship policy for this Council in terms of the provision of genuinely affordable housing. He commented that the Planning application for

Haddenham CLT had been submitted in the preceding week and he thanked Palace Green Homes for their support and assistance on this. In that connection, he urged any Parishes interested in progressing a CLT to speak to the relevant officers within the Trading Company.

Councillor Smith thanked Council officers for their work on the recent fly-tipping issues at Haddenham.

Councillor Hunt paid tribute to what already had been achieved in relation to the Corporate Objectives of the Council. The Hive Leisure Centre was on track for opening in the spring, the new Cinema and restaurants had opened at the Ely Leisure Village, and the first residents had moved into properties at the Stretham and Wilburton CLT. The Ely Bypass works were progressing and were scheduled for completion and the District still had free car parking and its element of the Council Tax frozen. These were positive facts and achievements.

Councillor Cheetham referred to the Lancaster Way Enterprise Zone, which was an exemplar for other zones within the County.

Councillor Bailey stated that she was delighted to second the new Corporate Plan which was a mixture of small and large items which had been asked for by local people. The new Council in 2015 had been established on a 'can do' culture, and officers had shown real drive and commitment to push this forward. It was due to the hard work of employees that the pace of delivery had been so rapid and much of the Plan already had been realised. Councillor Bailey stated that the gratitude of the Council to its staff for this achievement should be formally recognised, particularly since it had been done on the back of a Council Tax freeze. All of this was a massive achievement for such a small Council. Nevertheless, Councillor Bailey acknowledged that the new Corporate Plan contained an ambitious programme and further challenges, which officers and Members would rise to meet rather than 'resting on their laurels', in order to provide local residents with what they had asked for. Therefore, she commended the new Corporate Plan to Members.

In speaking on the motion, Councillor Roberts expressed disappointment at Councillor Dupré's criticism of the Plan and recognised the outstanding work of our staff, who had delivered the previous Corporate Plan.

It was resolved:

That the new Corporate Plan set out in Appendix 1 to the submitted report be approved.

43. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY AND SECTION 106 UPDATE**

Council considered a report, S147 previously circulated, giving an update on the income, allocation and expenditure of Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy contributions. The Director Commercial

explained the current position and that the Council was currently consulting on new projects to be added to the CIL Regulation 123 List. Central Government also was conducting a review of CIL and S106 and the outcome would be reported back to Members.

Councillor Josh Schumann requested that the message be reinforced to Parishes regarding the availability of CIL for projects.

It was resolved:

That the income, allocation and expenditure of Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy contributions detailed in the submitted report be noted.

44. **TRANSFER OF TOURISM, TOWN CENTRES AND EVENTS FUNCTION TO CITY OF ELY COUNCIL**

Further to the declarations of Prejudicial Interests on this item by Councillors Austen, Every, Hobbs, Rouse, Whelan as City of Ely Councillors, Councillors Every, Hobbs and Rouse exercised their public speaking right and then all Members who had declared Prejudicial Interests left the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting on this item.

Council considered a report, S148 previously circulated, containing draft Heads of Terms for the transfer of the Tourism, Town Centres and Events function to the City of Ely Council. The Chief Executive explained the background to the proposed transfer, the future processes to be followed and the following 3 key questions that Members needed to consider:

- Was the proposed transfer consistent with localism?
- Was the proposed transfer at least cost-neutral?
- What were the implications for the District-wide tourism strategy?

Councillor David Ambrose-Smith moved the recommendations in the submitted report and this was seconded by Councillor Bradley.

Councillor Every stated that Ely was a fast growing City and relied upon the revenue from visitors and tourists. The Cathedral and Oliver Cromwell House formed a vital part of this, together with the local events organised throughout the year. This required an experienced and professional staff and buy-in from local stakeholders. The devolution agenda indicated that this should more appropriately rest with City of Ely Council. This local Council had the capacity and vision to run the service, as shown by the services already transferred to its responsibility, which was why Councillor Every commended the proposal.

Councillor Hobbs endorsed Councillor Every's comments and stated that City of Ely Council had unanimously supported the proposed transfer and

made a commitment to the service. He considered that any delay would not be in the interests of the service.

Councillor Rouse agreed that the transfer was consistent with the wish of City of Ely Council to directly deliver additional responsibilities local to the City. Any delay would cause unnecessary uncertainty for staff and the public. Small independent local businesses and tourism were vital to the prosperity of the City and local control would recognise this.

All those who had declared Prejudicial Interests left the meeting at this point.

The Following amendment was moved by Councillor Dupré under Clause 11.4 of the Council's Procedure Rules and seconded by Councillor Beckett:

'This Council refers the proposal to transfer the Tourism, Town Centres and Events function to the City of Ely Council to a politically proportional task and finish group to consider and report back to the Community Services, Asset Development and Finance & Resources Committees on the detailed implications'.

Councillor Dupré stated that she had moved the amendment due to the considerable staffing and financial implications of the proposed transfer for this Council and for other towns and parishes within the District who had not yet had the opportunity to discuss those implications. The submitted report contained very little detail on these. Councillor Dupré considered that it was more important to do things correctly than to do things quickly, which was why a task and finish group was required to look at the issues in more detail and make recommendations to the relevant Committees.

Councillor Bailey stated that she did not support a delay in the process and commended the City of Ely in approaching this Council to take over the service which specifically related to its City. She believed that the key issues were covered in the report and it provided additional funding to Littleport and Soham to promote tourism in their towns. A fantastic start already had been made by City Of Ely with the opening of the Ely Torc exhibition at the Ely Museum and she believed that the three key questions posed by the Chief Executive had been answered, as the transfer would free-up funding for this Council to concentrate on a District-wide tourism strategy. This was why she could not support the amendment.

Councillor Beckett stated that he had seconded the amendment as this Council had chosen a Committee system rather than a Cabinet, and therefore it was proper for the proposed transfer to be considered by the relevant Committees in detail, in the interests of democracy. He believed that this could be expedited via the Committee process, if necessary.

Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was declared to be lost by a majority.

On the substantive motion, Councillor Brown stated that tourism sites in the south of the District such as Anglesey Abbey and Wicken Fen should not be forgotten.

Councillor Dan Schumann asked if the issue of State Aid had been considered with regard to the transfer. The Chief Executive confirmed that this would be considered.

Councillor Bradley also encouraged Members to visit the Ely Torc exhibition and highlighted the intention to develop a District-wide Tourism Strategy via Community Services Committee.

Councillor David Ambrose-Smith commended the Chief Executive and City of Ely Council for bringing forward this exciting project.

Upon being put to the vote, the substantive motion was carried by a majority.

It was resolved:

That the Council:

1. Agrees the transfer of the service, as set out in the draft Heads of Terms in Appendix 1 to the submitted report.
2. Instructs the Chief Executive, to implement recommendation 1 to meet the timetable detailed in paragraph 4.2 of the submitted report.
3. Instructs the Chief Executive to undertake the necessary consultation with Joint Consultative Committee and affected staff.
4. Instructs the Director, Commercial to bring forward a proposal to Community Services Committee, on the terms of reference for the development and implementation of a District wide tourism strategy.

All the Councillors with Prejudicial Interests returned to the meeting at this point.

45. **COMBINED AUTHORITY UPDATE REPORT**

Council received a report, previously circulated, on the activities of the Combined Authority from the Council's appointees.

It was resolved:

That the report on the activities of the Combined Authority from the Council's appointees be noted.

The meeting concluded at 8.34pm.

Chairman.....

Date 4 January 2018

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME – QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Agenda Item 12 Local Plan – Proposed Submission Version

Parish Councillor Ian Allen on behalf of Witchford Parish Council:

The Local Plan proposals for Witchford make it by far the greatest recipient of proposed new housing for a village parish. Witchford is preparing a Neighbourhood Plan, the consultation responses so far are accepting growth but not at the level put forward by ECDC. Witchford PC would like clarification on the following points:

1. Witchford is identified as a large village with a good range of facilities, yet has only a small post office and limited retail. Two schools catering for five to sixteen year old students and a pre-school, all at capacity. The bus service has been cut to approx every two hours, with no Sunday service. There is severe congestion on the A142 at peak times. How is this a basis for major development?
2. What guarantee will you give that the A142/Common Road junction and both the A142/Witchford Road and A10/A142 roundabouts are going to be upgraded to function effectively for the increase in traffic?
3. How is this capacity improvement going to take into account pedestrian and cycle access and encourage cycling as detailed in the Cycling Strategy?
4. Is there going to be a Parish boundary review as part of the largest allocation? 50% of WFD M1 which is allocated for 720 houses lies in Ely Parish, this the CIL and precept benefits will go to City of Ely, while Witchford bears the burden of urbanisation and increased traffic. Will ECDC guarantee a boundary change to reflect the new community?
5. The 'green wedge' described in the draft Local Plan of January 2017 between Ely Road and the A142 has been all but swallowed up by the site WFD M1. What assurances can ECDC give that this too will not be swallowed up with new development?
6. How is the traffic generated by the school(s) going to be managed in Common Road and Manor Road?
7. How are you going to manage and guarantee the defence of identified green space south of Main Street from development?
8. Will ECDC press for a road suitable for school(s) buses through the proposed site north of Manor Road, to help ease congestion?

9. Given the lack of progress on the Ely North development, half of which is in the same ownership as the largest Witchford site, is the Council at risk of another five year land supply failure, if the allocation move forward slowly?
10. Local needs affordable housing has been used as a 'persuader' in local developments, only for percentages to be halved. How is Witchford going to develop as a balanced community with adequate affordable housing for local needs or are the developments to serve as an overflow from an overheated Cambridge property market?
11. Why has the Local Plan ignored the objections of Witchford PC and residents by not reducing the boundary of site ELY.E2 to exclude Witchford Bridleway 4 across the old airfield. This is an important and well used route in open countryside. What assurances will ECDC provide to protect the environmental amenity of the bridleway?
12. Witchford has received a massive and disproportionate allocation on the grounds that it is a sustainable location being close to a station and employment sites. How is it that the 'golden triangle' and golf course have not been allocated, as they better fit NPPF sustainability criteria?
13. Given the lack of progress on the Ely North developments, half of which is in the same ownership as the Witchford WFD M1 site, is the Council putting itself at risk of another five year land supply failure and this whole sorry process being revisited again?

Response from Director Commercial:

I thank Parish Councillor Ian Allen for the question, which will require detailed consideration of the issues included in it and a written response will be provided. Members also are reminded to have regard to the points raised in conjunction with consideration of agenda item 12.

ADDENDUM: Following the full Council meeting, the additional response below has been provided by the Director Commercial:

Following your public 'Question Time' at full Council on 5 October 2017, it was agreed that, due to the extent of your questions, a written response would be sent to you.

The essence of your set of Questions related to growth at Witchford, and various concerns arising as a result. As you know, later in the full Council meeting (post your question), it was resolved that the Local Plan proceed to consultation but, before doing so, the largest of the sites at Witchford be removed from the officer recommended Local Plan. As a consequence, many of the questions and issues you raise in your questions become either irrelevant or less relevant.

In respect of any outstanding questions you raised which remain relevant, these are all points which suitably could be made as part of the forthcoming consultation on the

Local Plan, if you feel it appropriate to do so. That said, following the full Council decision to remove the site at Witchford, the Council hopes that residents of Witchford now will welcome the proposals for Witchford as set out in the Local Plan.

Parish Councillor James Hadlow, Cheveley Parish Council:

1. Can the Council please explain why site CHV2 in Cheveley has been included in the latest version of the Local Plan when drainage issues have not been resolved and the new independent expert analysis of the drainage report has been submitted? This analysis raised a number of issues: in particular the risk of flooding to the proposed and neighbouring properties, which include a Grade II listed heritage asset located in a conservation area, adjacent to the receiving pond.
2. Can the Council please explain why Cheveley village has two allocation sites when Cambridgeshire County Council have submitted a statement saying that Cheveley 'school does not have enough spare capacity in the next five years to accommodate the additional demand forecast as a result of the proposed development' (site CHV2 in Cheveley). Pupils therefore will have to 'travel to Kettlefields School' in Stetchworth or further afield. Why does Stetchworth not strategically therefore have any allocation?

Response from Strategic Planning Manager:

1. Any decision on this site is subject to agenda item 12. Officers are recommending the site in Cheveley because, from a strategic 'in principle' point of view, the site is suitable as an allocation. The Council is aware that there is also a planning application for the same site, but the process for allocating a site is different to considering a planning application. From a strategic Local Plan point of view, in principle the site is suitable. When it comes to a planning application, considerable detailed consideration would then also be applied.
2. It is confirmed that Cheveley is recommended to have two allocation sites, but one of those sites has consent and is virtually built out. So, in effect, Cheveley only has one new allocation, and that site is included for reasons explained in response to the first question.

Question by Andrew York, High Street, Cheveley:

Regarding the Local Plan and Cheveley village infrastructure vs. increased housing:

- What plans exist to upgrade the water and sewage system infrastructure in the village?
- Do ECDC have proposals to build a new school and village hall for community use in the village to support growth?
- How will ECDC ensure adequate sustainable transport exists for new residents?

Response from Strategic Planning Manager:

Regarding the Local Plan and Cheveley village infrastructure vs. increased housing:

What plans exist to upgrade the water and sewage system infrastructure in the village?

In terms of fresh water: We are aware that water resources in the Cheveley Water Resource Zone are somewhat limited. In the short term, Anglian Water's focus is on reducing consumption (metering, etc). In the medium to long term, it is likely that more water will be transferred in from neighbouring Newmarket WRZ, requiring a **new pipeline and pumping station**. However, Anglian Water have made assumptions about growth which are far higher than we are proposing in the Local Plan. Growth identified in the Local Plan will not, our evidence suggests, directly result in the need for that new pipeline or pumping station.

In terms of waste water: The receiving Water Recycling Centre (or sewerage works, as they are sometimes known) has sufficient capacity to accommodate waste water from the proposed levels of growth.

To accommodate growth, the foul sewerage network was identified as requiring upgrade to ensure sufficient capacity. This is the case for most sites. The necessary improvement would be expected to be delivered by a developer.

In terms of surface water: Any surface issues are a matter for detailed planning applications to resolve.

Do ECDC have proposals to build a new school and village hall for community use in the village to support growth?

There are no present proposals by ECDC to directly provide any such new facilities.

How will ECDC ensure adequate sustainable transport exists for new residents?

As part of the consideration of any new planning proposal, whether it be a Local Plan allocation or consideration of a planning application, the ability of a site to either access existing or provide new sustainable transport facilities is a material consideration. This approach applies to Cheveley, as well as anywhere else in the district. That doesn't mean a proposal will automatically fail or be approved on that basis, it will just be a factor taken into consideration in reaching a decision.

Planning Applications, Cheveley

Question by Jill York, High Street, Cheveley:

Having seen a surprising and worrying number of failures in ECDC planning procedures for recent planning applications in Cheveley village including 17/01518/FUM (and including changes to the local plan), for example:

- Why is it up to the Public to point out basic anomalies and omissions to the planning department?
- Why do the Councillors appear not to have the detail of applications, relying instead on the planning officers overview and how can they make a judgement without all the information being read?

So with this in mind please advise what is being done by ECDC to ensure due democratic process is being followed by its officers and councillors in the planning process?

Response from Director Operations:

Information is submitted by the applicant as part of a planning application and members of the public and consultees are consulted on the information submitted. At this point queries may be raised in relation to the information submitted by members of the public, consultees and also the Planning Officer dealing with the application. If all of the items required for validation have been submitted, an application is made valid, but during the course of the application it can often come to light that additional information is required to be submitted. This is part of the application process.

A comprehensive report is written by officers for Councillors and it is detailed within that report that all of the neighbour responses, consultee responses and details of the application can be viewed on Public Access. Councillors are able to access this information prior to a committee meeting. Planning Officers are qualified and employed by this Council to assess the information submitted and balance the material planning considerations, before making a recommendation to Planning Committee. Members of the Planning Committee are able to ask questions during the meeting for points of clarification from the Case Officer and also anyone who has registered to speak.

Officers follow the relevant processes and Councillors are provided with detailed reports which address issues which have been raised, to allow them to make a decision on an application.

Agenda Item 15 - Transfer of Tourism, Town Centres and Events Function to City of Ely Council

Question by Ted Coney, Waterside, Ely:

Does the Council see a correlation between arts, culture and heritage and the prosperity of Ely and the surrounding area? If it does, will it continue to support Oliver Cromwell's House both as a hub for information and as a tourist attraction?

Response from Chief Executive:

Agenda item 15 relates to the transfer of Oliver Cromwell's House (OCH) and other Tourism, Town Centres and Events functions relating to Ely to the City of Ely

Council. However, OCH will remain part of the district-wide Tourism Strategy, even if it is transferred to the City of Ely Council.