

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber, The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Wednesday 2nd July 2014 at 1:00pm

PRESENT

Councillor Joshua Schumann (Chairman)
Councillor David Ambrose Smith
Councillor Derrick Beckett
Councillor David Brown
Councillor Lavinia Edwards
Councillor Lis Every
Councillor Jeremy Friend-Smith
Councillor Tom Hunt
Councillor Mike Rouse
Councillor Robert Stevens
Councillor Gareth Wilson

OTHERS PRESENT

Councillor Ian Allen
Councillor Bill Hunt
Councillor James Palmer
Councillor Charles Roberts
Ann Caffall – Senior Planning Officer
Maggie Campbell – Senior Legal Assistant
Oliver Cook - Development & Enabling Officer
Sue Finlayson – Team Leader, Development Control
Karen Freya - Principal Housing Officer (Strategy)
Emma Grima - Infrastructure Programme Manager
Rebecca Saunt – Senior Planning Officer
Adrian Scaites-Stokes – Democratic Services Officer
Members of the Public - 32

12. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

There were no apologies for absence.

13. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor David Brown declared a personal interest in agenda item number 9, as he used the Bottisham Dental Practice.

14. **MINUTES**

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 4th June 2014 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

15. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- Agenda items 5 and 6 had been withdrawn;
- There would be a change in the agenda running order, with agenda item number 9 considered before agenda item 8.
- When considering the applications the following order would be taken: (i) the officer would give their report; (ii) the people registered would be given their opportunity to speak and to answer Members' questions; (iii) the Committee could question officers, (iv) the Committee would discuss the issues and come to a decision.

16. **13/00122/ESF – LAND SOUTH OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE BUSINESS PARK, ANGEL DROVE, ELY**

The Committee considered a report, reference P21 previously circulated, which provided details of the matters relating to the application since the Committee decision of 6th November 2013 to agree the application in principle.

Senior Planning Officer Ann Caffall reminded the Committee that revisions to two of the proposed conditions had been circulated previously and would now form part of the officer's recommendation for approval. Copies were also tabled at the meeting along with a submission received from Councillor Tony Godge. The revisions to Condition 43 and 57 related to some re-wording, but did not substantially change the conditions. Letters had been received from MRPP objecting to the application and had been circulated to Members for consideration. Officers had scrutinised those letters but they had not changed the officer's opinion so the recommendation remained for approval of the application.

The Committee were reminded that it had, at its meeting on 16th November 2013, agreed in principle to the approval of the application, which sought full and outline permissions. Four matters had been outstanding, to be brought back to the Committee for further consideration. These related to the completion of a Section 106 (S106) agreement, the closure of the existing superstore, Highway plans and with conditions to be delegated to the Principal Development Management Officer. All these matters had now been resolved.

The financial contributions, as shown in Appendix 2, had been scrutinised and found to comply with the legal tests, had been agreed with the various parties involved and met the viability criteria. The proposed Heads of Terms were acceptable. Condition 43, relating to the closure of the existing store, had been used elsewhere and had been checked with legal advisors. Any change of use on that site would require planning permission. All conditions had been checked by the legal advisors and agreed with the applicants, though they may need minor changes which should be agreed via the Principal Development Management Officer.

Since November 2013 an outline application had been received for a similar proposal at a Downham Road site on the outskirts of Ely. This was a material planning consideration and needed consideration in relation to this application. Officers' view was that this carried limited weight but Members had to decide what weight to give it.

On balance, the application was recommended for approval with delegated authority given to the Principal Development Management Officer relating to minor amendments to the conditions and the issue of the decision notice. If approved this application would have to go to the Secretary of State for consideration.

The Chairman then invited Mr Luke Raistrick from MRPP representing Cambridge Property Group, and Mr Bob Button, Ely Football Club, to address the Committee. Mr Raistrick reminded the Committee that there had been a lot of correspondence over this application. He asked that the Committee consider deferring a decision, so that the Downham Road site application could be considered alongside this application. This would show that the Downham Road site would offer more benefits for Ely. That proposal would include for a superstore, warehouse units and enhanced sporting facilities. Some of the information given to the Committee on the Angel Drove application was unrepresentative and legally flawed and failed the legal test, so the decision could be challenged elsewhere.

Mr Button stated that he was also representing Ely Tigers and Ely Outdoor Sports Association. He asked that the Committee defer the final decision, as the Downham Road application should be considered at the same time. He fully supported that application as it would provide extra facilities to enable more public participation. This would be better than the application under consideration for Octagon Park. It made perfect sense to have this in the north of Ely, but it made no sense to have two stores in south Ely. The Committee should not make a hasty decision and should think of the future. The Hockey Club and Rugby Club had written letters of support for the approach suggested by Cambridge Property Group.

Councillor Gareth Wilson wanted to know where the proposed new sports facilities at Downham Road would be located. Mr Raistrick stated that Cambridge Property Group were in discussions with landowners for land to the west of the current site. This would mean it would be near the proposed new leisure centre.

Councillor Mike Rouse wanted confirmation that the company did not own that land, nor had planning permission. Mr Raistrick confirmed this but stated that the company was working hard to get a deal and to submit an application.

The Chairman then invited Mr Guy Baker, from Mantle Management, to address the Committee. Mr Baker said that he represented the applicant and had been working closely with Council officers since 2008 on this application. The Planning Committee had agreed to grant approval for this application in principle, back in November, and since then constructive work had been ongoing to sign off the issues outstanding at that time. The scheme would be of great benefit to the city, with millions of pounds being generated through the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 agreement. There would also be measures to help support the city centre. If this application was not approved this opportunity would be lost. Legal advice had been obtained to ensure that the application was legally sound. Tesco was contractually bound to this scheme and had recently confirmed it only supported this scheme and

would not consider the one at Downham Road. That site was not part of the Council's emerging policy.

Councillor David Brown was concerned how the obligations under Condition 43 could be discharged, as it did not make sense. Councillor Gareth Wilson also thought ensuring the existing store close before the new one opened would be difficult to enforce. The Senior Planning Officer explained that the words 'permanently cease' should be given their ordinary meaning and had been included in the Condition as suggested by the legal advisors. Tesco was used to opening new stores and closing old ones. There would be a lead-in time for them to get organised to enable closure of the old store and the opening of a new store with no retail trading from both sides and they would be instructed to leave the old store.

Councillor Tom Hunt was interested in who would occupy the six new retail units. He was concerned about the increased footfall through the Business Park affecting the businesses there and questioned whether those businesses had been consulted. The Senior Planning Officer had included some information about the retail units in the report. There was some concern that city centre businesses would want to move into the new units but this would be addressed via Heads of Terms. This would mean that those businesses would have to maintain a presence in the city centre for a certain time period. The new units were bigger than the city centre ones, so it was expected that they would be occupied by users requiring larger floor space areas than is available in the city centre. The footpath links through the Business Park to the railway station would be good, as it provided a linkage to the new site.

Councillor Lis Every queried the percentage of the Section 106 allocation that would go towards benefitting the city centre and what the priorities were. Who would be responsible for the existing store after it became empty? The Infrastructure Programme Manager explained that the report showed the type of projects that could benefit but the actual priorities would depend on further investigations. This would be done through working with all stakeholders to identify suitable projects. The Senior Planning Officer stated the old store would remain unused, as any change in use would require planning permission.

Councillor Jeremy Friend-Smith noted that Appendix 2 listed the planning obligations. It appeared that Project 1 had no money for it, Project 4 had to be agreed with this Council and the Green Travel Plan seemed vague. The Infrastructure Programme Manager replied that the developers would actually carry out the works for Projects 1, 4 and 7, which would be agreed between this Council, the County Council and the developers. The Green Travel Plan aimed to measure alternative forms of transport to ensure that additional traffic was not created. Something similar to the 'Sainsbury bus' would be considered, although this might not be sustainable.

Councillor David Ambrose Smith was disappointed with the amount of money expected from developing the site, as it did not seem much. The Senior Planning Officer explained that the financial contributions had been calculated against the viability of the scheme, as there was a £2.4 million Community

Infrastructure Levy contribution and the financial contributions took into account the roundabout cost of £1 million.

Councillor Mike Rouse reminded the Committee that it had taken six years to reach this point and a lot of thought, care and processes had been gone through. In November the Committee had accepted this application in principle. The requirements from that meeting had now been met and there was no reason for the Committee to change its mind and not to approve the application.

Councillor James Palmer joined the meeting at this point, 1:40pm.

Councillor Mike Rouse duly proposed accepting the officer's recommendations and approving the application. This was duly seconded and, when put to the vote, declared unanimously carried.

It was resolved:

That, in relation to planning application 13/00122/ESF:

- (i) The Heads of Terms and Planning obligations be APPROVED;
- (ii) The planning conditions, as revised, be APPROVED and minor amendments as necessary to the planning conditions be delegated to the Principal Development Management Officer;
- (iii) The receipt of satisfactory Highway construction details be noted;
- (iv) The issue of the decision notice on completion of the S106 agreement be delegated to the Principal Development Management Officer.

17. **14/00359/FUM – CRYSTAL PARK, TUNBRIDGE LANE, BOTTISHAM**

The Committee considered a report, reference P23 previously circulated, which set out details of the application for the erection of new dwellings, the applicant's case, the site and its environment, the planning history and relevant factors and policies.

Senior Planning Officer Rebecca Saunt tabled a summary of comments received from Bottisham Parish Council, a note on the archaeology of the site and a summary of letters received from neighbours. The Committee was also reminded that comments had also been received from Councillor Kevin Ellis, and these had been circulated.

The Parish Council had advised the developers of its concerns and of the neighbours, to give them the opportunity to address those concerns. One of those related to the water supply and Anglia Water had confirmed that its current capacity would be acceptable. The Council's Conservation Officer had disagreed with the retention of the existing buildings but the site needed an archaeological investigation. Neighbours had raised issues over no mixed

use, the existing trees and overlooking. Councillor Ellis comments related to the doctors' surgery nearby and the requirement for the dental practice to move.

The application was for residential development on a site surrounded by residential developments and a doctors' surgery. Nine of the proposed dwellings would be for affordable housing and the site density was in keeping with the adjacent Ancient Meadows site.

Councillor Ian Allen joined the meeting at this point, 1:46pm.

The site had previously been allocated in the draft Local Plan for mixed use, but the allocation had been removed, as it was not consistent with other employment sites located within the development envelope in the district. The site therefore would be assessed in line with policies which sought to retain existing employment sites. The site had been marketed since 2000 for mixed use but there had been a lack of interest for this. Therefore the site was no longer needed for employment purposes.

The plans for the site had been amended to account for residential amenity and was now considered not to have an adverse impact. Some trees would be removed to allow better access to the site and some community parking. Although there was no open space provision on the site, the developers had offered a financial contribution in lieu. Archaeological work would be undertaken on the site, as there was the potential for finding buildings associated with a Roman villa, and would commence next week.

The application was recommended for delegated approval given to the Principal Development Management Officer, subsequent to the archaeological work and the completion of a Section 106 agreement.

The Chairman invited Mr Turner and Ms Clare Jackman to address the Committee. Mr Turner, a resident, objected to the application as he was against using the whole site for housing and was concerned about the adverse impact, although he was prepared to suggest some conditions to mitigate these issues. These should include a brick wall on the boundary, car park lighting on that wall, signs on the wall preventing ball games and the planting of trees. However, he was worried that his patio and garden would be overlooked by the new houses, which would affect his peace and tranquillity. The communal car park would generate disturbance and the proposed close-boarded fence would be inadequate. Overall the application did not accord with Council policy and would have an adverse impact on residential amenity.

Ms Jackman, from the dentist practice, informed the Committee that she had interest in buying land on the site but the landowner had not been willing to sell. The doctor's surgery was full and looking to expand, so the dental practice had to move. If the dental practice could not move to this land then the facility would be lost. The practice would like to build on this land, and be able to expand its business.

The chairman invited Mr Trevor Faulkner to address the Committee. Mr Faulkner, from Bloor Homes, stated that the officer's report showed compliance with the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. Therefore the application should be supported as there would be no adverse impact on the area. Consultants had been employed to check market demand and this had been scrutinised by the Council's Economic Development Officer. The Parish Council had conceded that the site could not be used for mixed use, so a residential scheme had been put forward. The developers had worked closely with Council officers leading to an amended scheme. So the officer's recommendation should be accepted.

Councillor Robert Stevens questioned what had happened to the science company that had operated from the site, whether some of the trees were not within the site boundary, the status of the road as it appeared that the site would not be a private estate and whether the site had been marketed properly. Mr Faulkner replied that the science company would re-locate, any trees not within the boundary were the responsibility of others though any overhanging branches could be cut providing the trees were not covered by Tree Preservation Orders, the road would be made to an adoptable standard and the site had been marketed commercially for ten years.

Councillor Tom Hunt asked why there were no options for two-bedroom houses on the site. In response it was revealed that the mix of houses was in accordance with a strategic marketing assessment of Bottisham which indicated a mix of three or four-bedroom houses would be best for this scheme.

Councillor Derrick Beckett wanted to know if any help would be offered to the dental practice to re-locate. Mr Faulkner reiterated the point that the application was for residential development only.

Councillor Gareth Wilson asked if there were any objections to the dental practice moving onto the site. Mr Faulkner thought this would question the viability of the residential site. The site was very limited and the marketing of the site had been done following advice from the Economic Development Officer.

Councillor Mike Rouse queried whether the Council's Strategic Housing Officer had been consulted. He was also worried about the proposed road width, the parking arrangements and how deliveries could be made. Mr Faulkner confirmed the Officer had been spoken to. The site would provide 55 off-street parking spaces, either in the curtilage of the dwellings or in the car park. The road would be narrow so there would be limited parking.

Councillor David Ambrose Smith asked whether the brick wall would be 2.2 metres high. Mr Faulkner stressed the preference for a close boarded fence, in terms of maintenance but planting in front of it would be considered. However, the developers could consider a wall as part of any conditions.

Councillor David Brown posed a question about pavements on one side or both sides of the road. The Committee was informed that the road would include for

shared services. Vehicles would move at a lower speed from the speed table at the entrance to the development.

Councillor Jeremy Friend-Smith questioned whether the windows of Plots 15 and 16 overlooking the neighbours would be bathroom windows. Roads in Ely had shared services and this was a nuisance, as it caused congestion. If no pavements were to be provided this would leave children vulnerable. At an adjacent site pavements had been provided to both sides of the road, so a pavement should be incorporated. Mr Faulkner stated that the policy requirements for back-to-back development had been met. The site would be a cul-de-sac, so there would be no through traffic and vehicle speed would be limited. Including a pavement would push the dwellings back from the road, causing other issues. This scheme had been discussed with the Highways department.

Councillor Robert Stevens wondered whether the affordable housing would be available for rent. Would this housing be given to people from Bottisham as a preference? The Development & Enabling Officer advised that this housing would be rented but there was no current policy requirement to give preference to Bottisham people as a priority.

Councillor Derrick Beckett noted that this location had been identified as an industrial site previously, but since 2000 there had been no interest in it until the recent interest from the dentist practice. The Senior Planning Officer stated that in terms of policy the Council had to consider the loss of employment sites but there had been no interest for development.

Councillor Tom Hunt asked whether 40% of the housing would be for rent and what the criteria was for local people to access them. The Development & Enabling Officer stated there was no specific policy for Section 106 sites, although there was general policy that gave priority to people in need from across the district. As the population of Bottisham was less than 3000 there was no right to buy. 40% affordable housing was the target for the south of the district.

Councillor Robert Stevens noted that the site had been removed from the draft Local Plan for industrial use. So the site should provide affordable housing for people in need. There was a lack of public open space in Bottisham and, although a sum of money had been suggested instead of providing some on the site, this would be difficult to achieve. The Parish Council were trying to secure some but the developer should find some space for this. The site was adjacent to the Ancient Meadows site, which had open space. The application site was eligible for commercial uses, although a totally commercial use might not be feasible. A mixed scheme had been suggested in the draft Local Plan, but this allocation had been deleted from the Plan. However, the village needed the dental practice and it was hoped a scheme could be devised to include this for the benefit of the inhabitants.

Councillor Mike Rouse opposed the application and proposed that it be rejected due to the loss of the potential mixed use, the insufficient parking provision and the unsuitable road layouts. Councillor Tom Hunt also suggested that the lack

of two-bedroom dwellings was also a reason to refuse. Councillor Gareth Wilson in seconding the proposal also referred to the lack of employment opportunities within the application. Upon being put to the vote, it was declared agreed unanimously.

It was resolved:

That application 14/00359/FUM be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- Loss of potential mixed use;
- Insufficient parking provision;
- Unsuitable road layouts;
- Lack of two-bedroom dwellings;
- Lack of employment opportunities.

The meeting adjourned at this point, 2:49pm.

The meeting reconvened at 2:59pm.

18. **14/00013/FUM – LAND PARCEL TO EAST OF MEADOWCROFT, STRETHAM**

The Committee considered a report, reference P22 previously circulated, which set out details of the application from the Stretham & Wilburton Community Land Trust (CLT) for a new development, the applicant's case, the site and its environment, the planning history and relevant factors and policies.

Senior Planning Officer Ann Caffall reminded the Committee that it would have seen the results of the consultation, with sixty responses including eleven objections. The development proposed was for thirty five market houses, fifteen affordable houses and a doctors' surgery. It would comprise two main streets including a footpath link to Plantation Gate. The development would be built in three phases. Phase 1 would comprise twenty housing units, thirteen market and seven affordable, and the use of Plantation Gate for two-way traffic. Phase 2 would consist of ten market and three affordable dwellings, plus the doctors' surgery and works units with Street 1 linked to Newmarket Road and Plantation Gate being used for one-way traffic. Phase 3 would include the remaining houses and commercial units. The market housing was needed to support the provision of the affordable housing.

Six of the criteria from policy GROWTH6 had been met. The seventh, stating the plan had to accord with other plans, could be mitigated for except for the archaeology and Highways issues. Archaeological trenching had been agreed and if important finds were discovered then a revised scheme may be required. This would be reported back to the Committee after the trenching had been done.

The Highways issues related to the use of Plantation Gate and the impact on nearby roads. Officers supported the hierarchical structure of the roads proposed but were mindful of the residents' concerns over safety of the whole

scheme. So further work was needed to provide safe access to the site and this would also be reported back.

Therefore approval in principle was sought for the application, subject to certain matters being brought back to the Committee.

The Chairman invited Mr Mike Petty to address the Committee. Mr Petty, a resident of Stretham, questioned whether the scheme had got community support. It had been driven forward by a local District Councillor who was also the Chairman of the Parish Council and Chairman of the Trust. Plantation Gate was narrow with no pavements either side but had been a main approach road for two-way traffic including pedestrians and children. Nobody knew anything about the site to the north towards the cemetery or why there was no mention of the land at the southern boundary to the site. Why had the Trustees not approached the local charity to decide who could use the houses? The Wilburton Trustees had decided who could use the houses. There should be no discrimination and anybody should be able to apply. This was a major development in open land, funded by the Parish Council.

The Chairman invited Mr Rowan Haysom and Dr Jan Aniskowicz to address the Committee. Mr Haysom, architect for the applicant, thought the scheme was of the highest quality and had evolved through the community process, where the community, from school children to pensioners, had been involved. The scheme layout, massing and footpaths reflected the community's views. There would be thirteen different house types, with the views preserved, within a generous layout. It would include affordable housing, a doctors' surgery and other units to help the village prosper. The Community Land Trust had ensured that any capital raised through the scheme would go to benefit the village. The scheme accorded with policy and the National Planning Policy Framework. It was recommended that the application be approved.

Dr Aniskowicz, a local General Practitioner, was excited by the concept of this scheme. It would help protect homes and jobs in the village. The planning policies encouraged thoughtful developments, which this was. The village surgery needed to be replaced and a new one would also benefit the surrounding villages. The scheme was commended, as it gave power to the people.

Councillor Tom Hunt was concerned whether people would walk to the new surgery. Dr Aniskowicz revealed that a survey completed four years ago showed that only a third of visitors walked to the surgery. It served a large area stretching as far as Haddenham but the current facility was unsustainable. The new surgery would help the other villages and it was fortuitous that this scheme was coming.

Councillor Mike Rouse asked about the current arrangements for the surgery in Stretham. The Committee was informed that it operated out of a rented bungalow, which should have been condemned and could be at a moment's notice.

Councillor Derrick Beckett noted the proposed surgery and industrial units and wondered where the rent was going. Had research about the traffic flow to the surgery and units and houses, including future flows, been done? Mr Haysom stated that rent money would go to the Trust. One document included a traffic assessment, including traffic flow. Consultants hired by the CLT thought the traffic flow would meet the necessary standards, though the County Council disagreed.

Councillor David Ambrose Smith asked about the neighbours objecting about the access to the site. Dr Aniskowicz accepted that this site would not suit everybody but it was necessary to make other things possible. Mr Haysom added that there had been thirteen public events, which had generated very different opinions. However, the brief from the village was to integrate the new scheme with the old. Some individuals would not benefit from the scheme but overall the whole would.

Councillor Robert Stevens wondered why it was essential for vehicular access via Plantation Gate. Other houses elsewhere were accessed by one road, so why was there the need for a second access and why was this off Newmarket Road? A one-way system would encourage fast traffic and these systems were rare in villages. Mr Haysom explained that the scheme would work well with one access via Newmarket Road but to integrate better with the village two accesses were being considered. This took into consideration the thoughts of what the residents wanted to see.

Councillor Jeremy Friend-Smith left the meeting at this point, 3:37pm.

Councillor Gareth Wilson wanted to know why access from Newmarket Road was not in Phase 1. Plantation Gate was tiny and would be impossible for extra traffic. The Newmarket Road access was needed first. Construction traffic would last for a few years so consideration ought to be given to avoid the scheme being used as a 'rat-run', as people would use it to circumvent the main roundabout. Mr Haysom stated that Phase 1 would be used to give a clear demarcation between construction traffic and residents. The construction traffic would not use Plantation Gate but would access the site via Newmarket Road.

Councillor Joshua Schumann reminded the Committee that all Highway matters were reserved and related conditions would be brought back to the Committee.

The Chairman invited Councillor Ian Allen to address the Committee. Councillor Allen supported anything that would provide affordable housing for those most in need. The plans in this application were a huge improvement over the usual and would be a fine addition to Stretham. However, there was concern about the governance of the allocations policy, so clarification over what safeguards would be in place was needed, to ensure that those actually most in need would be prioritised. Who was to oversee the fair operations of the allocations, would the standard model be used and were the decisions made open to appeal or scrutiny? Concern was expressed that there could be a return to the 1950s where local 'big wigs' would decide that 'the right people' were housed and there could be bias against some people such as animal

rights activists, gay couples or the unemployed, even if their need was greatest. If community land trusts were to be supported with public money, assurance was needed that the full range of residents in those communities had access to the housing, so the allocation policy must be transparent.

Paragraph 6.5 of the report was not complete, as there were practical problems with prioritising those working locally, for example what would happen if someone were promoted or chose to work elsewhere. Would they be evicted as might happen like a farm tied cottage? The objectors' concerns had to be addressed if we were not to return to a previous time when certain sections of the community had to 'doff their caps' to others.

It was questioned whether the number of market housing was appropriate for this out-of-envelope setting when compared to exception sites where 100% affordable housing was required. The development did not fit policy, as it was not small scale, even though the policy was not yet part of the adopted Local Plan. Councillor Allen remained unconvinced that there was broad public support for this scheme, given the paltry consultation results and the letters of objection and as this drove a 'coach-and-horses' through the Village Vision plan.

The Chairman invited Councillor Bill Hunt to address the Committee. Councillor Hunt was delighted to witness the first deliverable community land trust scheme and fully supported it. There was public support for it, as evidenced through the communication with residents and him being elected by the majority of electors to the County Council when promoting support for the scheme. The stakeholders showed support for the scheme, as it was for local people. The regular people needed to be looked after as they were needed within the community. The houses would be socially integrated and the benefits from the sale of the houses would benefit the people of the area. The Committee were urged to support this application and approve it.

The Chairman invited Councillor Charles Roberts to address the Committee. Councillor Roberts declared a prejudicial interest at this point, as he was the Chairman of the Parish Council and Chairman of the Community Land Trust, but exercised his right to speak. It had taken 2½ years from the idea to providing homes for local people who worked locally to enable them to stay in the community. Stretham had joined Wilburton, as both had similar issues. Investigations had started on the project and how to fund it, with the principal objective being for people to live and work in Stretham and Wilburton. Experts had been recruited to help and sites identified, discussed and prioritised. There had been consultation exercises and the drawing up of a design brief, which had been influenced via the results of those consultations. The idea for a doctors' surgery had come from the community's views, as had the proposed starter units. More consultation had taken place as the scheme evolved, with over one hundred members of the community joining the Trust. The application had finally been put in and it was commended for approval.

There was some concern about access to the site. At no stage should construction traffic use Plantation Gate. Residents would use it for two-way traffic, to separate them from the construction traffic. After Phase 1 Plantation

Gate would change to one-way traffic, with still no construction traffic. The uplift in value, that the scheme would deliver, and the sale of the market housing would be used for the surgery and the funding to build the affordable houses.

Councillor Robert Stevens asked whether the Community Land Trust would be paid for selling the market houses, how the allocation policy would work and whether Wilburton would be included. In response, the Committee was informed that the village would benefit from the sale of the houses. The proposed allocation policy would be similar to that used on exception sites. The objective would be to help people live and work in the area. The policy had been drafted and approved by Council officers. The Policy had been modelled on other policies for exception sites. It was still in its first draft format but the Housing Team were working with the Trust on the second draft.

Councillor Gareth Wilson asked whether the Trust intended to register as a social landlord and charity. Were there any plans to use the lump of land not included in the development for future housing? Councillor Roberts confirmed that the Trust was an Industrial and Provident Society, but he was not aware of any intention for it to become a housing provider. He also stated that there were no plans for that land as the Trust had no right to it. There were already thirty-five people on the waiting list for the new site and the land to the south of the site might be used for future development but there were no plans for that yet.

Councillor Charles Roberts left the meeting at this point, 4:14pm.

Councillor Tom Hunt was concerned about the Highways issues that had to be addressed. The doctors' surgery was a positive aspect of the scheme and the scheme had received public support, as evidenced by the one hundred people joining the Trust. The community land trust mechanism would help young people stay in their community and it was right that local people were given priority. This helped build strong communities and was a long term vision, so it should be supported.

Councillor Gareth Wilson thought the scheme had a lot of good things within it, such as affordable housing and green space but he was worried about access. The proposed junction would be unsafe and needed to be sorted out, possibly by using a roundabout or at least traffic lights. The Committee needed to see how the tenants would be selected for the affordable housing.

Councillor Derrick Beckett agreed the need for local houses to be integrated in the community. However, with no Section 106 agreement there would be no improvements possible. If this had been a commercial application it would be rejected as the scheme had many problems. It was not logical to use a track of one car width during the works. Also, the road entrance to the site should be to highways standards. Although the scheme looked good, there had not been enough joined up thinking.

Councillor David Brown noted that the highways issues would be brought back to the Committee and hoped the issues of road width and footpaths would be addressed. To ensure proper tenure of the affordable housing, care had to be

taken over the wording and the conditions had to be right in the Section 106 agreement. The Senior Planning Officer would involve the Housing Officer to agree the fine details. This would include trigger points to ensure the affordable housing was delivered at certain times, as the Council did not want just the market housing delivered without any affordable housing. This information would be brought back to the Committee.

Councillor Mike Rouse was happy to support this application in principle and the information given about highways and other issues. The Committee had been assured of public support for it and it would offer something different of benefit to the local people. He proposed that the application be approved in principle in line with the officer's recommendations with the addition that the finalised allocations policy also be brought back to the Committee.

This was duly seconded and, when put to the vote, declared carried.

It was resolved:

That application 14/00013/FUM be approved in principle subject to the following matters being addressed and reported back to the Planning Committee for final agreement:

- Further work to be carried out on access to the site for all phases of the development and means of ensuring safe highways, maintained in perpetuity by a recognised management body;
- Further archaeological survey work being carried out on the site;
- Further work to finalise the site's Allocations Policy;

Subject to satisfactory Heads of Terms and S106 agreement to ensure:

- Delivery of affordable housing elements and community facilities; and
- Trigger points for phasing of the development; and
- Tenure and affordable housing matters as outlined in the Housing officers report;

And subject to Conditions delegated to the Principal Development Management Officer.

The meeting concluded at 4:29pm.