

COUNCIL



24 JULY 2014 - 4:00PM

PRESENT: Councillor G G R Booth, Councillor D Broker, Councillor M G Bucknor, Councillor Mrs V M Bucknor, Councillor T R Butcher, Councillor J R Chambers, Councillor J F Clark, Councillor S Clark, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor Mrs C R Cox, Councillor J R Farmer, Councillor Mrs J French, Councillor D Hodgson, Councillor M J Humphrey, Councillor P Jolley, Councillor S J E King, Councillor K G Mayor, Councillor Mrs K F Mayor, Councillor A Miscandlon, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor Mrs F S Newell, Councillor D C Oliver, Councillor C C Owen, Councillor D R Patrick, Councillor T E W Quince, Councillor C J Seaton, Councillor R Skoulding, Councillor D Stebbing, Councillor W Sutton, Councillor M Tanfield, Councillor P A Tunley, Councillor F H Yeulett.

APOLOGIES: Councillor S Garratt, Councillor Miss S Hoy, Councillor B M Keane, Councillor G Swan

14/14 TO SIGN AND CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 8 MAY 2014

The minutes of the meeting of 8 May 2014 were agreed and signed subject to the following amendment:

- **Councillor Booth stated that item 12/14, third bullet point under Members asked questions, made comments and received responses as follows; should have read that he did think there was a policy in place that afforded some protection.**

Councillor Humphrey explained he thought an apology should be given to Councillor Melton from the previous meeting where he stepped down as Leader because after a lengthy service no one had thought to mention his leadership qualities and the vision that he brought to Council. He stated that the Council should acknowledge what Councillor Melton had done for this Council. Councillor Clark explained this had been brought up at the Group Meeting and as he was on holiday today then Councillor Mrs Newell had agreed, on behalf of Members, to send a letter of thanks and to give a gift of a bottle of sherry to him.

15/14 CIVIC ENGAGEMENTS UPDATE - FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Councillor Mayor updated Members on the Civic Engagements undertaken by himself and the Vice-Chairman since the last Full Council meeting.

16/14 TO RECEIVE QUESTIONS FROM, AND PROVIDE ANSWERS TO, COUNCILLORS IN RELATION TO MATTERS WHICH, IN THE OPINION OF THE CHAIRMAN, ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF PROCEDURE RULES 8.4 AND 8.6.

Under Procedure Rule 8.4, the Leader of the Main Opposition Group put questions to the Leader of the Council as follows:

- Councillor Booth stated that following on from the last Council meeting where he had raised his concerns regarding how complaints were looked into; he had now received a response on behalf of the Leader but was bringing this back to Council as he would like a full review

of the whole procedure due to his concern regarding the lack to detail given. Councillor Booth explained that complaints are not recognised and dealt with in the appropriate manner and would like a deeper review to take place and more information given. He asked the Leader for his commitment to this deeper review. Councillor Clark apologised that his response had not satisfied Councillor Booth and suggested that a meeting should take place with Councillor Booth, himself and Rob Bridge to go through his concerns and where he thought the system was breaking down. Councillor Farmer asked for clarification of the term "dealt with within ten days", was this normal days or working days. Councillor Clark stated that this usually meant working days. Councillor Farm explained that if only 90% are dealt with within ten days then was the Leader happy that 10% were not responded to. Councillor Clark stated he was prepared to look into this and if Councillor Farmer had any concerns then he would be welcome to join him when he met with Councillor Booth.

17/14 **TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM AND ASK QUESTIONS OF CABINET MEMBERS WITH PORTFOLIO HOLDER RESPONSIBILITIES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROCEDURE RULES 8.1 AND 8.2.**

Under Procedure Rule 8.2, Members put questions to Portfolio Holders as follows:

- Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated she had asked about Outside Bodies at the previous meeting and had been for previous 3 years. Following the initial raising of the subject it was finally agreed that Overview & Scrutiny would set up a sub group of which both she and Councillor Mrs French had been on. The report went to Cabinet, yet no decision was made; she explained she appreciated that Councillor Clark had stated it was complicated but that it was residents' money being paid out without any due diligence at all amounting to £2,500 in travel expenses yet Members have to give details for mileage. She stated this has continued to happen and that there are people that are representing Fenland that are no long Fenland councillors without any recourse at all; why was this so complicated as it is wholly unsatisfactory and unless she received satisfactory answers suggested that the Audit Commission be called in as it is poor practice that we are paying people and not receiving any reports back. Councillor Cornwell explained there had been a change recommended to Cabinet subsequent to the original decision which has taken a while but as far as he was concerned the final document was issued on 7 June 2014 and all non-conservative members were asked to give their own nominations to officers. He stated the report had been withdrawn from the Cabinet meeting scheduled for 19 June 2014 and stated he hoped it would be scheduled for the Cabinet meeting in September. Councillor Mrs Bucknor explained the previous minutes had stated that letters had been prepared but this has not happened. Councillor Mrs Bucknor added that she would be asking the Audit Commission to come in if this was not completed by September;
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked for clear clarification regarding the situation with Constantine House in Wisbech. Councillor Oliver replied stating there have been some issues with road closures but the planning team were in regular contact with the owners to ensure the building is refurbished as soon as possible. It was hopeful that scaffolding would be up from 4 August 2014 aligned to an approved road closure but that a building programme was still being awaited. Councillor Mrs Bucknor thanked Councillor Oliver for his response and asked if the deadline given of September has now been reviewed and if so what the new deadline was. Councillor Oliver stated this had not happened and until the deadline in September had passed the Council cannot proceed with a S215 but it was hopeful the refurbishment would commence which would then allow the Council to discuss with both the owners and contactors as to a likely date of completion. Councillor Mrs Bucknor explained that the only complaint from locals that made hundreds angry was the state of Constantine House and could she have assurances this would be dealt with. Councillor Oliver stated that as soon as a programme was in place then the public would be notified;
- Councillor Booth stated regarding the Community House Update and that he had previously

asked the Leader about the services provided there as there are other areas of deprivation within Fenland; how do we ensure all areas of deprivation are being dealt with and was there any update on the review that was going to take place. Councillor Mike Cornwell stated he did not have an update but would come back to him with an answer;

- Councillor Mrs French stated she had walked around March and that it was looking in a sad state, there were problems with the toilets, many trees were overgrown and now self-seeding. She asked for a commitment from both Councillors Tanfield and Murphy that a project be started through Streetscene and Community PayBack to clear the rubbish and to look at the street furniture. Councillor Tanfield stated she totally agreed with Councillor Mrs French and this would definitely be looked into to see what can be done to which Councillor Murphy agreed with Councillor Tanfield. Councillor Patrick stated that the footpaths in Wisbech have suffered from lack of cleansing and removal of rubbish and this needs investigating;
- Councillor Humphrey stated that with regard to Rural Capital Grants and the money used to support the application in Parson Drove that the Council needed to be mindful of funding for street lighting and asked what steps were being taken to support this as the loss of this funding to Parish Councils will have a detrimental effect. Councillor Seaton stated that a panel had been put together regarding the issue of street lighting and until there is some form of solution did not think it right to start discussing Community Grants but would come back to him;
- Councillor Booth stated that refurbishment works of some car parks had been included in the report but there was no mention of costs; what costs had been involved with these works and would there be any monies for the maintenance of street furniture in the villages. Councillor Murphy stated he was not aware of the costs involved but would get back to him with the relevant information and that villages are looked at but most of the furniture was in the towns. Councillor Booth stated there was more street furniture in the towns as that is where the money is spent and that more should be spent in the villages as that is where a quarter of the population reside. The recent newsletters that had been circulated hardly mentioned the villages and focussed on the towns but the villages should not be forgotten as a high proportion of people live there. Councillor Murphy stated he would look into this as he thought these newsletters had changed format and now included more about the villages. Councillor Butcher stated he lived in one of the villages and agreed with Councillor Booth but that he was pleased with the refurbished car parks. Councillor Booth stated there should be some recognition as a lot of infrastructure is used by the villages;
- Councillor Booth asked Councillor Yeulett that regarding the Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation that the town and parish councils would be involved as this has a direct impact on them. Councillor Yeulett replied stating that all parties and Members would be included in the consultation with the feedback collated and evaluated;
- Councillor Booth stated he was aware that the Area Appraisals would be updated and then taken to Cabinet yet he had not seen these; what was the current situation. Councillor Sutton stated that he had seen the documents that Councillor Booth was referring to with the last one for Parson Drove having been completed in 2000 and agreed that there is a need to look at each of them as and when it was necessary to update them.

18/14

YOUTH DISTRICT COUNCIL PRESENTATION

The Chairman of the Youth District Council, Councillor Miss Bennett, gave a presentation informing Members of the work that the Youth District Council have achieved during the past year, and what they would like to achieve in the future. She thanked the Members for their continued support of the Youth District Council.

Councillor Booth thanked Councillor Miss Bennett for an excellent presentation and asked if a date for Democracy Day had been set yet. Ross McGivern stated this has not been set yet but as soon as the date was known it would be circulated to Members.

19/14

**MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR TUNLEY REGARDING ESTOVER
PLAYING FIELD**

Councillor Tunley stated that in a meeting prior to Council he had withdrawn from the Conservative Whip and was now presenting his motion as an independent Councillor.

Under Procedure Rule 10, Councillor Tunley proposed that:

"Estover Playing Field, March is currently let on a three year lease by Cambridgeshire County Council to the Estover Playing Field Association.

Because of financial constraints this Council has reduced grant funding to the Association in recent years and the Association is now in a position of needing to rely on personal donations, donations from local businesses and fundraising activities to remain financially viable. In my view this is unacceptable for one of the town's longest surviving and most important recreational assets.

Proposals in the Fenland Core Strategy had cast doubt over the future of the playing field but the removal of the March North East housing allocation from the Strategy provides the opportunity to secure the long term future of the facility by way of a long term lease being granted by Cambridgeshire County Council. A long term lease would allow the leaseholder to apply for grants to improve their facilities.

I move that this Council requests Cambridgeshire County Council, upon termination of the current lease, to grant a long term lease on the Estover Playing Field, March at a peppercorn rent to either the Estover Playing Field Association or to March Town Council and that Members of the Cambridgeshire County Council be lobbied by way of letter to support this decision."

The Motion was seconded by Councillor Booth.

Councillor Mrs French proposed to move an amendment to the Motion that:

"I believe that we need to do more work with a wider partnership of authorities and organisations to get more value and infrastructure for this important area of March and this will need a carefully structured approach.

I therefore move that the motion is deferred until the next Council meeting in order that proposals can be presented."

The Motion was seconded by Councillor Cornwell.

Members made comments as follows:

- Councillor Booth stated he had reservations regarding the amendment to the Motion and that the original is a Motion of intent and he had seconded it to ensure the right facilities for the people of March and not for party reasons. He stated that at Overview & Scrutiny he had raised this issue as he had seen the comments from March residents and as a Council we have a duty to listen to residents and take on board their views and provide the facilities they are looking for. This area is not able to secure long term investment and needs the ability to develop facilities and therefore he was asking Members not to agree to the amendment. Councillor Booth stated that the Motion from Councillor Tunley spoke for itself and that Cambridgeshire County Council needed to be lobbied; it was reported in the press last week that a meeting had taken place involving Cambridgeshire County Council and that meeting "flies in the face" of what Fenland did when the Core Strategy came back and Fenland went against the grain and threw it out, Fenland District Council had the courage to

do the right thing therefore there was a need to support the original Motion and not the amendment as we need to show March residents we are a listening Council.

- Councillor Mrs French responded stating she had attended that meeting and was aware of the strong feelings of residents. The reason she was proposing it be deferred was in order for the Leader, with others to be able to sit down and come up with a solution; it would be inappropriate to accept the original Motion at this time as March Town want this resolved and therefore there needs to be a compromise; this will not happen with the original Motion.
- Councillor Tunley stated that the amendment was not to give the impression of intent; by putting forward the amendment then this would do a great disservice to both the North Ward and March as a whole. Residents were quite upset following the presentation by Cambridgeshire County Council last week therefore not to go forward with the original Motion will give the impression that Fenland is stalling and does not have the commitment to support the residents.
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated she was surprised to hear that Councillor Tunley had become an Independent member as she knew how challenging this could be and she was surprised that Councillor Mrs French had mentioned that they would be discussing this with Cambridgeshire County Council because if half the information reported from last week's meeting was true then there would be a big battle going forward. Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated that agreeing to hundreds of houses was unsatisfactory and could not both Councillors Tunley and Mrs French agree that if this was deferred and a meeting held with Cambridgeshire County Council that Councillor Tunley could be included in all of those meetings.
- Councillor Mrs French explained that some things Councillor Mrs Bucknor had heard were not quite correct and that Cambridgeshire County Council were working on various options but did not know why just one had been put forward at the meeting; she also agreed that Councillor Tunley could be involved.
- Councillor Owen stated that Councillor Mrs French had said there was quite a ruckus at the meeting and that it was very apparent that to make any progress then this amendment gives direction to proceed with this; this issue has been going on for 20 years.
- Councillor Tanfield stated it was important to engage with everyone and very important if Fenland wanted to move forward then to try and get as many views as possible, to step back and allow more to be involved.
- Councillor Quince stated that the amendment made a lot of sense as this way everyone can have their say.
- Councillor Cornwell explained that in his mind the amendment tried to achieve far more than the original Motion which is very pointed to one point of action, the amendment gives officers and Members time to try and get to grips with Estover. He doubted it would be gifted from Cambridgeshire County Council and that Fenland would have to compromise, negotiate a way forward together to get more out of the field. He stated he felt very strongly that the amendment gave Fenland a greater opportunity.
- Councillor Booth stated for clarification that the amendment does not talk about preserving the existing facilities that we have and is somewhat vague. There is talk about others investing, how would this be transparent as these meetings would be held behind closed doors.
- Councillor Farmer stated that the amendment negates the original motion as it only facilitates it and therefore what should be considered is a wider range of options, Wisbech Town Council have bought assets from the Council and this should be considered.
- Councillor Booth asked for clarity regarding openness and transparency as discussions will take place behind closed doors; his concern was due to more value and infrastructure and not adding pressure.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that the whole purpose of the amendment was to get round the table with Cambridgeshire County Council as at last week's meeting just one proposal was given but there are others available. Fenland need to discuss this to find out what the options are as there is no way that Cambridgeshire County Council will hand over that land, there has to be a compromise and we need to find out if we can come up with a satisfactory

scheme.

- Councillor Sutton stated that it appeared most March Members were in support of the amendment and that other Members should take note of this and support the amendment.

RESOLVED that the Amendment to the Motion is supported.

Councillor Farmer stated that he could now discuss an amendment to the supported amended motion.

Councillor Bucknor seconded Councillor Farmer's amendment stating that all Councillor Farmer had said was that everything should be discussed at the meeting which is not made clear in the motion, therefore making this amendment relevant.

Councillor Mayor stated this was semantics and that a vote had shown the vast majority in favour of Mrs French's amendment to the Motion, this was accepted and therefore the meeting should move to the next item.

Councillor Tunley stated this was an important issue and this was "play" going on here now bringing it down to a substandard level and the residents of March will see this as a stalling exercise.

Councillor Mayor again stated that the amendment to Councillor Tunley's Motion has been accepted.

Councillor Farmer stated his amendment was for all options to be considered for the field and not restricting it to the original proposal of Councillor Tunley.

RESOLVED that the Amendment is defeated and therefore the original Amendment now stands again.

20/14 MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR JOLLEY REGARDING DOUBLE TAXATION

The Motion was withdrawn by Councillor Jolley.

21/14 MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR JOLLEY REGARDING A COMMITTEE SYSTEM

The Motion was withdrawn by Councillor Jolley.

22/14 MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR TANFIELD REGARDING LEISURE CENTRE SIGNAGE

The Motion was withdrawn by Councillor Tanfield.

23/14 CORPORATE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

Councillor Owen presented the Corporate Governance Committee Annual Report.

Councillor Farmer commended Corporate Governance for producing a short report and commented that the paragraphs in the spreadsheet all followed the same format within the report, all of which could be summarised in one phrase. He stated he was pleased that there was now a new Chairman of Corporate Governance, which had been a committee that only rubber stamped existing practices and that the change in Chairman to one who is not scared to put forward their views, to ask to look at processes and to make some useful contribution to the work of Fenland

District Council and affect some change. Councillor Mrs Newell stated this remark was completely unacceptable that she of all people had never been told that she was too scared to speak up.

It was proposed by Councillor Chambers and seconded by Councillor Sutton and was agreed that:

- **the scope and achievement of the Corporate Governance Committee's work be NOTED, including the commitment to ensuring effective governance arrangements across the Council and its partners;**
- **the Annual Report be ADOPTED**

24/14 TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

Councillor Seaton presented the Treasury Management Annual Report 2013/14.

Councillor Booth stated that with regard to 2.1 within the report the revised forecast of a rise in the bank rate; why do we think it will be later this year when there are reports that it is not likely to happen, this is open to speculation, and therefore why have we stated that option. Councillor Seaton replied stating this was a fluid situation and nothing was set in stone; it is just an assumption that may well change.

Councillor Tunley stated that 1.8% was a negative position as inflation is at 2%. Councillor Seaton stated this was an average over the year.

It was proposed by Councillor Clark and seconded by Councillor Owen and agreed that the report be NOTED.

25/14 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2013/2014

Councillor Mrs French presented the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2013/2014 and gave her thanks to:

- Councillor Chambers as the past Chairman,
- Councillor Sutton
- Members and officers for their ongoing support and co-operation
- Representatives and Partner organisations that have taken the time to contribute positively

Councillor Booth stated it was pleasing to see that the call in procedure had been used this year and hoped that this was a picture of things to come as it adds value to the process but was disappointed to not see complaints handling as a category and therefore asked the Chairman to ensure this gets the attention that it deserves to which Councillor Mrs French stated she noted Councillor Booth's comment.

Councillor Mrs Bucknor endorsed Councillor Mrs French's comments and stated that strong scrutiny was important but this was impossible if half the Members on the committee have almost no experience of Council at all; as this is not a learning environment, there is a need to have experienced people on the committee that know how to question. She stated that when she had discussed this with Councillor Swan, who was a new Member, he was upset over her comment. There are some Councillors on the committee that for months do not ask questions and are struggling; this is down to Cabinet/Leader. Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated that the committee cannot include totally inexperienced councillors as this makes a mockery of the committee. Councillor Mrs French stated this had been discussed and training was being looked into but there were a couple of new Members like Councillors Skoulding and Farmer that are not trained for

Overview and Scrutiny but bring great experience to the Committee.

Councillor Sutton stated that he found Councillor Mrs Bucknor's comments offensive, particularly with regard to Councillor Swan as he had added greatly to the committee and Councillor Sutton had been very impressed with what he had brought forward and that Councillor Mrs Bucknor was doing a disservice to people.

Councillor Bucknor stated that Councillor Mrs Bucknor had not directed her comments towards Councillor Swan but she just mentioned his objection to her comments. Councillor Chamber agreed that Councillor Mrs Bucknor did have a lot of experience but that all Members have to start somewhere. Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated this was not school and that experienced Councillors were needed, Councillor Farmer did ask good questions but if this was to be a genuine committee then you should be able to question and therefore you cannot have people "learning" on the committee. Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated to the Leader that she did not want to see totally inexperienced Councillors on the committee.

Councillor Booth stated he recognised Councillor Mrs Bucknor's point but if they have good experience outside of the Council then they are able to look at issues from a different angle and therefore there was a need for a good mix of experienced and new councillors for stability.

It was proposed by Councillor Sutton and seconded by Councillor Mrs Mayor and agreed that the broad scope of work undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel during 2013/2014 be NOTED.

26/14 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Councillors Seaton and Booth presented the Community Governance Review - Final Recommendations with Councillor Seaton thanking all Members of the Working Group as it had worked very well.

Councillor Booth stated this report had a tight timeline as there were other reviews that needed looking at before next year's May elections.

Councillor Owen asked for clarification that the How Fen Ward with 114 electors was going ahead to which Councillor Booth stated this ward will move from the Chatteris ward to the Manea Ward. Councillor Owen stated this would mean those living in Chatteris would now be in the Manea parish and Manea ward to which Councillor Booth said this was correct due to the Local Government Boundary Commission creating a new parish to achieve electoral equality. Councillor Seaton added that Fenland is limited and have to work with the criteria given to which Councillor Owen stated this was ridiculous and he disagreed with it but realised there was no choice.

Councillor Mrs Newell stated that Fenland are going ahead with the suggested How Fen Ward but that Chatteris residents were not happy.

Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that Whittlesey were not happy with the district boundaries but realised that it was an attempt to bring co-terminosity. She stated that one ward was inappropriately named Elm and that she hoped the Boundary Commission would get the message and not use those names and put them in Bassenhally which will also mean there will be 5 town councillors in one ward.

Councillor Jolley added that someone residing 200 yards from Chatteris will now have to go all the way to Manea to vote.

Proposed by Councillor Patrick and seconded by Councillor Mrs French and agreed that the

Final CGR recommendations be APPROVED.

- **The parish boundary between Chatteris and Manea be amended to follow the new district ward boundary;**
- **The new parish wards in Chatteris be amended to reflect the new district ward boundaries across the town;**
- **The new parish wards in Whittlesey be amended to reflect the new district boundaries across the town;**
- **For the number of parish Councillors to represent Chatteris (12), Manea (9) and Whittlesey (14) to remain the same as at present.**

27/14 RESOURCE USE AND RENEWABLE ENERGY SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)

Councillor Sutton presented the Resource Use and Renewable Energy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) stating that Cabinet had discussed and agreed this item earlier in the day and there were no recommended changes to be made.

Councillor Owen stated this was a classic example as a reason for Fenland to look at and give due consideration as he stated this document had "past him by" and he suspected that not many other Councillors had seen it. Councillor Owen stated he had nine observations that he would like clarification on and hoped that all Members would be happy with the document otherwise there may be reason to think twice before approving it and therefore recommended that this item be deferred. Councillor Booth seconded Councillor Owen's recommendation as he was concerned this was the first time the item had been discussed and felt the document was not strong enough to protect residents as it contained no minimum distances. Councillor Sutton explained he was surprised that these concerns were being brought up now when this document had been circulated on two occasions for six weeks at a time. Members have been notified about it and if they have not taken the time to read it then now is not the correct time to raise it; the document has been to all stakeholders and he had attended the Agents Forum whereby if they had not been happy then they would have said so. Councillor Sutton stated he was disappointed that these issues were not raised at the appropriate time. Councillor Owen agreed with Councillor Booth and stated he did not know how he had missed this document as being a member of the planning committee this would have interested him and therefore something has gone wrong as some Members did not have the opportunity to consider this.

Councillor Sutton explained that the revised consultation was circulated in January and again on 3 June after the initial responses had been received as it had been felt necessary to go out for re-consultation. The document was emailed to all Members with a press release and a link to all the relevant documents. Councillor Booth stated that Councillor Sutton was correct but that this was the first opportunity as Members that they have had a chance to discuss this as there has been no opportunity previously, therefore what danger would there be in delaying this.

Councillor Sutton stated he disagreed with Councillor Booth and that there had been a chance to feed into the consultation as all Members had therefore they had missed their chance. Councillor Broker stated this covered a diverse range of topics and was not definitive, just a guide to pull elements together for the future development of Fenland to which Councillor Owen stated that once guidance is put through then it becomes definitive.

Councillor Owen proposed to move an amendment to defer the document.

Councillor Booth seconded the amendment.

The motion was defeated.

Proposed by Councillor Seaton and seconded by Councillor Murphy and agreed that the Resource Use and Renewable Energy SPD be ADOPTED.

28/14 DELIVERING AND PROTECTING HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT IN FENLAND SPD

Councillor Sutton presented the Delivering and Protecting High Quality Environment in Fenland SPD report stating that Cabinet had discussed and agreed this item earlier in the day and there were no recommended changes to be made.

Councillor Butcher stated he agreed with this report and still did but that he had received complaints when small developments of 15 to 16 houses were built as lots of these are affordable housing with small garages that you cannot park a car in therefore the size of garages needs looking at when planning permission is granted. Councillor Sutton stated he took on board Councillor Butcher's comments but that it was still down to the owners to use their garages for what they are built for. Councillor Broker explained that the LDF does refer to the size of garages.

Councillor Booth made an observation regarding the Conservation Area Appraisals as this document makes specific reference to these and therefore they do need bringing up to date to which Councillor Sutton responded stating these will be updated as and when. Councillor Miscandlon stated regarding garages and having been on the planning committee that there is tendency to build smaller garages yet cars have got bigger and developers need to understand that this issue needs addressing.

Proposed by Councillor Miscandlon and seconded by Councillor Murphy and agreed that the Delivering and Protecting High Quality Environments in Fenland Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) be ADOPTED.

29/14 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT – REMOVAL OF THE POST OF DEPUTY LEADER FROM THE COUNCIL CONSTITUTION

Councillor Clark presented the Constitutional Amendment - Removal of the post of Deputy Leader from the Council Constitution report stating that he had a named person to stand in to deputise for him when he was not available and that would be Councillor Butcher.

Proposed by Councillor Booth and seconded by Councillor Mrs Mayor and agreed that

- **The amendment to the Constitution is APPROVED;**
- **The Monitoring Office be authorised to make such typographical amendments as are necessary to produce revised clean text copies of the Constitution.**

Councillor Mayor welcomed Councillor Sam Clark to her first full Council Meeting and apologised for not stating this at the beginning of the meeting.

6:00pm

Chairman