



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
16 October 2014 at 6.00pm

PRESENT

Councillor Ian Allen	Councillor Tom Hunt
Councillor Anna Bailey	Councillor Chris Morris
Councillor David Brown	Councillor Neil Morrison
Councillor Lorna Dupre	Councillor James Palmer
Councillor Kevin Ellis	Councillor Tony Parramint
Councillor Lis Every	Councillor Charles Roberts
Councillor Colin Fordham	Councillor Hamish Ross
Councillor Jeremy Friend-Smith	Councillor Mike Rouse
Sheila Friend-Smith MBE	Councillor Joshua Schumann
Councillor Tony Goodge	Councillor Robert Stevens
Councillor Elaine Griffin-Singh	Councillor Gareth Wilson
Councillor Richard Hobbs	Councillor Pauline Wilson
Councillor Bill Hunt	Councillor Andy Wright

39. **ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE MEETING**

Due to the absence of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council, nominations were invited for the election of a Chairman for the meeting. Councillor Richard Hobbs having been duly proposed and seconded,

It was resolved:

That Councillor Richard Hobbs be elected as Chairman for the duration of the meeting.

40. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The following question was asked by Charlotte Cane of Swaffham Road, Reach:

'You are considering spending CIL funds on 2 major Capital projects. Why don't you allocate those funds to smaller local projects which will benefit more people around the District more quickly, e.g. urgent repairs to Swaffham Prior's school roof?'

In response, the Chief Executive stated that the question related to Agenda Item 13 on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) amendment to the Regulation 123 List and requested that the Corporate Unit Manager, Emma Grima, respond to this as part of her presentation on the item. In addition, the Chief Executive stated that similar issues had been raised by

Swaffham Prior Parish Council and a copy of his response to the Parish Council had been tabled for the information of Members and would be provided to Ms Cane.

41. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Allen Alderson, Councillor Michael Allan (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Christine Ambrose Smith, Councillor David Ambrose Smith, Councillor Sue Austen, Councillor Derrick Beckett, Councillor Tony Cornell (Chairman), Councillor Lavinia Edwards, Councillor Lindsey Harris, Councillor Tom Kerby, Councillor Philip Read, Councillor Hazel Williams MBE, and Councillor Sue Willows.

42. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interests were received.

43. **MINUTES**

It was resolved:

That the Minutes of the meetings held on 17 July and 4 September 2014 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

44. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

The Chairman advised Members of progress in the treatment of Councillor Philip Read and asked that the best wishes of the Council be conveyed to him for a speedy recovery.

45. **PETITIONS**

No Petitions had been received.

46. **MOTIONS**

No Motions had been submitted.

47. **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

The following 3 questions were received from Councillors Neil Morrison and Ian Allen and responses tabled as detailed:

Question from Councillor Neil Morrison:

'The Council last held a staff survey of its employees in 2012. It was the clear intention of the Authority to conduct a similar event sometime during 2014.

There is now only two months of the current year to run but no evidence that a staff survey is being implemented or even planned.

My question is:- As a consequence of the staff replies to the previous survey and the negative results being published in the Press, is the ruling group so afraid of a repeat performance that they have abandoned any pretence of holding a survey for fear of bad publicity before next year's District elections?'

Response:

The Council's HR & Facilities Service Manager has been reviewing the current format of the Council's staff survey and best practice in order to increase staff participation in 2014.

The introduction of regular 'pulse surveys' across the Council to engage with staff on specific issues (including those covered in the previous staff survey) has been proposed in the HR & Facilities Service Plan and subject to approval by the Regulatory & Support Services Committee on 20th October, the first 'pulse survey' will be conducted by the end of December 2014 and another by the end of March 2015. These new surveys will be conducted on a quarterly basis each year, which will enable Management to focus on key topics and implement agreed actions without delay to demonstrate that the Council is listening to the views of its staff.

Question from Councillor Ian Allen:

'Following the adoption by full Council on 4 September 2014 of the Motion regarding renewable energy applications and the impacts of those on the residents of the District:

Does the Council have a view on the impact of Gas Fracking on the rights of freeholders and on the safety of our water supply, coming as it does from vulnerable aquifers? Is the Council happy to allow Liberal Democrat Lady Kramer to gain assent, and I quote, "to give the right to leave deep level land in a different condition from that before, including leaving any infrastructure or substance in the land." The reinjection of toxic fracking fluids has caused problems in the USA and, if allowed here, could make our District especially vulnerable.'

Response:

East Cambridgeshire District Council does not have a policy on gas fracking.

The Supplementary Planning Document being reported to Council focuses on renewable energy technologies such as solar, wind and biomass, rather than non-renewable sources. It seeks to provide further detail to the policies in the Core Strategy (2009) and emerging Local Plan (2014 as amended) on renewable energy.

Cambridgeshire County Council is the body who is responsible for determining planning applications for gas fracking in the county (as the mineral planning authority). The District Council would be a consultee

to any planning application. Activities would also need to secure a drilling licence from central Government (Department of Energy and Climate Change).

Question from Councillor Ian Allen:

“In this Council’s Policy document on community-led development, I note that in the Section headed ‘3.2 Evidence of Organisational Structure’ fifth bullet point, it states:-

That (a CLT) has clear management policies and procedures in place – particularly to deal with conflicts of interest on decisions around allocations of resources (e.g. housing allocations).

How in practice can Members of Council be assured of transparency in dealings of allocations, rights of appeal by applicants, and the possibility of inducements in allocations by CLT Trustees? How is this Council going to monitor the activities of CLT partners in the management of CLT Trusts? How is the Council going to ensure transparency in the organisation of all CLTs, which are after all a Council Corporate Objective?”

Response:

In its capacity as a Planning authority, a community-led organisation such as a Community Land Trust, must produce an allocations policy, which is agreed with the Housing Strategy and Development team as part of the S106 agreement for the allocation of affordable housing (as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework).

In addition, the Council also operates a CLT Support Programme, which provides grants, loans and expertise to emerging and legal constituted CLTs.

In respect of the Council's pre-development loans, there are a number of mechanisms to provide assurance to members. The appraisal of any application and recommendation is undertaken by a third party, Foundation East Ltd and approved by the relevant Committee.

The lending criteria (approved by Development and Transport 11 June 2013) refers to the requirement for the organisation to be:-

- established as a not-for profit legal incorporated entity;
- community controlled and owned with an open democratic structure;
- clear about the community that it has been established to serve, with a clear vision and robust governance arrangements in place to ensure it is 'fit for purpose'.

In addition, as part of the application process, the CLT is required to submit, amongst other documents, evidence of need and proposed a property allocations policy.

The terms and conditions of any loan include a requirement from the CLT to formally resolve to accept the terms of the loan agreement and obligations on the CLT, specifically (ref: 6.1) as summarised below:-

- conduct its business in accordance with all relevant laws and codes of practices;
- keep ECDC informed of the progress of its business and will provide ECDC specifically, with trading and income and expenditure accounts, quarterly in audited management accounts and such information to satisfy the Council that the Borrower is carrying out its activities and undertaking in an efficient and business-like manner.

48. **CRIME STATISTICS AND LOCAL POLICING ISSUES UPDATE**

Council received a presentation from Inspector Marcia Nichols, East Cambridgeshire Safer Neighbourhoods Manager, on crime statistics and local policing issues update. Inspector Nichols explained that she had taken over from the previous Inspector Paul Ormerod and had been in post for 2 months, during which time she had become familiar with the crime patterns and community issues within the District.

Inspector Nichols' presentation covered the following areas:

- Previous Panel Priorities
- East Cambridgeshire Crime Trends - April 08 to June 14
- East Cambridgeshire Total Crime – August 13 to July 14
- East Cambridgeshire Crime/Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Performance – Aug 13 to July 14 compared to Aug 12 to July 13
- Areas of Concern
- East Cambridgeshire ASB - Aug 13 to July 14
- East Cambridgeshire ASB Incidents
- Good News Story – Cannabis Factory discovered in Soham
- Community Engagement
- Police Priorities 2014/15
- East Cambridgeshire Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Priorities 2014/15
- Current Local Priorities
- Future Priorities – Have Your Say

The following points were made by Inspector Nichols as part of the presentation:

Previous Panel Priorities – these had been reviewed in the light of the crime figures. Dwelling burglaries figures had reduced due to targeting of this area and was no longer a priority. However, Parking remained a priority issue. Reference was made to Soham and East area omitted from the presentation, which had issues with Anti-

Social Behaviour and positive results had been achieved from engaging with local young people.

Crime Trends – December 2012 had seen the lowest point in reported crime within the District. Whilst there had been a gradual increase in crime rates since then, overall crime rates were deemed to be low and below those for comparable authorities nationally. Some of the increase might be due to the ethical recording of offences criteria introduced nationally.

East Cambridgeshire Total Crime Graph – As would be expected, the Town areas of Ely, Soham and Littleport had the highest levels of crime, together with Ely East which included the major supermarket and other larger commercial premises. However, the crime rates for theft from shops had reduced by 29.1% in the period Aug 13 to July 14 compared to Aug 12 to July 13, partly due to dedicated patrols in the Town Centre in the pre-Christmas period to drive down retail crime. It was intended that similar patrols would be undertaken this December.

Areas of Concern – violent crime and sexual offences were areas of concern. However, in both cases the increase in reported offences could have been affected by the ethical recording of crime; and in the case of violent crime, work done by the Police on Domestic Abuse was likely to have resulted in people having more confidence to report domestic incidents. In the case of sexual offences, the Operation Yewtree affect nationally had resulted in more current and historical offences being reported.

Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) – reported incidents had reduced from 1,660 to 1,500 compared to the same period in the preceding year. Soham ASB Group had proved successful and it was hoped to replicate this in Ely.

Good News Story: Cannabis Factory discovered in Soham – good, proactive Team in this area had produced positive results and also resulted in discovery of person employed at cannabis factory who was the victim of trafficking.

Community Engagement – not just about enforcement but positive engagement and interventions for prevention of crime. For many of community engagement initiatives there was a dedicated point of contact and Police also attended community events such as school fetes, Aquafest, etc. Role Models scheme for young people explained.

Police Priorities 2014/15 – RISK explained.

Current Local Priorities:

- Acquisitive crime (dwelling burglary and taking of motor vehicle/taking from motor vehicle)
 - Driving Standards
 - ASB
 - Parking Enforcement in towns and outside schools
 - Drugs Use
-
- Future Priorities – Have Your Say: The Police were reviewing how they receive input since the demise of the Neighbourhood Panels and how to improve engagement with local communities on priorities.

The Chairman then opened the meeting up to questions from Members to the Inspector relating to district-wide policing issues.

Councillor Tom Hunt stated that he was the Council's representative on the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel and referred to the positive work undertaken by the Police to combat ASB in Soham and the positive response that he had received from the Police in 2012 when he had contacted them regarding ASB and drug use in Ely. Councillor Tom Hunt also commended the Police's use of social media locally. However, he commented that it would be easy for a small district like East Cambridgeshire to be neglected, bearing in mind the much larger conurbations of Cambridge and Peterborough within the County, and that efforts should be made to maintain a focus on the district.

Councillor Ian Allen referred to the fact that sexual offences were an area of concern but not a local priority. He also referred to the fact that Norfolk Police had moved resources from burglary to sexual offences, as this was often a crime that was hidden in rural areas, and asked if a similar approach would be taken in East Cambridgeshire. Inspector Nichols stated that specialist partnership groups were focussing on vulnerable young people and there was a clear referral pathway for sexual offences as well. Inspector Nichols also explained the daily management meetings that took place at local level, which dealt with the highest risk cases that had been identified over the past 24 hours. Safeguarding issues were identified as part of this process. So clear mechanisms and processes were in place internally.

Councillor Fordham stated that he had been a member of a local organisation for 54 years but the Police no longer attended events run by them. Therefore, he queried the criteria for Police attendance at local events. Inspector Nichols stated that there was an event-trained commander who made an assessment of individual events based on the risk they afforded in terms of potential threats and harm. Due to the limited resources available, it was now necessary to prioritise attendance at events in the context of maintaining front-line services.

Councillor Dupré referred to the local priority of parking enforcement in towns and outside schools, and asked about the level of resource that

would be given to parking enforcement in villages. Inspector Nichols stated that she was aware of parking issues in local villages and around village schools and these would also be assessed for risk and safety issues. Three key areas of enforcement, education and engineering were used to address such issues, but this was always a contentious subject at local level.

The Chairman thanked Inspector Nichols for her attendance and informative presentation and highlighted the positive relationship between the Council and the Police.

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

Council considered a report, P95 previously circulated, detailing a recommendation from Corporate Governance and Finance Committee:

Corporate Governance and Finance Committee – 25 September 2014

Treasury Operations Annual Performance Review

It was resolved:

That the report on the Council's Treasury operations during 2013/14 including the actual Prudential and Treasury indicators, as set out at Appendix 1 to the submitted report, be noted.

50. **BELL ROAD, BOTTISHAM MASTERPLAN – INTERIM POLICY GUIDANCE**

Council considered a report, P96 previously circulated, detailing comments received on the draft Masterplan for land east of Bell Road Bottisham and a revised final version of the document. The Principal Forward Planning Officer explained the background to the preparation of the Masterplan, which had been produced by a Liaison Group consisting of representatives of Bottisham Parish Council, the District Council, Bidwells for the landowner, the prospective developer Barratt/David Wilson homes and their consultants JB Planning Associates. Representatives of all of these bodies were present at the Council meeting and, with the permission of the Chairman, the Principal Forward Planning Officer read out the following statement submitted by Bottisham Parish Council:

'This has been a positive opportunity to be involved at an early stage re Future Development of a potential site.

All parties involved have used this opportunity to share ideas, concerns and deal with issues which needed to be addressed before a Planning Application was submitted.

We as a Council have been opposed to any future build in this village and stated our reasons. Our concerns re future growth still remain but

we, through the discussions and guidance, are willing to support this Masterplan.'

Councillor Tom Hunt commended the quality of the Masterplan and referred to comments made in the consultation responses on the need for smaller properties and for 5 Bed houses to be removed from the mix. He concurred with the view on the need for smaller units to be included in housing developments to help first-time buyers.

Councillor Stevens referred to the buffer zone adjacent to the ancient monument on the penultimate page of the document and asked if the woodland would remain. The developer confirmed that this would remain as it was outside of the application boundary and was important to the setting of the ancient monument. This would be maintained by the landowner. Councillor Stevens stated that although himself and Councillor Ellis, as local Ward Members, had not been involved in the drafting of the Masterplan due to interests, he commended the quality of the Masterplan and had not found any technical errors. However, Councillor Stevens did explain issues experienced in the village regarding open space provision with equipped play areas.

Councillor Brown commented that a lot of work had been carried out to produce the Masterplan and it had the support of the Parish Council. Therefore, he hoped that all areas of the District Council would give due importance to the Masterplan in the future. Councillor Brown also commented that 5 bed houses should not be ruled out of the mix for the development, since they were not available in the village at present.

Councillor Schumann queried if the developer was content with the proposed allocation of 50 dwellings and it was confirmed that the developer had changed their position and was now content with the allocation of 50 dwellings.

It was resolved:

1. That the responses received during consultation on the draft Bell Road Masterplan (attached as Appendix 1 to the submitted report) be noted.
2. That the revised final version of the draft Bell Road Masterplan be approved as Interim Policy Guidance (attached as Appendix 3 to the submitted report) prior to adoption of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan.
3. That any subsequent minor changes to the Masterplan document prior to publication as Interim Policy Guidance be approved by the Principal /Forward Planning Officer, in consultation with the Chair of Corporate Governance and Finance Committee.

51. **DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) ON RENEWABLE ENERGY**

Council considered a report, P97 previously circulated, detailing the consultation responses to and the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Renewable Energy Development (commercial scale), which sets out the Council's proposed approach to large scale renewable energy proposals. The Principal Forward Planning Officer explained the background to the preparation of the SPD and highlighted two sets of amendments to the text tabled by Councillors Anna Bailey and Gareth Wilson.

Councillor Bill Hunt moved the recommendations in the submitted report, which was seconded by Councillor James Palmer. In so doing, Councillor Bill Hunt thanked the Principal Forward Planning Officer and Forward Planning Officer for their work in translating the motion from the Council meeting on 4 September 2014 into the SPD which was a usable and customer-friendly document. He also thanked Councillors Anna Bailey and Gareth Wilson for their textual amendments, which he was happy to agree to incorporate into his motion. Councillor Hunt stated that the SPD preserved the best things in our District and ensured full and complete consultation when any large scheme was proposed. Communities needed to have a say in any scheme and the SPD allowed for this, supported localism and ensured that the benefits of a scheme outweighed the harm. Significant local support would be required before an application succeeded. Therefore, Councillor Hunt hoped that Members would support its adoption.

Councillor Gareth Wilson then explained the reasons for his textual amendments and also asked for a further small amendment to refer to the 'Devil's Dyke area' after the 'Ouse Washes' in paragraph 3.3. Councillor Bill Hunt also agreed to this amendment to his motion.

Councillor Bailey explained her amendments on mitigation measures and stated that she also would pass on some minor typographical corrections to the Principal Forward Planning Officer which she could amend under her delegated authority. She also pointed out that English Heritage had been split into two bodies with Historic England.

Councillor Pauline Wilson commended the comprehensive nature of the SPD but queried why this did not include a figure for the required distance of wind turbines from residential properties. The Principal Forward Planning Officer explained that the Government had recently issued new guidance stating that authorities could not impose inflexible distance criteria for renewable energy schemes but must consider each case individually.

Councillor Rouse stated that consideration would need to be given in the future to the balance between growing food crops and producing renewable energy. Many anaerobic digesters used maize to produce energy and this crop was being grown and transported often large distances to top-up such digesters. However, he commended the quality of the SPD.

Councillor Stevens also commended the SPD and reiterated the point he made at the Council meeting on 4 September 2014 that at present only a very small proportion of land in the District was used for renewable energy schemes. He concurred with Councillor Rouse's view that land use would become an issue in the future and highlighted that farmers did not need permission to grow maize to supply anaerobic digesters.

Councillor Stevens and then Councillor Allen referred to some other suggested minor typographical corrections to the SPD for the sake of accuracy, and it was suggested that they should pass these onto the Principal Forward Planning Officer who could then consider amending them under her delegated authority.

It was resolved:

- i. That the summary of the consultation responses to the Draft SPD on Renewable Energy Development, attached as Appendix 1 to the submitted report, be noted.
- ii. That the revised Supplementary Planning Document on Renewable Energy Development (attached as Appendix 2 to the submitted report) is adopted by the District Council, subject to the following amendments tabled at the meeting:

Paragraph 3.3 (point 1, final sentence)

'Applicants will need to consider any adverse impacts on views which are currently available from and to strategic green infrastructure sites including the Wicken Fen Vision area **and the Ouse Washes and Devil's Dyke area.**'

Reason for suggested change: Proposed additional wording to include reference to the Ouse Washes as an area of strategic green infrastructure which should be considered by applicants.

Paragraph 8.3 (point 4)

4. Catchment restrictions: The District Council will also consider the need to impose restrictions on the distance travelled by vehicles to provide suitable biodegradable materials to be used in anaerobic digestion plants within the district. **Planning conditions will also be applied to require the use of wheel washing equipment to ensure that material is not deposited on the public highway. The Council will also apply appropriate planning conditions to restrict the hours of operation of anaerobic digestion plants to protect residential amenity, as outlined in Section 6 of the SPD.**

Reason for suggested change: Change of wording to make it clear that planning conditions will (rather than 'may') be used to

require wheel washing equipment where anaerobic digestion plants are proposed. Proposed additional wording to include reference to the hours of operations of these plants.

Page 17 paragraph 6

Insert the following sentence at the end of the paragraph: “This may result in a requirement to carry out further additional mitigation measures.”

Page 19, new paragraph between paragraphs 6 and 7

Insert additional paragraph after paragraph 6 as follows: “Where impacts have been identified, it may be possible to agree effective mitigation measures. Where such measures have been agreed, there may be a requirement for post-construction surveys to validate the assessed level of predicted impacts and the effectiveness of the agreed mitigation measures. This may result in a requirement to carry out further additional mitigation measures.”

- iii. That any subsequent minor changes to the SPD document prior to publication be approved by the Principal Forward Planning Officer, in consultation with the Chair of Corporate Governance and Finance Committee.
- iv. That the revised Scheme of Delegation to officers for planning applications in the Council’s Constitution, as set out in Appendix 3 to the submitted report, be approved.

52. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - AMENDMENT TO REGULATION 123 LIST**

Council considered a report, P98 previously circulated, proposing an amendment to the Community Infrastructure Levy (‘CIL’) Regulation 123 list (‘R123 list’), namely; the inclusion of the Ely Southern Bypass.

The Corporate Unit Manager explained that the inclusion of the Bypass on the R123 list did not signify a commitment to fund the scheme but provided a mechanism for consideration of a funding allocation.

In response to the question earlier in the meeting under public question time, the Corporate Unit Manager explained that the Swaffham Prior request would require formal consultation before consideration by full Council for inclusion on the R123 list. Further consultation would be taking place in the near future for proposed changes to the R123 list to be considered for adoption in spring 2015. However, officers also would need to check the Regulations to clarify whether maintenance of existing infrastructure schemes were eligible for inclusion on the R123 list.

Councillor Palmer explained the background to inclusion of the Bypass on the R123 list and stated that whilst this was part of the Council's Corporate Objectives, the Council still would need to make a decision on whether to provide funding for the bypass.

Councillor Wright commented that it would not be appropriate to discuss the Swaffham Prior CIL R123 list request at this stage. However, he stated that S106 allocations were site specific and to be spent in the Parish to which they related, and therefore he queried the position on the £37,000 secured in lieu of provision of public open space on-site from a housing development in the village. The Chief Executive confirmed that discussions were ongoing with the Parish Council regarding the possible transfer of this sum to the Parish Council for them to use in accordance with the S106 agreement for the provision/improvement to public open space within the village.

Councillor Morrison commented that a response rate of 8 out of 35 local Councils consulted was very poor. He also commented that the E-mail response from Mepal Parish Council was ambiguous as to whether they were supporting the inclusion of the Bypass on the R123 list. The Corporate Unit Manager stated that she would clarify this point with Mepal Parish Council.

Councillor Allen challenged whether the Southern Bypass was a Strategic Objective of the draft Local Plan, as stated in paragraph 4.1 of the report. The Corporate Unit Manager agreed to confirm whether this was the case, but the Chief Executive stated that, nevertheless, it was one of the Council's Corporate Priorities and Members could consider its inclusion on the R123 list in this context.

Councillor Gareth Wilson stated that whilst he would not necessarily have chosen the 4 listed projects for inclusion on the R123 list, Ely did need a Bypass and so he would be supporting its inclusion. However, he hoped that when the minor projects were considered for inclusion on the list, these would relate to the whole of the District rather than solely to Ely and the north of the District.

Councillor Dupré challenged Councillor Palmer's interpretation of events at the County Council with regard to the Southern Bypass project and commented that the Bypass would have an impact on traffic flows on the A10 and surrounding villages such as Sutton. Therefore, she hoped that mitigation works for these also would be included on the R123 list in the future.

Councillor Stevens expressed his support for the addition of the Southern Bypass to the R123 list.

Councillor Tom Hunt commended officers on their work related to the Southern Bypass project.

In concluding, Councillor Palmer stated that the Bypass would affect the whole of the District, which was why it was a Corporate Priority of the Council. He also would be amenable to consideration of any suggestions for schemes for inclusion on the R123 list from the south of the District.

It was resolved:

That the draft Community Infrastructure Levy ('CIL') Regulation 123 list ('R123 list'), as set out in Appendix 1 to the submitted report, be approved.

53. **REVOCAION OF ELY MOORING BYELAWS**

Council considered a report, P99 previously circulated, requesting the revocation of Ely Mooring Byelaws sealed by the District Council on the 27 April 2001 and 5 March 2014.

Solicitor, Sarah Steed, explained the background to the request for revocation as follows:

- The Mooring Byelaw had been in place since 2001 with no challenges to the Council's ability to make the Mooring Byelaw.
- Community Services were instructed to look at solutions for the consistent enforcement of the moorings at Ely Riverside.
- Extensive consultation exercises were carried out with key stakeholders, residents and businesses to extend the Mooring Byelaw to include new areas of land.
- During the final stages of this work, a representation was made to the Secretary of State stating that there was a conflict of powers with the Environment Agency.
- Counsel's advice confirmed this was the case and the Mooring Byelaws should be revoked as they were unlawful.
- Alternative options to manage the District Council's mooring were now being explored and would be presented to the Commercial Services Committee on 12 November 2014.

Councillor Schumann expressed his sincere thanks to officers for all their work on the byelaw and stated that it was unfortunate that this had been unsuccessful due to other issues. Councillor Every echoed Councillor Schumann's sentiments.

In response to a question by Councillor Stevens regarding the issues relating to moorings at the Riverside, Councillor Hobbs, as Chair of Commercial Services Committee, explained that the Byelaws limited the mooring of boats for more than 48 hours and enabled enforcement to prevent long-term mooring at the Riverside, due to the limited spaces available, popularity of this stretch of the river and in the interests of promoting benefits to the local economy of the City from visitors.

It was resolved:

That approval be given to the revocation of Ely Mooring Byelaws sealed by the District Council on the 27 April 2001 and 5 March 2014.

54. **POLLING DISTRICT, POLLING PLACES AND POLLING STATIONS REVIEW**

Council considered a report, P100 previously circulated, detailing the outcome of the review of Polling Districts, Polling Places and Polling Stations. The Principal Democratic Services Officer explained that a formal review had to be conducted every 4 years, but that this did not prevent changes to Polling Stations being made at other times due to changing circumstances or issues that arose.

Councillor Every referred to the correspondence from City of Ely Council and Councillor Hobbs detailed in paragraph 3.4 of the report regarding a venue in the Ely East Ward to accommodate the elderly residents of Bell Holt, and stated that this was requested in addition to the Vernon Cross Room Polling Station rather than instead of it. The Chief Executive, as Returning Officer, agreed to consider the issue.

It was resolved:

- i That the outcome of the Review of Polling Districts, Polling Places and Polling Stations, as detailed in Appendix A of the submitted report, be noted.
- ii That the proposed changes detailed below to the location of Polling Places/Stations be approved:

Burwell KB1 - That a new polling station inside the polling district be found.

Cheveley MD1 - That a new polling station inside the polling district be found.

Dullingham Villages MK1 - That the larger of the rooms at Parsonage Farm Barns is used for all future elections.

Ely East HG1 - St Peters Church Hall in Broad Street be used as an alternative to The Maltings.

Ely West HI1 - Use of the larger meeting room of the Methodist Church.

Ely North HJ6 - Use of St Michael and All Angels Church in Chettisham to retain a polling place in Chettisham village.

Fordham Villages LI6 - Use of conservatory room at George & Dragon public house instead of using a portacabin in their car park.

Haddenham JJ1 and JA1 - That a new polling station inside the polling district at Witchford be found and that we seek to use the large hall at the Arkenstall Centre for future elections.

Littleport IE1 - If we cannot use the Methodist Church Hall, a new polling station inside the polling district be found.

Soham North LF1 - That a new polling station inside the polling district be found.

Soham South LG2 - That a new polling station inside the polling district be found.

Sutton JE1 - Use of the Royal British Legion Hall at the Brooklands Centre, larger room with better disabled access and easier route to polling station from car park.

55. **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW (CGR) LITTLE THETFORD**

Further to Minute 18 of the meeting held on 15 May 2014, Council considered a report, P101 previously circulated, detailing the outcome of the consultation on the draft proposal to decrease the number of Parish Councillors on Little Thetford Parish Council from nine to seven, as part of a Community Governance Review (CGR) arising from a request from the Parish Council.

Councillor Bill Hunt, speaking in support of the recommendation, stated that based on the electorate for the Parish of 556, this gave a ratio of 1 Parish Councillor to 62 residents for 9 Councillors, which would result in a Parish Council of 40 in Haddenham based on this ratio. Even reducing to 7 Councillors, there would be a ratio of 1 Parish Councillor to 79 residents in Little Thetford, which still would give a Parish Council of 31 in Haddenham if applied there.

It was resolved:

That the final proposal/recommendation, in accordance with the Terms of Reference for the Community Governance Review, be:

‘That the number of Parish Councillors on Little Thetford Parish Council be decreased from 9 to 7, to come into effect for the Parish elections in May 2015.’

and that Council approve the making of an Order to that effect.

56. **RESOLUTION TO EXTEND 6 MONTH RULE – SECTION 85 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**

Council considered a report, P102 previously circulated, requesting Members to consider a further extension of the 6 month rule for Councillor Philip Read, due to his absence from meetings because of ill health.

It was resolved:

That Council approves an extension of the 6 month rule for Councillor Philip Read on ill-health grounds until the end of the municipal year and expresses its best wishes to him for a speedy recovery.

The meeting concluded at 8.12pm.

Chairman.....

Date