



EAST  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of East Cambridgeshire  
District Council held in the Council Chamber,  
The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Wednesday  
16 November 2016 at 6.00pm

---

## **PRESENT**

Councillor Allen Alderson	Councillor Elaine Griffin-Singh
Councillor Michael Allan (Chairman)	Councillor Julia Huffer
Councillor Christine Ambrose-Smith	Councillor Mark Hugo
Councillor David Ambrose-Smith	Councillor Bill Hunt
Councillor Sue Austen	Councillor Tom Hunt
Councillor Anna Bailey	Councillor Chris Morris
Councillor Derrick Beckett	Councillor James Palmer
Councillor Ian Bovingdon	Councillor Andy Pearson
Councillor Mike Bradley	Councillor Charles Roberts
Councillor David Chaplin	Councillor Mike Rouse
Councillor Steve Cheetham	Councillor Joshua Schumann
Councillor Paul Cox	Councillor Alan Sharp
Councillor Peter Cresswell (Vice-Chairman)	Councillor Mathew Shuter
Councillor Lorna Dupré	Councillor Stuart Smith
Councillor Lavinia Edwards	Councillor Lisa Stubbs
Councillor Lis Every	Councillor Jo Webber

## 25. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The following statement was received from Wicken Parish Council and tabled in the absence of a representative from the Parish regarding the Local Plan Further Draft contained at item 12 on the Agenda:

Wicken Parish Council do not believe East Cambs can sign off the draft Local Plan for Wicken as presented because:

1. The map submitted is inaccurate and has significant omissions.
2. The process undertaken for consultation on Development Envelopes was flawed.

Wicken Parish Council requests that the Wicken section of the Local Plan is withdrawn until accurate, maps and data are available to the Full Council. It is misleading and incorrect for such information to be promulgated for public scrutiny and consultation when there are known omissions and inaccuracies in the data.

Our reasons for this are:

1. Wicken embraced the opportunity to have small scale, measured development in the village. However, due to the lack of a 5 year supply Wicken has seen 29 new dwellings approved in the last 9 months, 26 of which are outside the development envelope for commencement in the next 2-3 years. None of this is reflected in the Plan to be debated. None of these applications are annotated on the Local Plan maps in front of you and have not been taken into account by the Strategic Planning Department.
2. A further 13 dwellings are awaiting a decision, also outside of the development envelope, which on current form are likely to be approved. This makes a total of 42 new dwellings. Taking East Cambs statement in its meetings earlier this year that they were looking at Parishes taking a 10% increase, this number of dwellings equates to a 13% increase.
3. To put a plan forward that is recommending a further additional 24 dwellings on one site alone would bring Wicken's allocation to over 20%, twice the recommendation. Again, the map is inaccurate.
4. East Cambs undertook an extensive consultation under their "Call for Sites" initiative. East Cambs failed to follow the same process for the Development Envelope proposals. This means the process was flawed and did not give the public or parishes the opportunity to comment or receive feedback on the Development Envelope proposals received.
5. Only sites from the Call for Sites consultation have been included in the latest draft and the concept of the Development Envelope discussions has disappeared.

Wicken Parish Council challenges the validity of the process undertaken and the validity of the information contained within the documents presented. As a consequence, Wicken Parish Council does not believe the data presented for Wicken can be signed off by this Council.

The question was responded to by the Director Commercial, Emma Grima, as follows:

*This statement relates to the Further Draft of the Local Plan contained at agenda item 12. This Further Draft has been compiled in accordance with legislative requirements and, if approved for consultation later in the meeting, I would request Wicken Parish Council to submit this statement as a formal representation as part of that consultation process.*

## 26. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brown, Green, Hobbs, Ross, Dan Schumann and Sennitt.

27. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Declarations of interests were made by Councillors Bovingdon, Huffer and Palmer in relation to Agenda Item 12 Local Plan – Further Draft.

28. **MINUTES**

The Chairman highlighted that the Minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 26 May 2016, which had been omitted from the Agenda, had been tabled at the meeting.

It was resolved:

That the Minutes of the meetings of Council held on 26 May and 28 June 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

29. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

Vice-Chairman Councillor Peter Cresswell

I am delighted to welcome back my Vice-Chairman, Councillor Peter Cresswell, after a period of convalescence from an operation.

Members applauded Councillor Cresswell's return and Councillor Cresswell thanked everyone for their good wishes and expressed his pleasure at being able to return to his duties.

Chairman's Civic Service 27 November 2016

The Chairman reminded Members that his Civic Service would be held on 27 November 2016. The Service would benefit two charities – the Fusiliers Society and Macmillan Nurses.

Alteration of Order of Business

The Chairman stated that he had agreed to an amendment to the order of business to take Agenda Item 11 on Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution before Agenda Item 10 on Corporate Plan Priorities 2015-19.

Ely Markets Festive Lates

Ely Markets are running a series of events celebrating the diversity of their markets and showcasing the choice available all year round.

Ely “Festive Lates” are launching tomorrow, Thursday 17 November, and will take place every Thursday from 4.30 – 8.30 p.m. in the run up to Christmas.

These family-friendly evenings will feature street food, shopping and live music on Ely Market Place with a chance to sample street food, mulled wine, mince pies and browse unique crafts and gifts from local makers.

Ely Markets look forward to welcoming all to the Festive Lates tomorrow and every Thursday before Christmas.

The cards you will find on your tables give details of both the Festive Lates and Ely Markets Christmas markets and events during November and December.

30. **PETITIONS**

No Petitions had been received.

31. **MOTIONS**

No motions were received.

32. **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

No questions from Members were received.

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

Council considered a report, R113 previously circulated, detailing recommendations from Corporate Governance and Finance Committee and the LATC Shareholder Review Committee:

a. **CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE COMMITTEE – 30 JUNE 2016**

**Treasury Operations Annual Performance Review**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor James Palmer, highlighted table 1 in paragraph 5.1 of the report that had been submitted to Corporate Governance and Finance Committee, which showed the very impressive financial position of the Council. Therefore, he wanted to commend and thank the officers of the Council for their excellent performance which had put the Council in this favourable position.

It was resolved:

That the report on the Council's Treasury operations during 2015/16 including the actual Prudential and Treasury Indicators, as set out at Appendix 1 to the submitted report, be approved.

**b. LATC SHAREHOLDER REVIEW COMMITTEE – 26 OCTOBER 2016**

**Evaluation of Evidence and Conclusions/Recommendations of Shareholder Review Committee**

An amendment to the recommendation of the LATC Shareholder Review Committee, which was tabled at the meeting, was proposed and seconded. Councillor Palmer stated that it was important to have a Committee structure that reflected the changes to the organisational structure of the Council as a whole and now that a Local Authority Trading Company (LATC) had been established this needed to be effectively reflected in the overall Committee structure as well. Upon being put to the vote, the amendment to the recommendation was declared to be carried.

It was resolved:

In recognition of the recommendation of the LATC Shareholder Review Committee:

*'That a standalone Shareholder Committee be established, separate to the Council's Policy Committees and reporting directly to full Council'*

and in the light of this, Council instructs the Chief Executive to:

- (i) instigate a review of the Committee structure (including consideration of the above recommendation);
- (ii) convene a Member Seminar in the New Year to discuss the above review;
- (iii) report back to Council in April 2017 with a view to implementation of any revised proposals for the Annual Council in May 2017;
- (iv) request the Independent Remuneration Panel to revise their timetable to align with this review of the Committee Structure.

**34. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH DEVOLUTION**

Councillor Dupré proposed a procedural motion under Council Procedure Rule 11.12, which was seconded by Councillor Austen, *'that the debate should now be adjourned'*. Councillor Dupré explained that there had been significant last minute changes to the Devolution arrangements, including to the Transport powers, Concessionary Fares and Bus Operator grants, as well as to the costs arrangements and inclusion of a General Power

of Competence to the Combined Authority. Councillor Dupré questioned who Central Government had consulted or agreed these changes with and highlighted that Officers and Members had not had time to check or be briefed on these changes. Councillor Dupré stated that she had asked a number of questions on the revised Scrutiny arrangements but had not yet received a response to these questions. In concluding, Councillor Dupré reported that Cambridge City and Cambridgeshire County Councils had postponed the dates of their full Council meetings to the following week to allow more time for consideration of the changes and she urged this Council to do the same in relation to this item, as she was concerned that, if it did not, the Council would not be doing its duty in making an informed decision with all the information that we need.

In response, Councillor Palmer stated that Councillor Dupré had E-mailed him on the preceding day to ask for a deferral of the item. However, the E-mail demonstrated that she had read and understood the content of the 12 page draft Order which had been circulated after the agenda despatch, so this seemed to negate the reasons for a deferral. As this Council was not a Transport Authority, these aspects would not affect it in proceeding with a decision this evening. Councillor Palmer believed that the Council had more than sufficient information to consider the issues and take a decision and that Councillor Dupré's request was more about politicising the issue.

Councillor Bailey concurred with Councillor Palmer and stated that as the late document was only 12 pages long, she had been able to read and understand it before the Council meeting. She believed that the material changes largely related to upper tier authorities.

Councillor Bill Hunt stated that it appeared that the request for deferral was more for political motives and that these should not be placed before the welfare of local people.

Councillor Bradley stated that whilst the Government had been late in releasing the draft Order to Councils for publication, this and an explanatory note from the Chief Executive had been received by Members on the day before the Council meeting, so he had no concerns regarding making a decision himself.

Councillor Austen wished it to be recorded that she did not consider this to be a political matter, but about the interests of the people of East Cambridgeshire.

Upon being put to the vote, the adjournment motion was declared to be lost by 2 votes to 29, with 1 abstention.

Council then considered the report, R115, previously circulated, detailing the next stages in the Devolution process and seeking consent to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority draft Order. The Chief Executive explained the main features of the revised Devolution deal

and the outcome of the various types of public consultation. The Chief Executive also highlighted one proposed amendment to recommendation (vi) requiring the inclusion of the name of the Leader of the Council as the Council's appointee to the Combined Authority. The recommendations as amended by the Chief Executive above then were moved and seconded. In moving the recommendations, Councillor Cresswell emphasised that he was a strong supporter of Devolution.

Councillor Palmer stated that this Council had discussed at length at its June meeting the benefits to ECDC and the County as a whole from Devolution. Councillor Palmer highlighted that he had been born and bred in this District, so he was well aware of the benefits and limitations of living here. In particular, he knew the issues regarding transport links and, whilst there had been some small improvements over the years, there had been no means of significantly changing the status quo in this area. This District had always had high employment and levels of achievement, without significant investment from Government, but now Government had 'woken up' and seen that if it invested a little it would get a significantly greater return than by investing in other parts of the country. However, if we 'walk away' from this deal, Government will invest elsewhere. Councillor Palmer did not want to see future generations confined to cars on congested roads to Cambridge due to poor transport links and wanted to see the opportunity of choices offered by better rail links, etc. These would be the first steps towards a truly integrated Cambridgeshire. This Council needed to take advantage of the devolved powers offered and he could see no reason not to vote for Devolution unless it was politically motivated. Councillor Palmer wanted to see the 'Cambridge effect' extended beyond the CB1 postcode and this opportunity was unlikely to be offered again. This was a chance to stand up for the local community and provide infrastructure and facilities for the benefit of families in the future.

Councillor Bailey requested that the Council's grateful thanks be placed on record to the Leader and Chief Executive for the enormous amount of work that they had put into reaching this position on Devolution and, in particular, securing the level of infrastructure included in the agreement for this District. The comment had been made that this was one of the best deals offered in the Country and the consultation had shown strong public support. The new Mayor would be the accountable and 'go to' person, and the deal would bring massive opportunities such as the A10 upgrade, A14/A142 junction improvements, rail improvements and Skills improvements which had been so strongly promoted by Councillor Every as the Member Champion. Councillor Bailey expressed her support for the principle of 'subsidiarity' and stated that this deal would open-up the chance for further phases in the future, with possible extensions into the areas of health and social care. This Council would be mad to turn down the level of investment offered and Members should not be discouraged from the deal due to the issue of an elected Mayor.

Councillor Tom Hunt endorsed the points made by the previous two speakers and stated that he was hugely supportive of Devolution. He said that Members should focus on the positive public consultation results and he

believed that the new elected Mayor would be a worthwhile position and the Combined Authority would enable the fulfilment of the economic potential of the area. Devolution offered fantastic advantages for the people that Councillors represented and streamlined decision-making. Cambridgeshire was a diverse County and we should take these diverse skills and use them for the benefit of the County as a whole. Councillor Tom Hunt urged Members to approve the Devolution deal and asked them to sell both the Combined Authority and Mayoral role to the public.

Councillor Bill Hunt stated that he also was strongly supportive of Devolution. He acknowledged the costs relating to the Mayoral election, but stated that these would be mitigated taking place with the County Council elections. Councillor Bill Hunt requested a recorded vote on the motion, as he believed that the Combined Authority and Mayor were an investment for the future and wanted it placed on record that he had not stood in the way of progress within the County.

Councillor Dupré stated that it was the purpose of the Opposition Group on the Council to challenge, question and think in the interests of those groups that may be overlooked. Councillor Dupré stated that the debate so far seemed to have focussed on how much we were willing to give up to secure the promised investment. Things had moved on drastically since the original deal put to Council in June, in terms of the 3 key areas of money, power and accountability. With regard to money, this investment would now not be binding on the Government for the period of 30 years; costs of £1.7M would be incurred in the first year and £6M for the next 5 years relating to the establishment and operation of the Combined Authority, including the Mayoral function; and it could not be assumed that the £45 of investment income generated per £1 spent on running the Combined Authority would be 'new' money. Councillor Dupré wanted it placed on record that she welcomed the additional investment in East Cambridgeshire, but that there was a price to be paid for this. With regard to power, Councillor Dupré stated that power would be pushed-up from the County Council to the Combined Authority in relation to Transport. Peterborough City Council would have a veto on Transport spending in Cambridgeshire, which was not very democratic. In addition, there had been no real support for an elected Mayor, which was more bound-up with Central Government's conditions for funding. With regard to accountability, Councillor Dupré questioned how the Scrutiny Committee would hold the Combined Authority to account. She referred to the fact that there was no real detail at present regarding how appointments to the Scrutiny Committee by member authorities would operate. Councillor Dupré commented that if Members wanted to see how things could go wrong, they could look at the example of the Cambridge City Deal and the unpopularity of this body. In concluding, Councillor Dupré stated that she could not support something with so many unanswered questions and such a democratic deficit.

Councillor Every stated that she endorsed the views of Councillors Palmer, Bailey and Bill Hunt, which showed a pragmatic focus on Devolution and funding to the District. She stated that when she joined the City of Ely



Council 4 years ago and ECDC 3 years ago, she realised that decision-making would be slower than in the private sector and even possibly than in Education. But she didn't realise just how much that would apply. We constantly manoeuvre around bureaucracy in the County Council, encountering barriers, time delays and very often meet brick walls, despite an articulated willingness to help, in an endeavour to work for the benefits of our Ward residents.

We have had to deal locally with the result of poor central Transport decisions, often based on out of date paperwork, with little or no, or very late consultations. Responses have resulted in a protracted process with the likelihood at best of compromise or at worst downright refusal. This has been time-consuming as we use our energies to reverse decisions totally inappropriate to us. Transport has been downgraded in the area, leaving many of our residents unable to live independent lives. Subsidies have been cut for young people who wish to travel to Cambridge for further education opportunities.

We have seen money put into the City Deal which was designed to support students in schools in East Cambridgeshire disappear into an overall strategy which benefits the Cambridge area only, with lip service to East Cambridgeshire.

On the plus side, we've seen the Local Enterprise Partnership Board recognise the value of East Cambridgeshire and its people. The need for economic growth in this area finally has been recognised as has the undoubted value of our Economic Development Team who through their expertise have achieved financial grants of millions of pounds which will facilitate our business growth. The recognition of their value has produced confidence in our area that we will be able to recap in the future.

The Skills Service at the LEP is now funding School business links in the area and the need for a dedicated post 16 academic and vocational service and our planned expansion of apprenticeships.

Our Planning department is the best in the area and our 'open for business' strategy is now valued by individual applicants, agents and developers.

Our slimmed-down staffing profile has removed 'dead men's shoes' and given opportunities of promotion to our young and gifted staff who demonstrate their value to us every day.

We are working to manage our health care provision through partnership discussion, bringing groups together and providing funding.

We have our own Trading Company that will provide opportunities for creating profits, while the building of CLTs will provide much needed

affordable housing based on the area's individual needs and funded by the market.

Councillor Every stated that she could go on, but wanted to demonstrate just how well we could do things at ECDC. Why then would the Council not take the opportunity to have its destiny in its own hands by managing devolved funding for adult education, benefits, highways, schools and public health. We know that we can do this better, more efficiently and make savings which can contribute to other services.

Results from the local consultation showed that the majority of people support devolving powers from Government, particularly for decisions over areas such as transport, jobs, housing and skills, into the hands of local people.

Councillor Every concluded by stating that it was right for the Council to back this Devolution deal and it would never get a better chance to manage its own destiny. Therefore, Councillor Every supported the deal and urged her fellow Councillors to do the same.

Councillor Chaplin thanked Councillors for the wide-ranging nature of the input so far. He stated that we often wrung our hands on how long it took to achieve things in the public sector, which was why we needed to take a decision and not jeopardise the deal offered. If we did so it would be on our own heads, which was why he commended the deal to this Council.

Councillor Beckett stated that it was Councillors' role to ask questions that had not yet been aired in public. He believed that some Members had 'rose tinted spectacles' about how much funding would actually be provided to the Combined Authority. It was one thing for this to be written down and quite another for it to be delivered. In addition, all Cambridgeshire Councils would be fighting for funding from the Combined Authority and this Council would have a great responsibility to ensure that we deliver for the residents of East Cambridgeshire. Councillor Beckett requested clarification on the proposed reporting arrangements back to full Council by the Council Leader and representative on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and on the funding arrangements for the elected Mayor, which were explained by the Chief Executive and Director Resources.

Councillor Shuter commented that the Council should not let this opportunity slip and that we needed to extend the Cambridge phenomenon. This required the infrastructure to enable people to get to the areas of employment within the County. The Combined Authority would be the mechanism to achieve this. Whilst this deal was phase 1, it could be developed to obtain further Government investment. Councillor Shuter urged Members to support the deal to improve things for our citizens.

Councillor Josh Schumann stated that this was the best Devolution deal currently being offered in the Country, so how could Councillors refuse

such an offer? This Council needed to support the premier businesses located within the District such as Turners and Thorlabs, which was another justification for approving Devolution. Councillor Schumann believed in having decision-making more locally rather than in the corridors of Whitehall. He also commented that, whilst it was proper for the opposition Members to challenge, he used the example of a lengthy debate at a recent County Council meeting on 2 cycle lanes that was then deferred, as the way in which this challenge could hamper decision-making.

A recorded vote was taken on the Motion, the results of which were as follows:

FOR: (30) – Cllrs Alderson, Allan, C Ambrose Smith, D Ambrose Smith, Bailey, Beckett, Bovingdon, Bradley, Chaplin, Cheetham, Cox, Cresswell, Edwards, Every, Griffin-Singh, Huffer, Hugo, B Hunt, T Hunt, Morris, Palmer, Pearson, Roberts, Rouse, J Schumann, Sharp, Shuter, Smith, Stubbs, Webber.

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTENTIONS: (2) – Cllrs Austen, Dupré.

The Motion was declared to be carried.

It was resolved:

That:

- (i) consent be given to the Secretary of State making an Order to establish the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (Appendix 1A);
- (ii) consent be given to the Council being a constituent member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority with effect from the commencement date determined by the final Order;
- (iii) the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to consent to the final draft Order and associated documents, specifically:
  - to agree minor drafting amendments to the Combined Authority Order to be laid before Parliament;
  - to consent to the Council being included within the draft Parliamentary Order thereby reflecting this Council's decision;
- (iv) the Combined Authority be authorised to have a power to issue a levy to the constituent Councils in respect of any financial year.

(This will be subject to the inclusion of a unanimity clause in the Combined Authority constitution on this specific matter);

- (v) it be recommend to the Combined Authority that the costs of establishing the Combined Authority, holding the elections in May 2017 and running the Combined Authority (including Mayoral Office) for 2016/17 and 2017/18 are funded from the gain share grant provided by Government (as outlined in paragraph 10.11);
- (vi) the Leader of Council, Councillor James Palmer, be appointed to act as Council's appointee to the Shadow Combined Authority and once established, to the Combined Authority;
- (vii) Councillor Roberts be appointed to act as the substitute to the above (ref (vi) above);
- (viii) the outcome of the public consultation on the establishment of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority as outlined in paragraph 5.1 and 5.2 and Appendices 2A – 2D be noted;
- (ix) the timetable for the implementation of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution Order as summarised in paragraph 7.1 be noted;
- (x) the Government's response to the outline business case for Housing capital investment funds secured as part of the devolution deal as set out in Appendix 3 be noted;
- (xi) agree in principle, for a protocol requiring the Council Leader and the representative on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to report to each meeting of Council setting out the activities and decisions related to their respective roles within the Combined Authority;
- (xii) the Monitoring Officer be requested to devise the wording of a protocol for inclusion in the Council's constitution.

35. **CORPORATE PLAN PRIORITIES 2015-19**

*The Chairman, Councillor Allan, left the meeting for the duration of this item and the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Cresswell, took the Chair.*

Council considered a report, R114, previously circulated, containing an update on the Corporate Plan 2015-2019 for East Cambridgeshire District Council. The Leader of the Council proposed the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Roberts:

That the Council strongly endorses the progress made on the priorities within the Corporate Plan 2015 – 2019.

Furthermore, the Council urges the Leader of Council and Chief Executive to maximise the benefits of Devolution for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to further deliver the Council's agreed Corporate Plan 2015 – 2019.

Councillor Tom Hunt then moved an addendum to this motion as follows, which was seconded by Councillor Bill Hunt:

That East Cambridgeshire District Council will fly the Union Flag on a permanent basis from immediate effect.

In speaking on his addendum, Councillor Tom Hunt stated that he was proud to be British and believed in flying the Union Flag 365 days a year rather than the 20 or so designated days it was flown at present. Councillor Hunt listed achievements over the past year including our performance at the Olympic Games, and also wanted to recognise the sacrifice of those who had given their lives for this country. He commented that many Councils flew the flag on a permanent basis and that it was a symbol of unity and togetherness. There also would be cost savings from flying the flag on a permanent basis. He therefore requested Members to support the addendum. Councillor Bill Hunt concurred with the view that it had been a great year for this country and that he too was proud to be British. Many things united the people of this country, including our flag. He referred to our sporting successes and the fact that our queen was the longest serving monarch. Flying the flag on a permanent basis would generate a small cost saving of approx £150 per year on overtime costs and would demonstrate how we were serving our proud local people.

On being put to the vote, the addendum was declared to be carried unanimously and added to the original motion.

In speaking on the amended motion, Councillor Palmer stated that the Corporate Plan priorities were a lesson in what can be achieved. However, this Council would not 'rest on its laurels' but would continue to drive forward and strive to make East Cambridgeshire the best place in the country to live. Councillor Palmer emphasised that we should recognise the outstanding work of our staff, who had put the desires of Councillors into actions. This was a rolling, ongoing process, so we always needed to look to the future and to be ambitious to be the best.

Councillor Bailey referred to the change in the Council since 2013/14, when she frequently had been stopped on her visits to a local supermarket with negative comments or complaints regarding the Council. She believed that the Council truly had 'turned the corner' and the Corporate Plan showed what could be achieved when you focus on particular priorities.

Councillor Beckett stated that he was truly pleased to see what the Council had achieved and be part of a Council that 'punches above its weight'. However, he was concerned about the potential investment that may be required by the Palace Green Homes element of the LATC in relation to the potential development site at Kennet and he asked for an assurance that the Council would not go beyond the £5M loan already provided to the Trading Company. The Director Resources stated that the £5M loan to the Trading Company had been approved by full Council before the site at Kennet had been identified. If there were any additional requests in relation to this site, they would have to come back to full Council for debate and decision.

Councillor Dupré stated that she welcomed some of the priorities in the document such as the website update; comparatively healthy financial position of the Council; recycling improvements; proposed additional parking at Angel Drove and Littleport Station; and work of the Economic Development team on skills and partnerships, but she considered that some of these were 'renewed' rather than 'new' priorities. She also commented that the 27 CLT homes delivered were fewer than those 'negotiated away' in reduced affordable housing contributions and that the Station Gateway area in Ely was not really something under our control. Councillor Dupré asked the Leader of the Council if the Local Plan still would be ready for adoption in autumn 2018, if there was a delivery date for the Soham Railway Station, and what other alternatives were there locally to car transport?

Councillor Palmer responded by stating that the Local Plan still would be ready for adoption in 2018 after full consultation had been completed. The GRIP 3 study had commenced in relation to Soham Railway Station and a funding strategy was being prepared. With regard to the Station Gateway area in Ely, whilst the Council was not the landowner, it could assist in relocation proposals, etc, to realise the aims and visions for the area. With regard to alternatives to car transport, Councillor Palmer referred to the proposed improvements to Ely North junction to increase rail journeys, in the absence of any proposals for light rail within the District.

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

It was resolved:

1. That Council strongly endorses the progress made on the priorities within the Corporate Plan 2015 – 2019.
2. Furthermore, that Council urges the Leader of Council and Chief Executive to maximise the benefits of Devolution for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to further deliver the Council's agreed Corporate Plan 2015 – 2019.
3. That East Cambridgeshire District Council fly the Union Flag on a permanent basis from immediate effect.

36. **EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN – FURTHER DRAFT**

*The Chairman, Councillor Allan, returned to the Chair.*

*Councillors Huffer and Palmer left the meeting for the duration of this item.*

Council considered a report, R116, previously circulated, requesting Members to determine whether to approve, for the purpose of public consultation, the Further Draft version of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan. The Strategic Planning Manager, Richard Kay, explained the background to and consultation undertaken in relation to preparation of the Further Draft, and the next stage of consultation which would take place, subject to approval by full Council of the Further Draft. Mr Kay believed that the Further Draft contained a good mix of sites for the purposes of the next stage of consultation in January and February 2017.

The recommendations in the report were moved by Councillor Josh Schumann and seconded by Councillor Rouse.

Councillor Schumann read a statement on behalf of the Chairman of the Local Plan Working Party, Councillor Green, commending the content of the Further Draft and the work of the Strategic Planning team. He also urged Members to submit their specific comments on individual sites in their Wards as part of the consultation process, rather than picking apart the document this evening. Councillor Rouse concurred with this approach and stated that Members would be able to assess the public responses following the further consultation stage.

Councillor Hugo commented that the Council had expressed its support for CLTs but the Local Plan only included the Kennet site at this stage. Therefore, he would like to a greater focus on CLTs in the document as the best way to deliver community supported, high quality, affordable housing and opposition to exception sites.

Councillor Beckett referred to the Flood and Water SPD, which was the next item on the Agenda, and its relationship with the Local Plan. In particular, he referred to the importance of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and the reference in paragraphs 6.3.33 and 6.8.1 of the SPD to the vital need to consider how these features will be maintained and accessed for the lifetime of the development. Therefore, he requested that Policy LP25 of the Local Plan be amended to add in wording to the effect that 'where there is a surface water ditch there be a 6M strip left beside it for access and maintenance.' In response, Mr Kay stated that he did not object to the principle of this but that he would prefer to devise wording relating to appropriate access and maintenance, rather than being prescriptive on the requirement for a 6M strip. Councillor Schumann commented that this issue was already addressed in paragraph 6.9.7 of the SPD. However, Councillor Beckett stated that if it was included in the Local Plan as well, this would add further weight to what the Council could require. The Chief Executive

suggested that the Strategic Planning Manager should consider the matter further in consultation with Councillors Beckett and Schumann with a view to addressing the issue of the provision of appropriate access and maintenance strips for Surface Water and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) as part of the consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan.

Councillor Bradley expressed support for Councillor Beckett's request and also queried if the next stage of the Local Plan would include land for industrial purposes. Mr Kay confirmed that this would be the case.

Councillor Dupré stated that a lot of hard work had gone into preparation of the Further Draft and she commended Strategic Planning for this. She commented that the Local Plan sought to cope with the very large pressures of 30% growth and to ensure that this was sustainable, whilst meeting the wishes of local residents. There was also the difficult balance of finding sustainable sites whilst spreading growth evenly within the District. The reference to transport deficiencies within the document reflected the dismantling of local bus services over the years. Councillor Dupré welcomed the references to electric vehicles but considered that the overall issue of air quality had been overlooked in the document. She also considered that it was important to support local communities in producing Neighbourhood Plans. With regard to her own Ward of Sutton, she commented that it was the 5<sup>th</sup> largest settlement within the District, but was comparatively under-provided in terms of facilities. She also referred to infrastructure concerns relating to highways and water management and how these fitted with growth. These issues needed to be addressed in the future version of the Local Plan.

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. She made particular reference to the issue of appropriate housing for older people, which she did not feel was currently reflected in the Local Plan. She highlighted the fact that there was an ageing population within the County and a requirement for housing options for older people, which was being addressed in the Older People's Accommodation Strategy developed by the County Council. Councillor Bailey stated that she would submit these comments as part of the consultation process.

Councillor Roberts endorsed Councillor Hugo's comments regarding the need to ensure the prominence of the Council's CLT policy in the Local Plan. The policy was novel and ground-breaking and was able to deliver homes quickly, with local support. Therefore, it needed to be given due prominence within the Local Plan.

Councillor Alderson referred to a number of specific issues relating to his Ward, which Councillor Schumann requested he submit as part of the consultation process.



In concluding, Councillor Schumann requested Councillors to go back to their parishes and emphasise the importance of responding as part of the consultation process, as the Council needed their local views.

It was resolved:

1. That the Further Draft Local Plan (including associated draft Policies Maps) be approved for public consultation.
2. That a six week consultation period, likely commencing on 10 January 2017 and ending on 20 February 2017, be approved.
3. That the Director Commercial be delegated to make prior to its publication for consultation, any minor, non-consequential amendments (such as correcting typographical errors) and any presentational improvements.

37. **CAMBRIDGESHIRE FLOOD AND WATER SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

*Councillors Huffer and Palmer returned to the meeting.*

Council considered a report, R117, previously circulated, requesting Members to determine whether to adopt the Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The Strategic Planning Manager, Richard Kay, explained that an authority could produce as many SPDs as it required, but that there had been a collective approach to the preparation of this document to ensure a consistent approach across the County. It aimed to assist applicants and to reduce unnecessary costs and work on their part. Councillors Schumann and Rouse emphasised the positive nature of the SPD, with all Cambridgeshire Councils working together with the aim of informing policies not obstructing them.

Councillors Rouse and Bradley also highlighted the vital role of Internal Drainage Boards in managing water within the County and recognised SuDS as an important and attractive way of managing water and encouraging wildlife diversity.

It was resolved:

That the Council adopts the Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document, and brings it into immediate effect.

38. **BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND (BCE) REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES - EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON INITIAL PROPOSALS FOR NEW PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCY BOUNDARIES**

Council considered a report, R118, previously circulated, containing a proposed submission to the Boundary Commission for England (BCE) consultation on the initial proposals for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries. The Infrastructure and Strategy Manager, Sally Bonnett explained the nature of the initial proposals from the BCE to split East Cambridgeshire across three new constituencies and the Council's proposed submission which would retain Littleport in a constituency with other areas of Cambridgeshire, as currently.

Councillor Bailey thanked Ms Bonnett for producing the submission, which addressed the concerns expressed regarding removing Littleport from Cambridgeshire and moving it into a new South West Norfolk constituency.

Councillor Dupré stated that she understood and shared the concerns regarding the community identity and interests of Littleport with Cambridgeshire, but commented that in some cases Littleport residents used rail and road links to and health facilities in Kings Lynn. The Conservative Party had pushed for the reduction in the overall number of MPs that had resulted in the changes to constituency boundaries nationally, and if these were moved it would result in implications elsewhere.

Councillor David Ambrose-Smith stated that he had been a Littleport resident for 60 years and did not have an affinity or association with Norfolk. He welcomed the submission which supported the views of Littleport residents and commended Ms Bonnett for her work on this and other recent reviews.

Councillor Tom Hunt commented that the relationship of Littleport with Cambridgeshire appeared to be very strong and they would have been underserved by the BCE proposals. There were currently imbalances and anomalies in the number of voters an MP represented in certain constituencies nationally, and this needed to be addressed as far as possible. However, interested parties were being given the opportunity to express their views and this Council needed to take that opportunity.

Councillor Bailey highlighted that the submission recognised what Littleport had articulated to this Council regarding their community relationships. Councillor Bill Hunt stated that there were equally railway and road connections from Littleport to Ely and Cambridge as well.

It was resolved:

That Council agrees the submission to the BCE attached as Appendix 1 to the submitted report.

39. **AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION – PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Council considered a report, R119, previously circulated, containing proposed amendments to Part 3, Section C Regulatory Committees (ii) Planning Committee of East Cambridgeshire District Council Constitution. The Planning Manager, Rebecca Saunt, explained the amendments that reflected issues raised previously by Members.

Councillor Bill Hunt commented that in small communities the diligence of Members was required to ‘call-in’ significant applications which might cause concern below the threshold. Councillor Schumann thanked Ms Saunt for reflecting the views of Members.

It was resolved:

That the proposed amendments to the specified section of the Constitution detailed in Appendix 1 to the submitted report to include outline or full applications for over 50 dwellings and outline or full applications for major employment uses (major is defined as where the floor space created is 1,000 square metres or more) be approved.

The meeting concluded at 8.32pm.

Chairman.....

Date