

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
1	<u>Introduction and Apologies</u>			<p>Apologies received from: Sasha Bainbridge, Hannah Guy, Emma Nasta, Alex Patrick, David Rowen, Nick Seaton, Tim Slater, Ann Wardle, Martin Williams, Edward Clarke, Hannah Albans, Mark Jones</p> <p>Present: Lee Bevens, Dino Biagioni, Stephen Buddle, Chris Cooper, Marcel Cooper, Jonathan Cox, Mark Greenwood, Matthew Hall, Nick Harding, Graham Hughes, Peter Humphrey, Shanna Jackson, Simon Jackson, James Kenyon, Councillor Dee Laws, Lee Russell Peter Harley, John Maxey, Jordan Trundle, Chris Walford and George Wilkinson.</p>
2	<u>Review of Action Schedule from Last Meeting held on 4 October 23</u>			<p>The minutes of the meeting of the 4 October 23 were agreed.</p> <p>NH explained that one of the actions was for the County Council Ecologist to present to the forum members with regards to the role out of biodiversity net gain for large sites. It is hoped that they will be present at a meeting going forwards.</p>
3	<u>Combined Authority Infrastructure Project - Jonathan Cox - (Stantec)</u>			<p>Jonathan Cox (JC) from Stantec presented to the Forum.</p> <p>He explained that Stantec have been commissioned by the CPCA to explore some of the barriers that may or may not be holding back planned housing and employment growth in the</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>CPCA area. He explained that as part of the project there is engagement with local authorities, developers, outside bodies who are responsible for providing water and energy and his remit covers four key subject areas, including transport, energy, water supply quality and flood risk and green and blue infrastructure including BNG and digital connectivity.</p> <p>JC added that the project is exploring what sites and what areas there is planned housing and employment growth across the CPCA area and looking into the detail with regards to what infrastructure maybe required in order to assist with the delivery and also to get a better understanding of the barriers with regards to delivering the infrastructure.</p> <p>Members of the Forum made the following comments.</p> <p>JM stated that primary driving force for his attendance at the forum was with regards to the proposed traffic improvements around Wisbech which originated in a £10,000,000 fund which was handed to the CPCA to administer and then appeared to be delayed in terms of its availability. He added that the West Norfolk EAP is ongoing at the current time and the Inspector has raised additional questions with regards to when the Broadend Road roundabout is going to become available as it had been stated previously that work was due to commence in 2023 and the land has already been purchased. He asked for an update with regards to who now controls the funding and what is the process for ensuring the project can be delivered.</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>JC explained that he is working for the CPCA and therefore he does not have the insight into the pots of money and his role at the meeting is to gather information for the particular study. He added that he will feed back the issues raised by JM and those aspects may be raised when the necessary infrastructure review takes place in order to deliver growth in the region. JC explained that he is not in a position to comment on the funding issues that JM had raised.</p> <p>NH asked JM whether he was attending the EAP when that particular issue was discussed, and he asked who the question was directed at. JM explained that the EAP recommence on 16 March, and it is for additional questions that Inspectors have posed that will be discussed on 17 March in the context of confirming the East Wisbech allocation and the West Norfolk part remains sound and should stay within the plan. He added that the funding was all lined up and the land has all been purchased and there are other improvements to consider such as Elm Hall roundabout where all the necessary land has been purchased to enable the improvements which unlock an awful lot of the proposed additional development in the southern part of Wisbech including all of the industrial areas and there appears to be a delay possibly because of revenue considerations. JM added that there a number of applications coming through which are likely to obtain consent this year with a view to build out next year, and the finance does need to be made available.</p> <p>Simon Jackson, the Economic Growth Manager at</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>FDC made the point that it appears to be a very useful piece of work which JC is undertaking. SJ explained that his focus is on housing as part of the economic growth function but also on the employment side of things. He asked what the timescale is with regards to the piece of work and how does it breakdown in terms of consultation and draft reporting. SJ also expressed the view that consideration also needs to be given to solutions to the problems which are identified. SJ made reference to the presentation screen and added that the slide states to identify interventions the CPCA could make to overcome the barriers and he asked JC to explain what is meant by interventions. SJ stated that apart from money most of the issues are third party solutions as it involves energy and water and it is all about providing funding to get those people involved in the actual project to do things. SJ reiterated that it is going to be very important to identify what funding is required and if it is CPCA funding or from anywhere else it is going to be essential to get an understanding of where it is going to come from.</p> <p>Councillor Mrs Dee Laws (DL) stated that she would contact colleagues to obtain further information in order to assist JM and SJ. NH added that the challenge for Fenland from a developers point of view due to the viability challenges it is a big ask to bring sites forward where there is a huge infrastructure cost and therefore the schemes do not come forward and when it comes to the availability of funding from the various organisations that supply funding, they cannot be accessed because we do not have sites with planning permission that are ready to go. NH</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>advised JC that from the perspective of Fenland we would expect the CPCA not to have too sharp a focus on the authorities who do not have the challenges that Fenland has in the northern part of Cambridgeshire as it compounds the disadvantages that Fenland has. NH explained that for Homes England funding their model when considering the support of sites is geared around to how quickly is their money going to be recouped and what is the surety of getting their money back and what is the gearing ratio. He explained that because the build out rates here are slower and the rate of return is lower it is apparent that our schemes never qualify for Homes England funding and the funding goes towards those other parts of Cambridgeshire. NH added that with regards the challenges around the supply of energy to sites in order to be able to bring them forward, there is currently a project being undertaken by CCC which is looking at that issue in a silo way and it is not looking more broadly in the context of the other considerations which need to be taken into account when delivering development and is only looking at the most advantageous place to bring forward from a development point of view in terms of being able to get power to the site, whilst ignoring all of the other factors when allocating land for development in the various local plans throughout the county.</p> <p>NH asked the forum how they wish to feedback to Stantec their observations and feedback.</p> <p>SJ stated that consideration needs to be given with regards to where the document is going to end up and he raised the point of decision-making</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>concerning resource and what weight will the report findings have when considered by the CPCA decision making structure.</p> <p>JC explained that over the next couple of months he will be working to finalise matters with a view to have a draft report ready for the CPCA to review at the start of April. He added that the current plan for the CPCA is to take the report to the Environmental and Sustainable Communities Committee in July. JC added that from his perspective the CPCA are putting considerable weight on this and they are looking forward to receiving the report as they feel it will be valuable tool for them to understand the links between some of the infra structure barriers that are in existence across the CPCA area and what the levels of housing and employment that may unlock.</p> <p>JC made the point that there are barriers that are beyond the four subject areas which are the funding elements to things and the different elements which are being handled in a siloed way and maybe a more joined up approach is needed and the work he is undertaking may seek to recommend a few actions which are beyond the initial work he is undertaking.</p> <p>SJ questioned what will the report tackle if there is no detailed level of information about what the actual barriers are at a particular site. He added with regards to energy and electricity, most local authority areas will be struggling with new demand for electricity and the cost that people are being quoted to provide additional electricity capacity and sub stations which can be a very substantial</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>cost and a significant barrier. He made the point that if the level of information is not present at a particular location will there be the option to fill that void or just report back that the information is not available.</p> <p>JM asked for the contact details in order to be able to submit the information to JC.</p> <p>NH asked whether the level that JC is working to is also looking at the challenges around bringing the parcels of land forward for development or is it about improving the attractiveness of an area more broadly in order to facilitate development. NH added that with regards to the A47 whilst improvement to the A47 would not necessarily open up a parcel of land it would make Fenland a much more attractive area potentially for economic development and housing development which in turn might improve viability so that more development sites can be brought forward independently rather than be dependent on assistance.</p> <p>JC added that with regards to voids in information there is going to have to be some limitations with regards to the level of detail and that will have to be handled accordingly. Some of the subject matter may not be able to be site specific and he is looking at aspects where there is planned growth locations at the moment although there is an element of future growth which are potentially unlocking future development within the planned growth for the region. JC explained that consideration is being given to cover it in both ways so that there is a site-specific element to it but also an area wide potential for unlocking</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>further growth whilst also noting the limitations.</p> <p>He added a coordinated repose would be welcome and NH agreed to collate the responses.</p> <p>SJ made the point that when considering the information that is available in each of the authorities within Cams and Peterborough then Fenland will be a very poor relation in that regards generally speaking as there are a number of other areas will have masses of information and intelligence into all of the aspects that JC is reviewing. He added that Fenland is not in the same league with regards to the level of information and is already at a disadvantage. He added that the CPCA also wants to reduce inequalities and therefore he when the CPCA Transport Committee is going to review the benefits that could accrue from investment, in his opinion, the benefits need to be reviewed and look at reducing some of the inequalities and not just looking at the return on investment from a financial perspective.</p> <p>NH stated that he recalls that the CCC undertook a piece of work about three years ago with regards to utilities infrastructure and he asked Graham Hughes (GS) whether he recalls that. GS stated that NH is correct and there are conversations taking place with the CCC and with officers who carried out that original piece of work and therefore there is the historic and updated data. GS explained that as well as the team who are looking at the development aspect of the project there are also others within Stantec who energy and water experts and they are speaking to the utility companies and reviewing the</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>published data and from that information there should be a pretty good outcome of what the plans are and what needs to be done.</p> <p>DL confirmed that she has emailed the appropriate officers at the CPCA along with the Leader. She added that she supports the views of SJ and stated that the north of Cambridgeshire has not had its fair share of investment and the area is behind compared to other parts of the County.</p>
4	<u>Local Plan Update</u>			<p>NH explained that the decision has been made to prepare the emerging Local Plan under the existing transitional arrangements and Gareth Martin is working on the new Local Development Scheme which is due to be published in March as it is a government requirement. Gareth Martin is also working on the updated Annual Monitoring Report and a fair chunk of the information is included within the AMR and is underpinning the emerging local plan. NH explained that a discussion with members will take place with regards to the growth strategy identified at the Reg 18 stage in response to the representations that have been received and have commented on the proposed allocation and the alternatives proposed. NH explained that the Regulation 19 stage should be in the Spring of 2025.</p>
5	<u>S106 Monitoring Fee</u>			<p>NH explained that as of the 1 April there is going to be a Section 106 monitoring introduced which will be a £500 fee per schedule in agreement where FDC is the relevant body which has obligations to fulfil in that legal agreement.</p> <p>Members of the Forum asked the following</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>questions.</p> <p>MC asked that if an applicant put forward a unilateral undertaking would there be a monitoring fee. NH explained that there would be a monitoring fee in the context that we would have to ensure that we spend the money. However, but in terms of what is going to be approved by members that has not been incorporated into our fee and charges system and therefore we will not be raising a monitoring fee in that regard.</p> <p>MC asked whether the £500 is for each item mentioned in the Section 106 that the council will have to check, and NH confirmed that is correct.</p>
6	<p><u>Earlier Return of Invalid Applications.</u></p>			<p>NH stated that currently invalid applications are returned after 13 weeks of issue of the first invalid letter unless otherwise agreed and as of 1 April that is going to be reduced to 4 weeks in order to try to encourage people to submit valid on receipt applications as the current percentage of invalid applications being received remains very high and we are trying to give an incentive to getting applications right first time. He added that if the valid reasons are unable to be addressed within the four-week timescale, then the recommendation is for the application is to be withdrawn and therefore applicants will avoid incurring administration charges which will be introduced from 1 April.</p> <p>JM stated that at the current time if there is an invalid application and it takes a fortnight to correct, it may then wait another four weeks to be re validated. He asked whether those application will be revalidated virtually on receipt and NH</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				confirmed that will be the case.
7	<u>Administrative Fee for Returned Invalid Applications.</u>			<p>NH referred to the administration fee and advised that as of the 1 April, when an invalid application is returned, there will be a deduction from the planning application fee that has been submitted of the following:</p> <p>The deduction will be as follows.</p> <p>£60 on major applications £24 on all other application types</p> <p>This is to cover our administration costs and time spent dealing with the application up until the point of return.</p> <p>Both of those fees does not actually cover the costs incurred but it was decided not to deduct the full amount straight away.</p>
8	<u>Planning Guarantee</u>			<p>NH explained that last month the Government changed the Planning guarantee and therefore for non-major applications has been reduced to 16 weeks and if your application has not been determined within 16 weeks from the valid from date then a refund of your application fee would be due. However, if there has been an agreement to an extension of time then that would null and void the ability to be entitled to a refund, even if the planning decision is made after the expiry after the extension of time agreement, you would still not be entitled to a refund.</p> <p>NH explained that because of the 16 week guarantee arrangement and because of the high number of planning applications which end</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>upgoing before the committee because of our scheme of delegation, between week 3 and 4 officers have been asked to contact agents to ask for an extension of time to week 16 unless the application is certain for approval within 8 weeks.</p> <p>NH added that he has chosen 16 weeks in order to try and reduce the amount of administration and officers will still endeavour to provide a timely decision as possible irrespective of putting 16 weeks on the extension of time.</p> <p>Agents may choose not to agree to a 16 week extension of time and as a group of officers a decision will need to be made with regards to the agents lesser proposal or whether or not officers move forwards with a decision on the application on the basis of it will be decided as submitted. He explained that any amended plans will not be submitted unless there is an extension of time in place as there is a high risk that any amended plans would not be able to be dealt with and move an application to committee should it need to, within 16 weeks.</p> <p>NH reminded the forum that only one set of amended plans can be accepted on non major applications, however officers have been given discretion to allow a further round of amendments if officers are 99% sure that the application is acceptable.</p> <p>JM stated that he understands that if there is going to be amended plans then there is the need for an extension of time as 8 weeks is not enough time, however previously there has been significant delay beyond 8 weeks when there are no variations proposed and no request for</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>variations and it is just the administration time the department is taking with its consultees to get to a point of making a decision. He added that in those circumstances, just because the department see it as a slow point to get to a decision because of external consultees he does not think it is fair to say to the applicant that an extension of time is required due to non-adherence to government timescales. JM expressed the opinion that there needs to be a particular circumstance that warrants an EOT before an EOT is requested and for it to pair. He added that by giving an EOT for 16 weeks n applicant is stopping their clock on the planning guarantee. NH stated that if it certain that the application is acceptable as submitted and officers are not able to get a decision within 8 weeks because it may need to go to committee, then that is why an EOT would be requested and if agents choose not to agree to that then that is fair enough.</p> <p>LR asked whether that stance is also going to be applied to condition of discharge applications too. NH explained that the planning guarantee does not cover condition discharges and with regards to planning discharge applications they are supposed to be determined within the appropriate timescales because otherwise you can apply for deemed discharge consent. Officers have a discretion over whether or not there is a reasonable prospect of a timely resolution of a condition discharge application topic area being resolved.</p> <p>CC asked whether the Technical Officers have discretion about what amendments have to be recirculated to the consultee cohort. NH stated</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>that if an application is received and a case officer asks for some revision then in most cases that revision will have to go out for public consultation as it is different to what the neighbours have seen before and if the changes are so small then one would question whether it was needed in the first place, and there would be a approach whether or not it was appropriate not to undertake a further consultation. He added that broadly speaking you would only undertake a consultation with those bodies that are relevant to that particular change.</p> <p>DB stated that he is led to believe that officers are currently experiencing issues with statutory consultees not providing any responses and he asked how this issue fits with the new administrative arrangements being introduced. NH explained that the instruction to officers is that they need to make the judgement as to whether or not they think the missing consultee response is going to be significant to the determination of the application. He added that the officer will make attempts to contact the consultee however it may mean that a judgement call needs to be made in order to decide whether the decision is delayed or take a decision regardless.</p> <p>DB stated that there have been a couple of instances where he has been led to believe that an officer recommendation is imminent and then there have been instances where a statutory consultee has not been contacted and the officer has then had to go out to undertake that missed consultation. He asked whether that would be down to the officer to make a judgement call as to whether the response from the omitted consultation maybe forthcoming and maybe</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>significant in the determination. NH stated that he would expect such situations to be rare and he explained that there is a new ICT system which is due to be implemented imminently which will automatically draw down from the mapping system those organisations which need to be consulted on a planning application and that should reduce the risk of those types of errors from arising.</p>
9	<p><u>Implications of the Planning Guarantee (in the context of the FDC scheme of delegation and performance)</u></p>			<p>NH stated that as well as changing the planning guarantee for non-major applications, the Government is also looking to not allowing any extension of time on householder applications and maybe only allowing one extension of time on those planning applications that are not householder applications. NH made the point that the Government may need to consider adjusting the performance requirements of local authorities to take those things into account, such as reduced performance requirement and it is likely to mean more applications being refused.</p> <p>JM stated that this appears to be pushing agents towards pre apps and getting things agreed before they submit which is fine provided that an effective pre app response can be achieved. NH agreed to provide the internal target for pre apps to JM in writing. JM added that in his experience they are not quick and are not necessarily comprehensive which does not give confidence that the actual application you submit will be acceptable.</p>
10	<p><u>Receipt of Right First time Applications.</u></p>			<p>NH advised that information is published each month with regards to the number of applications received and those that were valid upon receipt.</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>He explained that going forwards where in the last 12 months, 75% of your applications valid upon receipt the department is pledging to undertake validation checks within 5 days and that 5 days performance by the tech team will be improved upon the closer that we get for those 5 days to be a business-as-usual speed of validation checks for everybody.</p> <p>He added that if business as usual is that 75% of validation checks are done by us in 5 days and you are a top performing agent then the officers will endeavour to undertake your validation checks in 1 or 2 days. NH explained that the incentive will be kept under review as the business-as-usual validation speed improves.</p> <p>JM asked whether NH means that it should be applications valid on receipt or without submission of amended or additional information.</p> <p>NH stated that performance is measured on that basis.</p> <p>NH explained that a definitive validation checklist is published on the council's website along with guidance notes.</p> <p>CC stated that there appears to be something not listed on the validation check which had an impact on one of his applications. NH agreed to look into the issue.</p> <p>CC asked whether the validation checklist is tweaked to reflect the requirements of Fenland or to national requirements.</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>NH explained that the is the national list and a local list on the website and CC asked whether the National list contains items which are not on the Fenland List. NC stated that the Fenland list covers both.</p>
11	<p><u>BNG for Major Sites goes / went live on 12 February 2024</u></p>			<p>NH explained that there is a government consultation on future homes and building standards which contains information with regards to reducing Co2.</p> <p>NH added that with regards to another building regulations matter for tighter water efficiency, and he explained that it would appear that a new standard which sites below 110 litres per day is going to be introduced. He explained that related to that there has been some engagement by Anglia Water (AW) when it comes to employment related development which is a high consumer of water and AW are looking to introduce some controls in respect of that type of development and they are looking for local authority support for that. NH stated that FDC have not issued any support for it, and we have concerns in respect of that requirement, and we are aware of the pressure that there is with regards to water resources within our area, notwithstanding the proposed reservoir at Chatteris. NH explained that he cannot provide further detail as the information coming forward from AW is vague and it only talks</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>about industries which are high consumers of water without any indication of what that water consumption threshold is that they are looking to bring under some form of control. Any forthcoming news will be shared.</p> <p>Biodiversity Net Gain for major sites is now live and agents will now need to submit BNG calculations before and after and the calculations will be vetted by the ecologist. He added that the existing site BNG calculation will always be retrospective if there has been any site clearance.</p> <p>NH explained that he has highlighted to FDC Property Team along with the officer that manages the cemeteries that the council looks after as well as opens spaces to ascertain whether there is any land which has no development potential or is under used which the council could put forward a location where off-site biodiversity could be provided where it cannot be provided for on existing development sites. He added that for smaller sites within Fenland by bringing them forward it formats where BNG provision is going to be significant challenge.</p> <p>Councillor Mrs Laws stated that she would be unhappy with closed cemeteries and graveyards being utilised in this way. She added that in her view there should be no encroachment into the cemetery itself.</p> <p>JT asked whether the Council are updating their validation checklist with regards to BNG and what is going to be required at the validation stage for BNG.NH explained that when he reviewed it last week he could see that the regulations had been</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>updated to facilitate the national requirement for the submission of the BNG calculations and he added that if it is on the national list then FDC will make reference to it on the local list. JT added that KLWN have outlined a new matrix which has been released via the DEFRA website and the statutory tools to compete it plus the requirement of a written statement for the BNG potential and follow up documents including management and draft plans when there are outline applications and then to be confirmed if an approval is given at discharge of condition stage.</p> <p>NH stated that the council has a process which has to be followed if the local list is to be updated which involves committee approval and consultation and therefore it will take a while for it to filter through. He added that if the national requirement has not ben updated yet then the application will not be invalidated because the BNG calculation is missing. JT asked whether the council will accept what ecologists put forward on major schemes at the moment and NH stated that he will check whether the national requirement has been changed and if it has then the website will be updated to reflect that but if the national requirement has not bee published yet then FDC cannot invalidate any applications because the BNG information is missing.</p> <p>MC stated that if off site improvements can be allowed to compensate for development how close to the development do they have to be. NH stated that the preference is for it to be provided on site and if it is going to be off site it would need to be as local as possible and as a district we would not be happy with a BNG being provided out of the district unless the application site is</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>adjacent to one of our boundaries and there is an available habitat which is in need of enhancement which is in closer proximity than the nearest appropriate site within the Fenland district.</p> <p>MC asked whether any work has been undertaken to identify projects which local developers could take on board to achieve an improvement. NH stated that there have been none identified at the current time. MC explained that he is aware that Warwickshire have been running this type of project over the past couple of years and he asked whether they have been contacted to find out what they have discovered or is there a document which gives guidance on what can be done as a result of the Warwickshire learning curve. NH explained that Fenland has had a number of major developments within the area and as a consequence of those requiring offsite bio diversity to be provided we have gone to a number of organisations and land owner bodies to see whether or not they have any projects where any off site contributions could be spent for the enhancement of BNG. He made the point that it has been a struggle to obtain engagement and therefore there is greater emphasis being put on trying to get under used FDC owned land in order to make provision. He added that he has looked at the CCC farms scheme as they have a site where they are selling BNG credits, but it is very expensive and not feasible for Fenland.</p> <p>JM asked where Fenland are obtaining their ecology advice from. NH stated that advice is being sought from CCC. JM asked whether that resource allocates a dedicated amount of time for FDC and NH explained that FDC have half a post.</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>CC asked whether there is any advice or guidance available with regards to BNG credits. NH stated that FDC have received some Government funding in relation to BNG and it is something where a cost is going to be established. CC explained that it is very hard to get to grips with potential costs associated with the policy. NH stated that we should be striving for on site delivery of the BNG and it needs to be the priority in terms of delivery with offsite provision being the fallback position if needed. CC asked whether there was a threshold which has been introduced with regards to the provision on site in terms of unit numbers. He added that if there are ten units of social housing within the local plan it states that a contribution can be provided and not provide on-site. NH stated that there is no threshold.</p> <p>JM stated that he has heard from general publications and by reading online. that the cost of £20,000 to £30,000 per unit has been mentioned which is a lot of money. He explained that he has been trying to enable onsite provision without reducing the numbers that a site can accommodate because it has a financial cost by the land owner having adjoining land which is not allocated and non-allocated land has been taken into the option specifically so it can be a potential site for BNG to enable to keep the numbers into the proposed allocation and deliver a nice soft edge to the settlement BNG adjoining.</p> <p>CC asked JM for clarification with regards to the £20,000 to £30,000 per unit and asked him whether he means per unit of credit requirement. JM confirmed that is correct and it is</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>a lot of money and there are people who are trying to attract investment on that.</p> <p>GS asked JM whether he is including the adjoining land within the baseline and JM stated that will be down to the local authorities' requirements are in planning terms whether it will be blue land or within the red land. He added that in his opinion as you are not applying for any development on that, and you are planting it up it does not need planning consent and therefore does not need to be within the redline. NH stated that his initial comment is that it could be blue land, but the blue land would have to have a baseline calculation for it and that would be the starting point for working out how many credits you are able to provide through the enhancement.</p>
12	<u>Future Homes and Building Standards Consultation</u>			<p>NH stated that as part of the Government Consultation on permitted development changes there are a number of things which have been included as part of the consultation and one element is larger house extensions where they are asking for opinions on larger roof extensions and there are also items with regards to permitted development changes in respect of air source heat pumps, demolition and replacement dwellings and adding additional floors to dwellings. NH explained that as the information was only released yesterday he has not had the opportunity to digest the information.</p> <p>NH explained that the Government is looking to change national policy so that Local Authorities give more weight to the benefits of delivery homes on brownfield sites and the local authority should be more flexible when applying planning policies</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				and guidance in relation to internal layouts.
13	<u>Review of Building Regulations 2010 (Part G) for tighter water efficiency standards</u>			This was covered under an earlier agenda item.
14	<u>Performance</u>			<p>NH stated that there is a current 4 week validation backlog and the information is published on the website with regards to performance concerning the validation backlog.</p> <p>Majors 91% were determined on time Minors 67% Other Applications 85% were determined on time.</p> <p>He added that with regards to the Governments 24 month rolling performance requirement. There is no issue with regards to major application. Non Majors 71% are close to the designation threshold of 70%</p>
15	<u>Staffing Update</u>			<p>Leavers</p> <p>Curtis McVeigh will be moving on shortly. Mark Broad Agency Enforcement Officer has moved on and a replacement is in place. Brian McPartland and Richard Conroy have left the Authority and were both Agency Staff.</p> <p>New Starters</p> <p>Agency</p> <p>Andrew Dudley – Enforcement</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>Richard Fitzjohn Gavin Taylor</p> <p>Verbal Offers of Employment for Permanent Positions have been made to the Head of Planning, Policy Manager and Officer Post. S106 Officer Post and Assistant Enforcement Officer.</p> <p>New Head of Planning start date anticipated in three to four months time. Policy Manger – June Policy Officer – June Section 106 Monitoring Officer – March Assistant Enforcement Officer - June</p> <p>It has not been possible to fill the vacancies for the Principal and Senior Development Office, Tree Officer or Senior Enforcement Officer posts.</p> <p>An Interim Head of Planning will be in place until the permanent position is filled.</p>
16	<u>Any Other Business</u>			<p>JM stated that he has previously asked NH what the views of the officers and the committee were going to be on applications coming in on a draft allocation site and NH had stated that that clearly until adoption the new plan carried limited weight but with the amount of study that had been</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>undertaken on the new sites before they had been accepted for draft allocation and the fact that they had been put forward by the council as their preferred areas it would be unrealistic to publicly oppose them and as such they would be as supportive as they could provide there were no technical reasons for objecting to a site.</p> <p>NH stated that he does not recall saying that we could support them unequivocally because the council has to be conscious of the fact that there is clear government guidance irrespective of how much weight that can be given to an emerging local plan and as a local plan progresses towards adoption more weight can be applied to it dependent upon the number of outstanding objections to that allocation. He stated that if there is a proposed allocation which has no outstanding objections to it and you have reached Reg 19 stage then you could give weight to the emerging allocation but at the current point in time the council is only at reg 18 stage and we have objections to nearly all of the allocations there are going to be issues with regards to giving weight to those.</p> <p>JM stated that he posed the question in order to be able to get a better understanding of why from his experience quite a few of the draft allocation sites are at pre app stage receiving responses that are contrary to the draft allocation in terms of the scale in particular but often the principle of it even being a suitable site when the councils study has identified them as the preferred sites.JM added that the current local plan is out of date and will not be at Reg 19 stage till 2025 which will mean that adoption will be likely to be in 2026</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>meaning that the local plan will be 12 years old. JM asked where developers should be directed to if not towards the draft allocations.</p> <p>NH stated that the pre apps are submitted in respect of the anticipation that an application is going to be made and determined under the terms of the adopted local plan and officers give their advice in that context. In the future the sites and position of those sites that are coming forward for pre app and what the position is for those allocations along with what stage of the new local plan the council is at along with the objections whether they are outstanding or resolved are all factors which need to be considered as things are changing all the time.</p> <p>JM stated that reality at the current time is that there are very few sites that aren't actual allocations or the obvious elements under the existing local plan that have not been built out. He questioned whether everything needs to stop until 2026.</p> <p>NH stated that all the remaining BCP parcels of land are still there to be brought forward if they haven't come forward yet through an application or pending application and also the council windfall policy.</p> <p>JM stated that a lot of those are under 250 and therefore meet the windfall policy and are still receiving negative responses. NH made the point that you cannot say that every site on the edge of a market town is automatically acceptable just because it is a windfall site it has to go through a technical assessment to see whether it is</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>appropriate or not.</p> <p>NH stated that there is a non-statutory consultation being undertaken by National Grid for overhead powerlines that are proposed to be routed between Tydd St Gile and Newton. The proposals can be seen on the National Grid website.</p> <p>There is likely to be another powerline proposal coming forward and not likely to be in the district but will be adjacent.</p> <p>The Medworth Wisbech Incinerator decision is imminent following the inquiry.</p> <p>Councillor Mrs Laws passed on her thanks to NH for all his assistance and help and wished him well for the future.</p>

Finish: 5.00 pm