

Minutes of the Meeting of East Cambridgeshire
District Council held in the Council Chamber,
The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Thursday
21 February 2013 at 6.30pm

P R E S E N T

Councillor Allen Alderson	Councillor Tom Kerby
Councillor Michael Allan	Councillor Peter Moakes
Councillor Ian Allen	Councillor Chris Morris
Councillor Christine Ambrose Smith	Councillor Neil Morrison
Councillor David Ambrose Smith	Councillor James Palmer
Councillor Derrick Beckett	Councillor John Palmer
Councillor David Brown	Councillor Tony Parramint (Chairman)
Councillor Will Burton	Councillor Philip Read
Councillor Tony Cornell (Vice- Chairman)	Councillor Charles Roberts
Councillor Lavinia Edwards	Councillor Mike Rouse
Councillor Kevin Ellis	Councillor Joshua Schumann
Councillor Colin Fordham	Councillor Robert Stevens
Councillor Jeremy Friend-Smith	Councillor Hazel Williams MBE
Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith MBE	Councillor Sue Willows
Councillor Tony Goodge	Councillor Gareth Wilson
Councillor Richard Hobbs	Councillor Pauline Wilson
Councillor Tom Hunt	Councillor Andy Wright

56. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions received.

57. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Austen, Bailey, Griffin-Singh, Harris and B Hunt.

58. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Brown declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 12.a – Schedule of Items Recommended from Committees and Other Member Bodies – Burwell Masterplan, as he had been the Cambridgeshire County Council Member on the Burwell Masterplan Working Party.

59. **MINUTES**

It was resolved:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

60. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

Agenda

Please note that it has been necessary to withdraw agenda item 12.c – Schedule of Items Recommended from Committees and Other Member Bodies – Final Supplementary Planning Document on Developer Contributions from the agenda.

As you will be aware from the report within the Council agenda, this document was due to be presented to the Development and Transport Committee on Tuesday 19 February, and recommended to Council for adoption at this evening's meeting.

The public consultation on the document closed after the dispatch of the Development and Transport Committee agenda. Unfortunately, the appendices to the report were not finalised in time for circulation to the Development and Transport Committee to allow Members sufficient time to digest and consider the appendices. Therefore, the item was withdrawn from the Development and Transport Committee agenda.

The report will now be presented to the Development and Transport Committee meeting in March and recommended to Council for adoption at the Annual Council meeting in May.

Draft East Cambridgeshire Local Plan

The District Council is preparing a new plan for East Cambridgeshire. The new Local Plan will set out a blueprint for the future growth of the district, looking at how much, where and when development should take place up to 2031. It will seek to ensure that development in the district is 'sustainable' and meets the needs of the local area. The Local Plan will be the main basis for making decisions on planning applications.

A draft Local Plan has been published for comment and is currently out for public consultation from 11 February – 25 March 2013.

The Local Plan is split into 2 key parts:

Part 1: Spatial Strategy and Policies - sets out a strategic vision for future growth and a series of detailed policies to guide development relating to housing, employment, environment and climate change, community services and infrastructure.

Part 2: Village and Town Visions - comprises a 'Village/Town Vision' for every settlement in the district. It sets out how each settlement should change and improve, and identifies sites for development.

Your comments and views on the draft Local Plan and Village/Town Visions are welcomed and should be made by 5pm on Monday 25 March 2013 by

completing the online comments form on the Council's website. Alternatively you can email the Forward Planning Team.

Copies of the document have been circulated you this evening. However, the document can also be viewed on-line or inspected at the District Council Offices. You are also welcome to attend one of the exhibitions that are advertised on the Council's website.

Member Seminar on Waste

Members are reminded of the Seminar on Waste scheduled for Monday 25 February 2013 at 6pm in the Council Chamber, which you have previously been notified of. The Seminar is intended to raise awareness of the new services that are being introduced, timescales and the progress being made. Also communication measures to ensure residents are aware of changes and how to use the new collections.

If you have not already done so, please can you inform Denise Gawthrop in Elections as to whether or not you will be attending. The Chairman emphasised the importance of the Seminar due to the likely level of public interest and enquiries on the new waste collection arrangements and encouraged Members to make every endeavour to attend.

Association of Drainage Authorities

With the Chairman's permission, Cllr Goodge notified Members of the Association of Drainage Authorities Local Authority Seminar that was being held on 14 March 2013 at the Great Northern Hotel in Peterborough. Members were encouraged to attend, particularly those that represented the authority on the Internal Drainage Boards.

61. **PETITIONS**

No petitions had been received.

62. **MOTIONS**

Cllr J Friend-Smith, as the proposer of the original motion, as detailed within the agenda, stated that a new station in Soham was long overdue and the motion was proposed to emphasise the joined-up working required to support the opening of a new station.

Cllr J Friend-Smith noted that the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan included considerable development that would place greater pressure on the transport links in and out of the district. The opening of a new station in Soham would assist in alleviating this pressure.

Cllr J Friend-Smith stated that the scheduled dualing of the track between Ely and Soham would assist with the opening of a new station in Soham, and the motion was proposed to encourage all major parties to join together. Cllr J Friend-Smith noted that improved infrastructure and transport links would be required in order to attempt to alleviate the pressure that would be placed on the district through additional growth.

The motion was proposed by Cllr J Friend-Smith and seconded by Cllr John Palmer.

Cllr Stevens spoke about the various rail services that were currently available throughout the county and how a new station in Soham could impact on these services. Cllr Stevens stated that a direct link should be provided from Soham to Cambridge and he noted that currently it was not possible to travel between Newmarket and Ely as a piece of track had been removed. Cllr Stevens stated that it was important to continue to look to provide additional direct links.

Cllr James Palmer thanked Cllr J Friend-Smith for his interest in Soham and he noted that a number of Members had already been campaigning for the opening of a new station in Soham. Subsequently, Cllr James Palmer proposed the amended motion as tabled at the meeting, which was seconded by Cllr Cornell, as follows:

'This Council welcomes the inclusion of a new station at Soham in Network Rail's Business Plan for 2014-19.

The Council recognises the hard work of the Leader of the Council in bringing the prospect of the station closer to fruition.

Furthermore, the Council requests that the Leader continues to contribute fully to the joint work between Cambridgeshire County Council, Network Rail and other partners to bring the vision of this Council into being.'

Cllr Fordham expressed his support for the motion proposed by Cllr J Friend-Smith and for a direct link between Soham and Cambridge.

Cllr G Wilson stated that he could not understand the logic to the amended motion as it omitted the key point of the original motion – to support the opening of a new station in Soham and to link Soham directly to Cambridge. Cllr G Wilson stated that the original motion was not party political, but was proposed to encourage progress on the matter. Cllr G Wilson stated that we was able to support the third paragraph of the proposed amended motion, but stated that it was pointless to delete the second paragraph of the original motion. Cllr G Wilson stated that all political parties should be working together on this issue.

Cllr S Friend-Smith MBE stated that the original motion had been proposed as a genuine attempt to encourage all political parties to work together on this issue and she noted that the motion should have been presented to the previous meeting of Council. However, the motion had missed the deadline for submission and inclusion within the agenda.

Cllr Beckett, the former Chairman of the Soham Masterplan Working Party, noted that a new station at Soham had been a concept that had originated from the Soham Masterplan and he could not understand why all Members would not want to support a direct link from Soham to Cambridge and why they would only want to see a service between Soham and Ely.

Cllr Cornell noted that there was a train service from Ely to Cambridge that then went on to London. Cllr Cornell stated that the original motion did not recognise the work that the Leader of Council had already undertaken in

progressing the issue and that it could be construed that the Leader of Council had not made any contribution in the past.

Cllr J Friend-Smith stated that the original motion had not been an attempt to single out any particular Member and suggested that the word 'continues' be inserted into the original motion as follows:

*'The Council requests that the Leader of the Council **continues to contribute fully ...** '*

A recorded vote having been requested was taken on the amended motion as tabled at the meeting, which was supported, with Members voting as follows:

For (22)	Cllrs Alderson, Allan, C Ambrose Smith, D Ambrose Smith, Brown, Burton, Cornell, Edwards, Ellis, Goodge, Hobbs, T Hunt, Kerby, Moakes, Morris, James Palmer, Parramint, Read, Roberts, Rouse, Schumann and Willows.
Against (12)	Cllrs Allen, Beckett, Fordham, J Friend-Smith, S Friend-Smith MBE, Morrison, John Palmer, Stevens, Williams MBE, G Wilson, P Wilson and Wright
Abstention (0)	

63. **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

Questions were received from Cllrs Allen and J Friend-Smith and tabled at the meeting:

The following question was asked by Cllr Allen:

'While I accept that there is a possibility of differing views about the merits of the Community Land Trust (CLT) model in delivering much needed low cost housing, can the administration explain whether the proportion of affordable housing in the proposed Stretham CLT is going to be the norm. The development of tens of private houses for sale in an out of development envelope location to deliver low numbers of homes for rent seems excessive. How does this fit into exception site policy which excludes private housing? Were the residents of the community told about the proportions in consultation materials, and is it a hidden aim of emerging policy to grant massive uplifts in edge of settlement land values?

Granting permission for a couple of market houses to free up cheap land for low rent housing is to be lauded, especially if there is evidence of strong local support and need, but are large urban extensions acceptable particularly if there are evident conflicts with elements of Council community led development policies as evidenced by Growth Policy 6 in the Draft Local Plan?

I ask this question as this Council has committed to support CLT development and policy needs to be transparent, robust and able to withstand scrutiny.'

Cllr Allen further added that Members should closely study Growth Policy 6 in the Draft Local Plan, as provided at the meeting, to consider whether CLTs comply with Council policy.

The Chief Executive stated that a full written response would be provided to Cllr Allen and appended to the minutes.

The following question was asked by Cllr J Friend-Smith, who explained that this was a further attempt to draw Members together:

'The tradition of all Councillors meeting together before Full Council meetings has recently lapsed because the Conservatives were too busy. As a consequence, for the last two years, other groups of Councillors have not been able to meet the visiting chaplain who comes to take prayers before the annual meeting of Full Council. With this pressure, it must be difficult for the Conservatives to welcome the visiting chaplain.'

Under the rule of proportionality, I would like to ask that the Independents and Liberal Democrats should meet and greet the visiting chaplain this year. Have we the right to make this claim?'

The Leader of the Council confirmed that all political parties would convene before the Annual Meeting of Council to meet the visiting chaplain.

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

Council considered the first of two reports on items recommended from Committees and other Member bodies, M347, previously circulated, detailing a recommendation from the Finance and Governance Committee meeting of 31 January 2013 regarding approval of the 2013/14 Annual Treasury Management Strategy, Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy (AIS).

It was resolved:

Finance and Governance Committee – 31 January 2013

2013/14 Annual Treasury Management Strategy, Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy (AIS)

That Council approve:

- The 2013/14 Treasury Management Strategy detailed in the submitted report;
- The Annual Investment Strategy detailed in the submitted report;
- The Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement detailed in the submitted report;
- The Prudential and Treasury Indicators as set out in Appendix 1 of the submitted report.

65. **THE ROBUSTNESS OF THE 2013/2014 BUDGET AND THE ADEQUACY OF RESERVES**

The Council received a report (M348), which considered the robustness of the Council's budget for 2013/14 and the adequacy of the Council's reserves.

The Head of Finance explained that the 2013/14 budget had been prepared using the 2012/13 budget as its base, which had then been amended for any known changes and other assumptions. The key changes included:

- The addition of unavoidable inflation on service contracts, utility budgets and insurance but no general inflation for other types of service expenditure.
- Forecasts of key income streams for fees and charges and investment interest had been reviewed and amended where appropriate.
- A Council tax increase of 2%.

Two years ago, the Council had identified an estimated funding gap of £2.679m across a 4-year period from 2011/12 to 2014/15 and, as a result, a savings package was approved by Members to fund the budget gap. At the end of 2011/12, over £0.6m of savings were identified ahead of being required and were set-aside in an earmarked reserve for future financial years. These savings had been regularly reviewed during 2012/13 to assess their likely delivery together with the impact of any savings not being achievable across this 4-year timeframe.

The Head of Finance explained that whilst the Council was currently in the favourable position of having identified sufficient savings to balance both the 2013/14 and 2014/15 budgets, there were nevertheless risks associated with the 2013/14 budget as it contained levels of savings which, if not achieved on a recurring basis, could revert the Council back to a more challenging financial position. The more significant areas of risk in relation to these savings were listed in paragraph 4.8 of the officer's report but also included the introduction of car parking charges from July 2013.

The Head of Finance noted that if the proposed savings failed to materialise, then the Council would have to either draw down from the Surplus Savings Reserve ahead of schedule or identify alternative compensatory savings as any service overspending in 2013/14 should not be met from the Council's General Fund Reserve.

At the end of 2011/12, the Council's General Fund Reserve stood at £1.797m, in comparison to three years ago where the Council's General Fund Reserve stood at £1m. The Head of Finance explained that there was no statutory minimum level set for a Local Authority's reserves. The level of reserves was a matter for determination by each individual Local Authority after taking into consideration its strategic, operational and financial risks. However, District Councils similar to East Cambridgeshire tended to work on a minimum level of reserves of 10% of its net revenue budget. The revised net budget for 2012/13 was £9.028m and therefore the General Fund Reserve balance at 1 April 2012 of £1.797m was at an adequate level of 19.9%. Whilst in percentage terms the General Fund Reserve was nearly double the minimum recommended level, smaller district councils should also consider the adequacy of this reserve in

monetary terms and in comparison to the potential size of any known future financial challenges.

The Head of Finance explained that currently there were no plans to either increase or utilise the General Fund Reserve during 2013/14. The strategy for this reserve was that it would not be used to fund any on-going expenditure. Instead, the reserve should only be used as a last resort when any unanticipated financial pressures arose. The changes to the Business Rates Retention Scheme and the Localised Council Tax Support Scheme from 2013/14 onwards and the inherent risks associated with these changes meant that the General Fund Reserve might be utilised in the medium term.

It was resolved:

That Council notes the Head of Finance's assessment as to the robustness of the estimates and adequacy of reserves as set out in the officer's report.

66. 2013/2014 COUNCIL TAX, REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS

The Council received a report (M349), which considered the Council's capital and revenue budget for 2013/14 and the setting of the Council Tax for 2013/14.

Cllr Moakes proposed and Cllr James Palmer seconded the recommendations, as detailed in the officer's report.

The following amendments to the Council's Budget, as tabled at the meeting, were then proposed by Cllr G Wilson and seconded by Cllr Morrison:

That the draft revenue budget resolution set out in Appendix 2 of the officer's report be approved with the following amendments:

Appendix 2		2013 - 2014	change to
<i>page 1</i>	<i>Development & Transport</i>	<i>2,291,395</i>	<i>2,446,395</i>
	<i>Net District Spending from Summary</i>	<i>14,533,045</i>	<i>14,688,045</i>
	<i>Net Operating Expenditure</i>	<i>8,699,532</i>	<i>8,854,532</i>
	<i>Contributions to/(from) Earmarked Reserves</i>	<i>(62,918)</i>	<i>(217,918)</i>
<i>page 2</i>	<i>Car Parks</i>	<i>26,559</i>	<i>181,559</i>
	<i>Development & Transport costs</i>	<i>2,291,395</i>	<i>2,446,395</i>
<i>page 17</i>	<i>Fees and Charges</i>	<i>242,604</i>	<i>87,604</i>
	<i>Total Income</i>	<i>298,882</i>	<i>143,882</i>
	<i>Net Direct Expenditure</i>	<i>(31,101)</i>	<i>123,899</i>
	<i>Net Expenditure</i>	<i>26,559</i>	<i>181,559</i>

That the Statement of Reserves as set out in Appendix 4 of the officer's report be approved with the following amendments:

Appendix 4

STATEMENT OF RESERVES	2013 – 2014	change to
<i>page 17 Change Management</i>	<i>(25,000)</i>	<i>(180,000)</i>
<i>Change Management</i>	<i>237,685</i>	<i>82,685</i>
<i>Total Reserves</i>	<i>(443,157)</i>	<i>(598,157)</i>
<i>Total Reserves</i>	<i>5,825,328</i>	<i>5,670,328</i>

All other figures to remain the same

Cllr G Wilson explained that the amendments might seem complicated, but were quite straightforward. The amendments were based on not introducing car parking charges at this present time for a number of reasons, including that the timing was not right, there was no on-street parking scheme and there were large amounts of other car parking available at Sainsburys, as well as at Aldi, once it opened. If car parking charges were introduced, for these reasons the smaller traders would not be able to compete. Cllr G Wilson stated that workers on a minimum wage or part-time workers had not been considered within the scheme.

Cllr G Wilson further explained that the budget did not include all of the costs associated with introducing the scheme, for instance a person would need to be employed to empty the machines, and there were no signage costs included within the budget, or costs associated with installing the machines. Cllr G Wilson stated that none of this had been considered and the proposed introduction date for car parking charges was only a short time away.

Cllr G Wilson noted that Forest Heath District Council had incurred a substantial loss when car parking charges were introduced in Newmarket and as a result more cars parked on-street. Cllr G Wilson stated that should the Council introduce car parking charges now the scheme would be doomed to fail. Cllr G Wilson did not believe that the Council could expect the Police to enforce the additional issues that would occur as a result and he referred to the parking on Forehill which was already being experienced.

Cllr G Wilson explained that the amendments proposed were to utilise £150,000 from the Change Management budget to fund the non-introduction car parking charges as it was not anticipated that this money would be required during the next 4 years. Cllr G Wilson stated that the Council should wait for the economy to improve before it introduced car parking charges and it should also consider the petition that it had previously received opposing car parking charges, as well as considering the re-introduction of a park and ride scheme.

Cllr Read reminded Members that it had once had the opportunity to re-locate the Council offices which would have made The Grange site an attractive proposal for encouraging more business to the district. Had the Council offices

been relocated the Council would have found itself in a more favorable financial position that it was in now.

Cllr Rouse stated that he was sympathetic to the sentiment of the amendments proposed and that he continued to oppose the introduction of car parking charges. However, Cllr Rouse stated that he would not be voting on the amendments proposed.

Cllr Williams MBE noted that Members were being asked to approve the Council's Revenue Budget. However, she was unsure as to whether Members fully understood the implications. Cllr Williams MBE referred to page 17 of the Council's Revenue Budget which included a Courier budget of £7,564 to collect from the machines in the Angle Drove car park. There was no other budget allocated for collection from any additional machines once car parking charges had been introduced. Therefore, without accepting the proposed amendments, Members would be approving a budget that had funding gaps and further budget savings would be required in the future to meet these deficits.

Cllr Williams MBE further questioned the purpose of the Scrutiny Committee, as the report provided to the Scrutiny Committee regarding the introduction of car parking charges had been incomplete and the matter had not been back to the Scrutiny Committee since. Cllr Williams MBE stated that the approach to car parking should be holistic and not piecemeal in order to include in the considerations parking provision at the supermarkets as well as on-street car parking.

Cllr Wright noted that the inclusion of the introduction of car parking charges into the Council's budget, which was a matter that was still out for public consultation, had been raised at a Finance and Governance Committee meeting. Cllr Wright stated that there was now pressure on Members to introduce car parking charges in order to avoid a funding deficit in the Council's budget. Cllr Wright agreed with the amendments proposed by the Liberal Democrats and to use £150,000 from the Change Management budget to fund the non-introduction of car parking charges made sense for this financial year. Cllr Wright stated that the introduction of car parking charges could then be determined once the results of the public consultation had been considered.

Cllr Morrison stated that the introduction of car parking charges was not a 'done deal' as it was still out for public consultation. Cllr Morrison noted that there were currently 12 vacant shop units within the city centre and he referred to a recent press article where an individual was attempting to encourage better business links to the district. Cllr Morrison stated that this would not be possible with the introduction of car parking charges.

Cllr G Wilson stated that Members who assumed that all of the costs associated with introducing car parking charges were encompassed within the Council's budget were wrong. Cllr G Wilson explained that the proposed amendments were purely suggesting that the introduction of car parking charges should not happen in July 2013 nor that the budget should assume an income from car parking charges during this financial year, as it was not feasible to assume.

Cllr Read enquired whether, in the long-term, Cllr G Wilson was in support of introducing car parking charges. Cllr G Wilson stated that his personal view was

that car parking charges should not be introduced until a civil parking enforcement scheme had been agreed, as one should not be introduced without the other. Within the Liberal Democrat Group, Cllr G Wilson explained that the opinions between Members differed as some believed that car parking charges should never be introduced, whilst others were open to the idea if other options were considered, such as, the re-introduction of a park and ride scheme. However, all of the Liberal Democrat Members were in agreement that the introduction of car parking charges should not happen this financial year.

A recorded vote, having been requested, was taken on the amended recommendations proposed by the Liberal Democrats, as tabled at the meeting. The amendment was declared lost with Members voting as follows:

For (12)	Cllrs Allen, Beckett, Fordham, J Friend-Smith, S Friend-Smith MBE, Morrison, John Palmer, Stevens, Williams MBE, G Wilson, P Wilson and Wright
Against (21)	Cllrs Alderson, Allan, C Ambrose Smith, D Ambrose Smith, Brown, Burton, Cornell, Edwards, Ellis, Goodge, Hobbs, T Hunt, Kerby, Moakes, Morris, James Palmer, Parramint, Read, Roberts, Schumann and Willows.
Abstention (1)	Cllr Rouse

Cllr Wright stated that he had experienced difficulties whilst attempting to respond to a constituent's enquiry of how the Council had achieved savings of £2million following an article in the Press and an item contained within the Chairman's Highlights letter, particularly as the first page of the Council's Revenue Budget illustrated a £2million difference between the Net District Spending Summary from 2011/12 to 2015/16. The article had stated that the Council would not be proposing any new cuts to services or funding for the next financial year, but would be proposing a Council Tax increase of 2%.

Cllr Wright commended the Finance Team who had managed to 'plug a hole' for the past 2 years. However, Cllr Wright acknowledged that the final year of the four years savings package could be problematic if savings were not achieved, for example, car parking charges were not introduced and if the Council did not continue to receive the New Homes Bonus.

Cllr Wright stated that over the next 2 years the Council would need to assess every department to determine whether it was needed to continue with that particular function and to establish whether any further savings could be made, for instance by shared services or joint posts. Cllr Wright wanted assurances that this would be conducted as a matter of urgency.

Regarding the estimated pay award that had been included within the Council's budget, Cllr Wright acknowledged that staff had not received a pay increase for the past three years. However, Cllr Wright noted that neither had many of the public and some people, for instance in the building industry, had received a pay cut, yet still household bills continued to increase. Therefore, unless the 2% Council Tax increase was removed from the budget, Cllr Wright stated that he would not be able to support the Budget as he felt it was important for the Council to obtain the support of the public and to increase Council Tax did not deliver the right message.

Cllr James Palmer explained that there were also additional financial pressures on the Council and that Members needed to consider the bigger picture to enable the Council to effectively operate. Cllr James Palmer acknowledged the concerns expressed by Members and assured Members that the budget had not been prepared with 'closed eyes'.

Cllr J Friend-Smith agreed with the points expressed by Cllr Wright and that the Finance Team had delivered excellent results. Cllr J Friend-Smith stated that he was not comfortable with the 2% Council Tax increase and felt that the public would wonder whether they would be receiving an enhanced service as a result of the increase. Cllr J Friend-Smith noted that many local residents would be frustrated if car parking charges were introduced as people would be parking on-street and creating parking problems for local residents. Cllr J Friend-Smith stated that the Council had withdrawn its financial support for the Dial-A-Ride service and for these reasons he would not be able to support the budget.

Subsequently Members voted on the recommendations as proposed in the officer's report, which were carried.

It was resolved:

- i. That the formal budget resolution, which calculates the Council Tax requirement as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer's report, be adopted.
- ii. That the draft revenue budget set out in Appendix 2 of the officer's report be approved.
- iii. That the capital programme and financing as set out at Appendix 3 of the officer's report be approved.
- iv. That the Statement of Reserves as set out in Appendix 4 of the officer's report be approved.
- v. That the Fees and Charges 2013/14 as set out in Appendix 5 of the officer's report be approved.
- vi. That the programme for schemes to be funded from the former Housing and Planning Delivery Grant as set out in Appendix 6 of the officer's report be approved.

At the conclusion of the above agenda item, at 7.46pm, the Chairman announced that he would adjourn the meeting for a short comfort break, during which time the Head of Finance and the Principal Accountant left the Council Chamber and did not return to the meeting.

At 7.55pm the meeting was resumed.

The Chairman requested that Members support him in congratulating the Finance Team for their endeavours in providing the Council with a balanced budget.

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

Council considered the second of two reports on items recommended from Committees and other Member bodies, M350, previously circulated, detailing two recommendations from the Development and Transport Committee meeting on 10 January 2013.

The first recommendation to be considered related to Council's approval of the Burwell Masterplan. Amendments to the Burwell Masterplan document made subsequent to its consideration by the Development and Transport Committee meeting were included in Appendix A1 of the submitted report. The Chairman drew Members attention to the revised pages 5 and 24 of the Burwell Masterplan document that had been circulated at the meeting, which illustrated the revised maps, as indicated in the listed amendments.

Cllr Brown requested that to avoid confusion with other District/Parish documents in the future that officers carefully consider the wording used with future Masterplan documents, particularly the term 'vision' as this had created confusion during the public consultation.

It was resolved:

Development and Transport Committee – 10 January 2013

Draft Burwell Masterplan

That the draft Burwell Masterplan, as amended by the Burwell Masterplan Working Party on 9 January 2013, including the amendments identified in Appendix A1 of the submitted report and pages 5 and 24 of the Masterplan document, circulated at the meeting, be approved as the Council's long term vision for the future of Burwell.

The second recommendation to be considered by Members related to Council's adoption of the Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report 2011/12.

It was resolved:

Development and Transport Committee – 10 January 2013

Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report 2012

That the Annual Monitoring Report 2012, as attached as Appendix 1 of the submitted report be adopted.

As previously advised by the Chairman during his announcements, the third recommendation to be considered by Members regarding the Council's Final Supplementary Planning Document on Developer Contributions had been withdrawn from the agenda.

68. **PROPOSED CHANGES TO CONSTITUTION: 1) PLANNING TERMS OF REFERENCE – CIL - ENFORCEMENT; 2) CONTRACT PROCEDURE RULES – TO ALLOW FOR E-TENDERING PROCEDURES**

Council received a report, M351, which considered proposed changes to the Council's Constitution regarding:

- Planning Committee's Terms of Reference: Following the implementation of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regime from 1 February 2013, the Council would need to implement procedures for enforcement and possible Court action.
- Contract Procedure Rules - The Council currently only accepted postal tenders. Therefore, to allow for greater flexibility and/or to access call-off arrangements under existing framework agreements, the Council should have the ability to use e-procurement. This would only be on a pre-arranged and organised basis. It was anticipated that this would become a legal requirement on or about 2014. The recommendation would then allow the Council to pre-emptively look at the issue and prepare for any changes.

Cllr Read was not totally comfortable with the CIL arrangements. However, he acknowledged that a considerable amount of work had been undertaken and that the 'proof would be in the pudding'.

Cllr S Friend-Smith MBE expressed concerns regarding the security of any e-procurement system. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services explained that currently the Council did not have the software to be able to facilitate e-procurement and that it was a matter that needed further consideration. E-procurement would be used to receive tenders for contracts and often such software was operated in a way where a document was submitted electronically to a secure email address that could not be accessed until a specified date. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services explained that when the Council did look to introduce e-procurement that it would consider joint working with another authority.

It was resolved:

That Council authorise the Monitoring Officer to amend the Constitution, as follows:

- a) Planning Committee's Terms of Reference, to include delegated powers to the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development to deal with operational issues relating to CIL enforcement and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to authorise any Magistrates Court action;
- b) Contract Procedure Rules (rule 8) – to allow for e-tendering to be undertaken (in lieu of postal tendering)¹

69. **DRAFT PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2013/2014**

The Council received a report, M352, which considered the Council's draft Pay Policy Statement 2013/14, attached as Appendix 1 of the officer's report. The

¹ On a pre-authorised/ pre-arranged basis.

Localism Act required the Council to have approved and published a Pay Policy Statement by 31 March 2013, which must be updated each year. Once approved the Pay Policy Statement would be published on the Council's website.

The Deputy Chief Executive noted that the Council's first draft Pay Policy Statement had been devised and approved last year and the amendments to this year's document were highlighted throughout the document in bold type.

The Pay Policy Statement included information on the salary scales of the Chief Officer posts within the Council; Expenses and allowances; Bonuses and other additional payments; Performance Related Pay; Severance Payments; Payment of Election Fees; Re-Engagement of ex-employees; and Employee pension contributions.

Cllr James Palmer requested that prior to Council, future Pay Policy Statements be presented to Scrutiny Committee, followed by the Personnel and Corporate Services Committee, which was supported by Members.

In response to a question by Cllr Wright regarding Paragraph 3.4 of the draft Pay Policy Statement 2013/14, that stated that Council was budgeting for a pay award increase of up to 1.5% in 2013/14, the Deputy Chief Executive explained that this was still subject to national negotiations and no decision had yet been made as to whether staff would receive a pay award this financial year.

In response to a question by Cllr Morrison regarding Paragraph 13.2 of the draft Pay Policy Statement 2013/14, the Deputy Chief Executive explained that the ratios illustrated the salary differences between the Council's highest pay scale and lowest pay scale. The ratio difference between the top of the Council's highest pay scale and top of the lowest pay scale was 1:8.46. However, the ratio difference between the lowest point of the Council's highest pay scale and the lowest point of the lowest pay scale was 1:9.2. The Deputy Chief Executive noted a typographical error in Paragraph 13.2 of the draft Pay Policy Statement 2013/14 as the ratio figure of 1:9.2 was missing a decimal point.

It was resolved:

- i. That Council approve the 2013/14 Pay Policy Statement, as attached as Appendix 1 of the officer's report, and that the 2013/14 Pay Policy Statement be published on the Council's website.
- ii. That prior to Council, future Pay Policy Statements be presented to Scrutiny Committee, followed by the Personnel and Corporate Services Committee.

70. **SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORT**

Council received a report, M353, previously circulated, that provided a summary of the items considered by the Scrutiny Committee at its meetings on 7 January, 21 January and 4 February 2013.

It was resolved:

That the report be noted.

Prior to concluding the meeting, the Chairman reminded Members of the Chairman's Reception that was being held at The Maltings, Ely, on the following evening.

The meeting concluded at 8.13pm.



COPY

**EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL
LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

THE GRANGE, NUTHOLT LANE
ELY, CAMBRIDGESHIRE CB7 4EE
Telephone: Ely (01353) 665555
DX41001 ELY Fax: (01353) 665240
www.eastcambs.gov.uk

Councillor Ian Allen
Address Redacted

My Ref: PM/Ldr/Is/CllrIanAllen-Council210213

6th March 2013

Dear Councillor Allen

COUNCIL – 21ST FEBRUARY 2013 – TO ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

Thank you for your question regarding Community Land Trusts.

All Community Land Trusts (CLTs) are specifically defined in the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008 Part 2 and share five key features, specifically:

- community-controlled and community-owned
- open democratic structure
- permanently affordable housing and other assets
- not-for-profit
- long term stewardship

Nevertheless within this overall framework, CLT's vary enormously in terms of overall purpose, location, governance, options for development, finance and management. This myriad of arrangements should not come as a surprise given the raison d'être of CLT's as community led organisations responsive to local needs and circumstances.

I would not therefore, describe the Stretham and Wilburton CLT as the norm or any future CLT within the District.

The policy framework for the assessment of any planning applications for CLT is contained within the draft East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (ref: Policy Growth 6: Community-led development).

Draft Policy Growth 6 specifically sets out where an element of open market housing on the site would be acceptable, specifically and I quote:-

"It is demonstrated through a financial appraisal that this is essential to enable the delivery of affordable housing or other community benefits on-site, and it does not increase the land sales value above that which would be likely for a 100% affordable housing scheme on the site; and

The community benefits of the scheme (such as the level of affordable housing or open space) are significantly greater than would be delivered on an equivalent open market site".

Subject to consultation, this will provide the framework for the consideration of any planning application from any CLT/or any other community led schemes.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Peter Moakes
Leader of the Council