



EAST
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee
held in St Mary's Church Hall, St Mary's Street,
Ely on Wednesday, 30th June 2015 at 2.00pm

P R E S E N T

Councillor Joshua Schumann (Chairman)
Councillor Sue Austen
Councillor Ian Bovingdon
Councillor Paul Cox
Councillor Lavinia Edwards
Councillor Bill Hunt (Substitute for Councillor Tom Hunt)
Councillor Mike Rouse
Councillor Lisa Stubbs

OFFICERS

Maggie Camp - Solicitor
Penny Mills – Senior Planning Officer
Janis Murfet – Democratic Services Officer
Jon Pavey-Smith – Planning Officer
Andrew Phillips – Senior Planning Officer
Rebecca Saunt – Senior Planning Officer
Sue Wheatley – Planning Manager

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Councillor Vince Campbell
Councillor Peter Cresswell
8 members of the public attended the meeting.

12. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Derrick Beckett, David Chaplin and Tom Hunt.

It was noted that Councillor Bill Hunt would substitute for Councillor Tom Hunt for the duration of the meeting

13. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Hunt, Rouse and Schumann, being Cambridgeshire County Councillors, declared a personal interest in Agenda Item No 7 as the application was being made by the County Council.

Councillor Cox declared a personal interest in Agenda Item No. 7; Minute No. 18 refers.

14. **MINUTES**

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 28th May 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

15. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- The Committee meeting scheduled for 1st July 2015 had been cancelled as planning application reference 14/00728/ESF had been withdrawn. The Tree Preservation Order E/1/15 would go to a future meeting;
- The Planning Inspectorate had chosen to uphold the Gladman's Appeal and grant planning permission for 125 units at Witchford. The reason given was that the District Council did not have a 5 year housing supply. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated that with regard to decision-taking, where the development plan was absent, silent or relevant policies were out of date, there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development and therefore permission should be granted unless *"any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole ..."*

In connection with planning application reference 14/00728/ESF, Councillor Hunt wished to place on record his thanks to Penny Mills, Senior Planning Officer, and Cathy White, Senior Trees Officer, for all their sterling work in preparing the Berry Fen Wind Farm application.

16. **14/01423/FUL – LAND NORTH EAST OF 2 CROCKFORDS ROAD, NEWMARKET**

Jon Pavey-Smith, Planning Officer, presented a report (Q21, previously circulated) which provided details of a full application seeking permission to erect two dwellings with integral garages and associated garden space. Members were reminded that consideration of this application had been deferred from the Planning Committee meeting held on 10th June 2015.

It was noted that the site comprised an elevated landscaping strip between the railway line and Crockfords Road. It occupied an elevated position approximately 2 – 3 metres above the level of Crockfords Road. The

area was residential in nature, located within the settlement boundary for the area known as the Newmarket Fringe. The site contained a number of mature trees and was heavily landscaped towards its eastern edge and along the top of the embankment. It was bordered by a 2 metre high palisade fence along the rear boundary with the railway line.

Illustrations were displayed at the meeting which included a map of the application site, an aerial photograph of the area, and an illustrative of the proposal and site layout.

The Planning Officer reminded Members that the main considerations in the determination of this application were:

- Presumption in favour of sustainable development;
- Impact on the residential amenity of future occupiers;
- Visual amenity/impact on the street scene;
- Stability of the bank and the effect on the railway line; and
- Impact on highway safety.

It was considered that the proposed development would not result in loss of residential amenity to neighbouring properties, either through overshadowing or overlooking. Concern had been raised in relation to the proximity of the railway line but it was noted that there were a number of residential properties which bordered the railway line along Crockfords Road and Green Road. The occupants of the proposed dwelling would therefore encounter similar levels of noise and vibration as those in the existing properties. It was recommended that a condition be imposed for boundary treatment details to be provided, as this would allow the Local Planning Authority to ensure that an appropriate (and where required) noise attenuating boundary treatment was erected.

The Planning Officer stated that an amendment to the proposal had been received reducing the height of the dwelling to two storeys. This reduction was consistent with the siting, height and elevated position of dwellings on the opposite side of the road (Pembroke Close) and to the east on New Cheveley Road. Furthermore, the street scene to the south and east was characterised by detached bungalows on elevated plots.

Members noted that the proposed dwellings, when viewed from the driveway, would appear to be two storeys in height. However, the ground floor would be built into the existing bank and would be screened from view, particularly when travelling along Crockfords Road from either direction.

The dwellings were of a simple and uniform design which mirrored each other in their design. Each of the elevations would be broken up by window and door openings, whilst the two storey element would be punctuated by two garage doors. The design was similar to dwellings farther up Crockfords Road. The proposal therefore complied with Policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015, and guidance contained within Policy 7 of the NPPF 2012.

The Planning Officer reiterated that, given the elevated position of the site and the requirement to construct part of the dwellings and vehicular access below ground level, it was inevitable that the land would be excavated to achieve this. However, this was not a material planning consideration, as the construction of the driveway, dwellings and the foundations adjacent to the railway line would be dealt with under Building Regulations. Network Rail had not objected to the scheme subject to relevant conditions regarding tree planting and the development not encroaching onto their boundary and land.

With regard to Highways, it was noted that the County Highway Engineer had raised no objections to the scheme, subject to the inclusion of conditions. The proposal made provision for garages and parking for two vehicles, which complied with Policy COM8 of the Local Plan.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Andrew Fleet, agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application and made the following comments:

- The site was elongated and generally raised above the highway;
- Full planning consent had already been given for one dwelling;
- His clients had purchased the site in 2014. They wanted to self-build two semi detached dwellings, which they would occupy on completion;
- There had been no pre-application discussions, but much negotiation, and helpful advice given;
- The local Member had raised concerns, but most issues had been considered;
- The locality already benefitted from two storey dwellings and this application was for a two storey dwelling;
- There was sufficient amenity space;
- None of the Statutory Consultees had raised any substantial objections;
- The proposed dwellings would only be 4 minutes from the station and 5 minutes from the High Street;
- There would be access to local and national bus services;
- It would be in a sustainable location and the detailed design of the dwellings would be prepared by a structural engineer.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Planning Officer confirmed that there was already planning permission for a two storey dwelling on the site.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Peter Cresswell, a Ward Member for Cheveley, speaking in opposition to the application, read from a prepared statement:

“I’m here this afternoon, as local Ward Councillor, to oppose this application, on behalf of local residents and Woodditton Parish Council.

I am grateful to our colleague, Councillor Chris Morris, for calling the application in. He would have liked to be present at this meeting, but was delayed.

You are aware that in December 2013 an application was approved for a bungalow to be built on this site. At the time I admit I was surprised, taking account of the viability of the project and the cost of excavation. Now Planning Committee you are faced with an opportunistic application for two dwellings on the same site, which would be clearly more viable, but that I view with a considerable amount of scepticism.

I submit that it is fundamentally wrong for the application to be recommended for approval, with such a long list of conditions attached, in particular those outlined by Network Rail.

I advocate that an application of this nature, which I’m sure you recognise is far from straightforward, should come before this committee after conditions are examined in more detail. There are uncertainties regarding the application and these must be addressed to your satisfaction; the elected members on the Planning Committee.

To highlight how unsatisfactory this is, you only have to study the response from Network Rail, which is detailed in the report.

Network Rail has stipulated that any development must not interfere with any possible work on the track in the future. Looking ahead there is a possibility that this line will need to become a double track, if Soham Railway Station is reopened and the track between Soham and Newmarket is reinstated.

As you will have seen on your site visit, the construction would necessitate cutting into the railway embankment to a considerable extent. It would be too close to the railway line and there are clearly safety issues.

At the site meeting it was pointed out by the Case Officer that other dwellings in Crockfords Road are close to the railway track but none are as close as these houses are intended to be. With the likelihood, in future years, of this becoming a double track, I suggest that if this application is approved, the question will be posed countless times “Whoever allowed planning permission for those houses to be built so close to the railway”.

I must also draw Members’ attention to the fact that a similar application to this one was turned down in June 2008.

I urge you to do so again. It is a totally unsuitable site for the two dwellings that are being proposed.”

Councillor Hunt, commenting on the response from Network Rail (paragraph 5.1, first bullet point refers), noted that there was to be no encroachment onto Network Rail land. He suggested to Councillor Cresswell that this surely covered the issue and they could not widen the track. Councillor Cresswell replied that it was still far too close; he agreed Councillor Hunt's point was correct, but it was close and far closer than other dwellings in Crockfords Road.

Councillor Bovingdon remarked that there was an existing permission for one dwelling on the site, therefore Network Rail's concerns would have been the same for that application.

The Chairman reminded Members to bear in mind that they could give planning permission for something that was not viable or not likely to be built as these were not considerations when making their decision.

There being no other comments or questions, it was proposed by Councillor Hunt and seconded by Councillor Bovingdon that the Officer's recommendation for approval be accepted. When put to the vote, the motion was declared carried, there being 5 votes for, 1 against and 1 abstention. Councillor Rouse did not cast a vote; he had earlier indicated that he would not do so because he had not attended the site visit.

It was resolved:

That planning application reference 14/01423/FUL be APPROVED, subject to the conditions as set out in the Officer's report.

17. **15/00503/FUL – LAND SIDE OF 124 MERESIDE, SOHAM**

Penny Mills, Senior Planning Officer, presented a report (Q22, previously circulated) which sought full planning permission for the erection of a single storey bungalow and integral garage.

The application site was located within the development envelope of Soham and included a parcel of land immediately to the rear of No. 122 Mereside, which was a single storey dwelling. The land originally formed part of the garden to No.124 Mereside, but had since been separated and enclosed by a close board fence. The site would be accessed by an existing driveway which ran between Nos. 122 and 124 Mereside.

Illustrations were displayed at the meeting which included a map of the application site, an aerial photograph and an illustrative of the proposal.

Members were reminded that the main considerations in determining the application were:

- Principle of development and planning history;

- Impact on the character of the area;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Highways issues; and
- Flood risk and drainage.

The Senior Planning Officer reminded Members that at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework was a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. Where relevant policies were out of date, permission should be granted unless:

- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
- Specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

She also drew the Committee's attention to a tabled copy of the Appeal Decision in respect of "Land to the side of 124 Mereside, Soham, ref: APP/V0510/A/07/2035940". The Inspector clearly stated in his decision report "*placing an additional house in the backland area of No.124, would to my mind create a cramped development, which would have an adverse effect on its surroundings*". The Senior Planning Officer reiterated that the Inspector's decision was a material consideration in respect of the current planning application.

Turning to the issue of impact on the character of the area, the Senior Planning Officer said that the character of the area had not changed since the Inspector had made his decision. The proposal was at odds with the character and therefore contrary to Policy ENV2 of the Local Plan.

With regard to the impact on residential amenity, the proposed scheme would not provide the neighbouring properties with a high quality environment, but would result in backland development with all its associated problems. It would also set a precedent for further housing development at the rear of Nos. 116, 118 and 120 Mereside. Cumulatively, if this was allowed to occur, it would have a detrimental impact on the character of the locality. It was therefore considered that the scheme conflicted with Policy ENV2 of the Local Plan.

Members noted that the County Highways Engineer had raised no objections to the proposed scheme subject to standard conditions relating to a traffic management plan, visibility splays, and the use of bound materials for the first 5 metres of the driveway and its construction. It was considered that the proposal complied with Policy COM8 of the Local Plan.

The Senior Planning Officer stated that a Flood Risk Assessment had not been submitted on the basis that only the first few metres of the site entrance were located within Flood Zone 2. The majority of the site, including

the siting of the proposed bungalow, was outside the flood risk area and at least 2 metres above the Flood Zone 2 area, and therefore accorded with Policy ENV8 of the Local Plan.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Andrew Fleet, agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application and made the following comments:

- The reasons for refusal seemed to rest on two issues: backland development and precedent;
- With regard to the former, it was difficult to understand how the proposal could be described as such when there was a plethora of development around the site;
- There were 2 dwellings to the rear of No. 126. The footprint of this dwelling was that of a modest bungalow and the site was 403m²;
- There would be no unnecessary disturbance caused by the access off Mereside;
- The site would be enclosed by a close boarded fence and the garden would be in the eastern corner thereby protecting the residential amenity of Nos. 122 and 124 Mereside;
- The residential amenity of No. 120 would be protected by the footpath;
- The habitable room windows had been designed so that there would be no overlooking;
- If this scheme was in one of the other gardens, it could have been built without planning permission;
- The site would sit comfortably in the street scene, and had been designed to address most issues;
- In respect of setting a precedent, he had always been told there was none, and therefore the application should be judged on its own merits.

Councillor Hunt enquired about the size of the plot and was informed that it was 403m², excluding the driveway.

Councillor Rouse noted that the Appeal Decision made mention of a common entrance, and he asked Mr Fleet if this had changed. Mr Fleet replied that there was a new entrance, individual to the plot.

Councillor Rouse continued, saying that according to the map, there were properties coming off Teal Avenue (Nos. 11 and 12) that had dwellings right behind them. They could almost be said to be backland development, except they were not, because the properties had been granted approval. To his mind, this application was a perfectly developable plot. It was surrounded by others, but respected the amenity of the surroundings.

It was duly proposed by Councillor Rouse and seconded by Councillor Hunt that the Officer's recommendation for refusal be rejected, and that

planning permission be granted. When put to the vote, the motion was declared carried, and

It was resolved unanimously:

That planning application reference 15/00503/FUL be APPROVED for the following reasons:

- 1) Members believe there is sufficient space on the site to accommodate a dwelling;
- 2) It will have suitable access from Mereside;
- 3) No precedent will be set as other nearby buildings have been granted planning permission;
- 4) There will be no impact on residential amenity;

and that the imposition of conditions be delegated to the Planning Manager.

18. **15/03004/CCA - SPORTS AND LEISURE CENTRE, CAMEL ROAD, LITTLEPORT**

Andrew Phillips, Senior Planning Officer, presented a report (Q23, previously circulated) which sought endorsement of the consultation response proposed by Officers raising concerns in relation to an application which was being determined by Cambridgeshire County Council.

It was noted that the application sought permission for a pre-school, primary school (1 Form Entry, 210 pupils), secondary school (with extension capacity to 5 Form Entry, 750 pupils) special education needs (110 pupils aged 2 to 19) and a leisure centre. No mention was made in the development description as to the replacement of the pumping station, and this was likely to form its own application at a later date.

The site was located to the west of Camel Road and to the north of Elm Side. The north-eastern part of the site was currently the existing leisure facility/recreation ground, while the south-western section was agricultural ground.

Illustrations were displayed at the meeting which included a map of the application site, an aerial photograph, views from the edges of the site, illustratives of the overall site layout and parking arrangements, a plan of the Elm Side entrance and the proposed materials pallet.

Tabled at the meeting was a paper which set out details of the site location and access routes for the new schools.

Members were reminded that the key issues for consideration were:

- The footpath and cycle link should be given priority in order to ensure sustainable methods of transport;
- Review Transport Statement;
- Secure/sheltered cycle provision;
- Legal Agreement/Conditions to retain existing leisure centre until new one opens
- BREEAM;
- Design;
- Landscaping;
- Water drainage; and
- Community Access.

The Senior Planning Officer stated that the information provided by the developer sought to provide less secure/sheltered cycle provision than that required by Policy COM8, which set a minimal standard. The under-provision of cycle spaces was a significant concern and it was therefore suggested that this be addressed by means of a condition.

Members noted that Littleport Parish Council had raised concerns regarding the access from Elm Side. The designated footpath/cycle way that ran from Camel Road and around the eastern edge of the site measured 5 metres, with there being 2 metres for the footpath and 3 metres for the cycle way. However, where the path crossed Black Bank Drive, the shared surface narrowed to 3 metres. This reduction in width was likely to mean that pedestrians and cyclists would come into conflict or push one another into the roadway. It was considered that the developer had failed to achieve the aim of providing a suitable route, as required by Policy LIT6. This was made all the more important by virtue of the developer not seeking to improve Black Bank Drive for pedestrians and cyclists, as it did not want to encourage school children using unsupervised transport networks.

The proposal would be a major landmark within Littleport and therefore the design and layout needed to be of the highest quality. The size of the development would make it visible from Camel Road and the A10, and there would be potential glimpses from the public roads to the south of the site.

The architect's vision for the site was to create a set of buildings that followed an agricultural vernacular, while performing a community function. However, the final design, as submitted, had not been assessed by the Quality Panel. The previous design had been shown to the Panel, and there were concerns raised regarding the design and massing of the proposed buildings.

The Committee noted that the individual elements of the scheme had been given their own design, and while each could work on its own, together they were considered to be incoherent. It was felt that with the Quality Panel being made up of a variety of architects, the proposal should be taken back and the Panel's comments given priority.

With regard to materials, the Design & Access Statement had given the impression that natural timber would be used for the external appearance of the buildings. However, the proposed elevations stated that concrete boarding would be used. This was considered to be a significantly poorer material and raised concerns over the quality of the design.

The Senior Planning Officer informed Members that he had received the Tree Officer's comments after his report had been written. It would be important to broaden the range of tree species on the site, and there was an opportunity for the new tree planting to support environmental teaching projects; this could be considered in the new landscaping plan for the site, in layout and species selection. A detailed specific arboricultural impact assessment and tree protection plan would be needed for the trees identified to be retained in the development scheme.

It was considered that there should be a hard and soft landscaping condition. It would provide focus to the secondary school entrance, as the current layout did not take into account the desire line between the car park and entrance way. The positive use of landscaping would also help the proposal to blend into the countryside and minimise the visual impact of the development upon the character of the area.

The Lead Local Flood Authority (Cambridgeshire County Council) had requested a pre-commencement condition to ensure there would be no increased risk in flooding and to protect water quality. The Littleport & Downham Internal Drainage Board agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority's view that a 1.1litres/sec/ha run off must be maintained.

In connection with community access, it was noted that the development would involve the demolition of the existing leisure centre with a new leisure centre being provided connected to the secondary school. The developer had not submitted a draft Heads of Terms with the application to ensure that the proposed leisure centre and associated public open space was given to the community rather than being managed by whoever ran the school.

There was concern that if the school provider took over, access to the leisure centre could be significantly limited. In view of this, it was felt that the application should not be approved until a signed legal agreement or conditions were secured to ensure the whole community of Littleport had priority access to the leisure centre, and that the existing leisure centre should remain until the new one was completed.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Lisa Skinner, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application and made the following comments:

- She was disappointed at the content of the report, as there had been discussions for 18 months and the District Council had been part of the stakeholder group;

- The need for the new schools had arisen from the pressure of the growth of Littleport and the complexity of the Special Educational Needs school;
- The scheme had evolved to build a new sports centre;
- The design intended to respect and reflect the Fen vernacular;
- The intention was to create a coherent architectural campus with a shared central space. This approach had been endorsed by the Quality Panel and East Cambridgeshire District Council, and the buildings would be separated as requested by the Quality Panel;
- There was a strong approach to the site;
- The access would be reassessed and the cycle/pedestrian pathway was to be reviewed;
- The proposed materials were of a good quality and chosen to be robust and colour fast;
- The cycle and scooter spaces would be monitored as part of the Travel Plan;
- The existing leisure centre would not be demolished until the new one was ready;
- With regard to the ownership and management of the facility, the Chief Executive of East Cambridgeshire District Council was taking the lead in discussions;
- The proposed development was well designed and would help in the regeneration of Littleport.

During the course of discussion, Ms Skinner responded to comments and questions from the Committee.

Councillor Rouse asked if there was any opportunity of keeping the haul road as an emergency access, given the huge amount of traffic that would be using the lower end of Camel Road. Ms Skinner replied that there had been extensive discussions, but the haul road had been intended to keep construction traffic away from the centre of the town.

Councillor Hunt said he was aware of the large numbers of children that would be coming on to the site, and with the haul road being a natural drive, it would be very useful for emergency vehicles to be able to use it. He felt this should be included in the plan. The Chairman interjected to say that Ms Skinner had answered the question; it was not intended to use the haul road as an emergency access, but the suggestion could be put forward.

Raising the issue of the proposed materials, Councillor Bovingdon enquired about the difference in the maintenance of the concrete cladding and the Cedral weatherboarding. Ms Skinner said the weatherboarding could fade over time and look quite drab. It might have to be treated on a regular basis, so colour was an issue, and also the maintenance attached to it. By contrast, the concrete would maintain its colour.

Councillor Cox asked if the schedule for the building of the primary school would be commensurate with there being more children. Ian Trafford, Education Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council, replied that the primary school was due to follow in 2020/2021, but as there were more children, this would be reviewed to see if the build needed to be brought forward. It would be necessary to look at funding and this would go through the Capital Programme process. In response to a further question from Councillor Cox, Mr Trafford confirmed that they were not looking at this in terms of decades.

At this point the Chairman reminded the Committee that the District Council was not determining the application, only responding to the consultation.

Councillor Hunt declared this to be “an exciting day”. Littleport was to get a much needed secondary school and a top class leisure facility. Some children would be able to go to school in Littleport rather than having to come to Ely, and this would be of benefit to both settlements. He had concerns regarding the use of an emergency road because he believed it would be dangerous to allow only one entrance to the site. For this reason he thought the haul road should be kept open, even if it was never used. There should be no further delays.

Councillor Rouse remarked that there had been much discussion before the Senior Planning Officer had joined the District Council and inherited this case. The design issues had been addressed and would respect the Fenland vernacular; this scheme was needed and welcomed and would be a game changer for Littleport. Speaking as the father of a mentally disabled child, Councillor Rouse said the proposal had been a long day coming, and there should be nothing that would lead to any further delays. This would be the biggest investment in Littleport and he looked forward to it.

Councillor Cox said he fully supported there being a review of the cycle and pedestrian pathway at Elm Side, but the project should be agreed and commenced as soon as possible. There was, he acknowledged, a certain amount of architectural disagreement and “agricultural vernacular” was subject to interpretation, but he was not fussed what the scheme looked like. There had been great promises made regarding public access to the primary school in Parsons Lane, with the intention of providing space in the school to be used by the community, but he thought the final plans had subsequently been changed.

The Chairman asked Councillor Cox whether, on reflection, he should have declared a personal interest in this item. Councillor Cox replied that as

one had to be a member of the leisure centre to use the gymnasium, and he was a member, he should have done so.

The Chairman suggested and it was agreed that, in the light of Members' comments, the Committee should review the bullet points set out in the consultation response and amend them as necessary. After some discussion it was agreed:

- Point 1 to be amended to include reference to the cycle/pedestrian pathway measuring 5 metres in width up to the edge of Elm Side public highway;
- Point 2 to be deleted;
- Points 3 - 5 to remain, as set out in the Officer's report;
- Point 6 to be deleted;
- Point 7 to remain, as set out in the Officer's report;
- Point 8 to be deleted and replaced with a new point regarding the County Council exploring an additional access for emergencies from Camel Road.

With regard to the last point, Mr Trafford cautioned that retention of the haul road could be explored but he could not guarantee it. The alignment would have to be reviewed, so this might not be easy to achieve. Ms Skinner concurred, adding that the integrity of the sports pitches was important and there would have to be checks to ensure there were no adverse effects.

In connection with Ms Skinner's comment, Councillor Cox asked about the County Council's intentions regarding the school's playing fields, as they would be dissected by the road being constructed. Mr Trafford replied that the County Council was not looking to acquire them, but it was looking at general access for amenity use.

It was duly proposed by Councillor Rouse and seconded by Councillor Bovingdon that the comments, as amended, be forwarded to the County Council. When put to the vote,

It was resolved unanimously:

That the consultation response raising concerns proposed by Officers as set out below, be endorsed:

- Due to the increase in morning rush hour traffic using Elm Side, the footpath and cycle link should be given priority, by measuring 5m in width up to the edge of Elm Side public highway, in order to ensure sustainable methods of transport.

- The amount of secure/sheltered cycle provision should meet or exceed the minimum standards under Policy COM 8. If this cycle provision is not all provided at the start of the development then it should be phased/tied to a Travel Plan that is reviewed annually;
- That a legal agreement or conditions is required to secure the Leisure Centre, and associated sport pitches remain with priority remaining for the whole community of Littleport. A condition should be used to prevent the demolition of the existing leisure centre until the new one is ready for use;
- A finalised BREEAM assessment should be submitted to demonstrate how the design and siting of the school will meet at least “Very Good” before the application is approved. A condition should be added to ensure the development meets at least Very Good before occupation;
- A hard and soft landscaping condition should be added to ensure a high quality public realm, in particular the plaza at the front of the secondary school;
- Explore an additional access for emergencies from Camel Road.

The meeting closed at 3.25pm.