

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 13 March 2018

### **Present:**

Councillor Peter Dean (Chairman)  
Councillor Richard Scoates (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Vanessa Allen, Douglas Auld, Eric Bosshard,  
Katy Boughey, Lydia Buttinger, Simon Fawthrop, Ellie Harmer,  
David Livett, Kate Lymer, Russell Mellor, Alexa Michael,  
Neil Reddin FCCA, Michael Turner and Angela Wilkins

### **Also Present:**

Councillors Nicholas Bennett J.P.

### **55 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Kevin Brooks and Nicky Dykes; Councillors Angela Wilkins and Ellie Harmer attended as their respective substitutes.

An apology for absence was also received from Councillor Charles Joel.

### **56 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were received.

### **57 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 JANUARY 2018**

The Legal Representative reported comments received from Councillor Dykes' which stated she could not comfortably agree the Minutes as a true reflection on the meeting.

Councillor Dykes had received no satisfactory explanation as to why a refusal notice was issued when no vote had been taken. Whilst she understood the Council's position in that refusal was inferred with the Committee not ratifying the decision, she questioned whether that was acceptable for such an important application.

There was a significant difference between "ratifying a motion to approve planning consent" and deciding retrospectively that in not ratifying the motion, it was refused.

Members were then advised that the decision made by the Committee on 25 January 2018 took immediate effect. The Minutes were simply a record of

what had already taken place. The discussion was recorded by the Council, the Minute taker had listened very carefully to that recording and the Minutes set out what was said together with the terms of the resolutions. By law and the Council's Constitution, Minutes were submitted to the next meeting of the Committee for confirmation. The Council's Constitution was clear in that the Rules of Procedure (Regulation 16) set out that the Mayor (or Chairman in this case) would sign the Minutes of the proceedings at the next suitable meeting. The Chairman would move that the Minutes of the previous meeting be signed as a correct record. The only part of the Minutes that could be discussed was their accuracy.

The Legal Representative was aware of the complaint about the subsequent decision to issue a decision notice however, that was a complaint not about the accuracy of the Minutes but about actions taken subsequent to the meeting and was not an item on the agenda for discussion at this meeting. It would be very wrong to confuse the two. It was important that Members either agreed the Minutes or, if they believed the Minutes did not reflect their statements or the terms of the resolution, then a discussion could take place. However, it was not an item to raise new matters that were not before the original Committee and set out in the Minutes as a record of their decision. On that basis the Chairman was requested to put the Minutes to the meeting.

Whilst Councillor Bennett did not dispute the accuracy of the Minutes, he asked why the Council had issued a refusal notice following the previous meeting held on 25 January 2018 during which the only resolution made was not to ratify Members' previous decision. It was agreed that a written response would be sent to Councillor Bennett.

Councillor Wilkins sought clarification on the Legal Representative's statement that decisions 'took immediate effect' given that the Committee's previous decision taken in October did not do so. Whilst she accepted the Minutes were, overall, an accurate record, she wished to make one minor change and also requested that scope be made for discussion under 'matters arising' as discussion was required on the serious issues that had been raised.

Councillor Wilkins was informed that the resolution made in October was subject to call-in by the Mayor of London and the Secretary of State. It was also subject to a Section 106 Agreement which, although virtually finalised, was not completed before receipt of the Planning Inspector's decision.

The Chairman confirmed that the issues above would not be discussed at this meeting as 'matters arising' was not an item on the current agenda.

Councillor Wilkins stated that the vote taken at the last meeting was 'not to ratify' the Committee's previous decision. Following the motion which was carried, the recording clearly captured the officer suggesting reasons for refusal as set out on page 94 of the October agenda. The Minute therefore should clearly set out that the reasons for refusal were discussed after the vote was taken. In this regard, Councillor Wilkins proposed that the final line

of the resolution in the Minutes be amended to read:- 'The Chief Planner's representative **then** suggested a reason for refusal of the application which would be as set out in the previous agenda set out on page 94 of the report, which was accepted.' Members and officers agreed to the amendment.

Councillor Wilkins also questioned why, following the vote taken by Members not to ratify the previous decision', discussion suddenly turned to officers suggesting reasons for refusal. The Legal Representative agreed to respond to this in writing.

Councillor Bennett then asked why no provision was made on the agenda for matters arising and matters outstanding from previous meetings. It was agreed that written response would be sent to Councillor Bennett.

**RESOLVED that subject to the minor amendment proposed by Councillor Wilkins, the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.**

## **58 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

Two written questions were received from Mr Colin Willetts, Secretary of Longbury Residents' Association. These questions, together with the Chairman's responses are set out below:-

### Question 1

Could the Chairman tell us of all planning applications (to include dates/outcomes inc. updates) by Persimmon Homes to develop the frontage plot of land in Grays Farm Road (adjacent entrance to Stilwell Close)?

### Chairman's Response

No planning applications were submitted by Persimmon Homes to develop the frontage plot of land in Grays Farm Road, adjacent entrance to Stilwell Close.

There has been one planning application for the site (16/05004/FULL1) submitted by Thomas Aston Homes Ltd for "Erection of 8 three bedroom terraced houses with 14 car parking spaces, cycle parking and refuse stores." That application was granted planning permission on 18 April 2017.

### Question 2

Could the Council contact them to remove Herras fencing and replace with upgrade hoarding as the site now looks like a levelled bomb site 'eyesore'?

Chairman's Response

The heras fencing at the site is considered to be permitted development as it is a temporary hoarding around the site and as such, it would not be expedient for the Council's Planning Enforcement team to take any further action in this instance.

This is a current development site with a planning permission in place DC16/05004/FULL1.

Arrangements could be made for an investigation to take place to ascertain whether the current condition of the land adversely affects the amenity of the area and whether it would warrant any action under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. However, this is a discretionary power and a decision will be made as to whether a notice under these provisions would be appropriate in this particular case.

**59 PLANNING APPLICATION 17/04478/FULL1 - FLAMINGO PARK CLUB, SIDCUP BY PASS ROAD, CHISLEHURST BR7 6HL**

Description of application – Demolition of existing nightclub building and other buildings and structures and removal of existing hardstanding and construction of new football ground comprising clubhouse and stands (max height approx. 8.4m) with floodlit artificial playing pitch, external grass sports pitches and 42 no. dwellings (26x3 bed two storey terraced dwellings, 12x2 bed flats and 4x1 bed flats set within 4 two storey blocks) with associated access, parking and landscaping.

Members were informed that further representations in support of the application had been received which raised no new points from those set out in the officer's report.

Since publication of the report, an amended Energy Assessment had been submitted which officers considered acceptable. The carbon off-setting sum had been agreed with the applicant and as such, Members were advised that the third ground for refusal in the report no longer formed part of the officer recommendation.

Amended floorplans had also been received which indicated a wheelchair housing unit in line with relevant Building Control Standards. The floorplans were considered acceptable and should permission be granted, it was recommended that a condition be added to require detailed floorplans to be agreed prior to the start of the above groundworks.

Oral representations in support of the application were received from Mr Gary Hillman, Chairman of Cray Wanderers Football Club.

Mr Hillman explained that Cray Wanderers was the second oldest football club in the world and one of the Borough's oldest sporting clubs whose future depended on finding a new 'home'. The application was supported by local

community groups and residents' associations. All concerns raised by the Mayor of London and Members when the scheme was previously considered in 2016 had been addressed. During the past 10 years over 2,000 letters of support had been received including 570 for this particular scheme. The application included previously developed land and the four storey nightclub building. The height of the residential buildings and the clubhouse had both been reduced to two storeys. The more traditional design was also considered to be an improvement. The openness of the Green Belt had increased and the square footage of the residential and leisure elements had decreased. The nightclub building would be removed. The scheme provided 100% affordable (largely shared) ownership properties, a large football pitch, trees and planting to screen the housing from the football ground and an improved youth and community offering.

The new scheme substantially improved the development's overall viability and Planning Officers had accepted the amended energy strategy assessment. Overall, there was a much more robust case in planning terms to enable Members to again decide (as in 2016) that very special circumstances had been proven. This was a unique scheme that would turn an eyesore into a community asset. Twenty alternative sites had been explored in the last decade but this was the only viable option for the Club. Should the application be refused, Flamingo Park would continue to deteriorate and remain unavailable to the community for its original sporting use.

In response to Member questions, Mr Hillman confirmed that access to the front of the development had been removed. Councillor Boughey was concerned that the access located at the bottom end of the site did not particularly lead anywhere except onto a muddy footpath about 25 minutes' walk from the local bus stop and small alleyways such as this were always a concern to Crime Officers. In this regard, she requested that the entrance to the footpath be removed and retained at the front of the site. Mr Hillman agreed that this would be acceptable as a planning condition.

With regard to the housing element being situated at the furthest end from the main road, Mr Hillman explained that whilst various layouts had been considered, positioning the housing elsewhere would lead to the loss of one football pitch which, in turn, would lead to the loss of support from Sport England. The housing in its current location was hidden behind the ground and improved the openness of the Green Belt.

Referring to viability, Councillor Fawthrop asked why the housing provision was required. Mr Hill advised that at the level of football played, it would cost between £4-6m to build a stadium and land costs would also need to be paid. Overall between £6-8m was required in order to build the stadium. The 3G pitch alone would cost £500,000. He confirmed that the maximum support obtainable from Sport England was £250,000 which would only be granted following permission of the application.

The artificial pitch would contribute to the sustainability of the club as more use would be gained from it. 3G pitches were very popular and widely used in current times.

Representations were made to the Council for the site to be removed from the Green Belt. The applicant had spent a total of 11 years in consultation with the Authority in order to find a suitable ground and this site was by far the best in terms of viability.

A minimum ground capacity for 1300 supporters was required for the level of football played.

Member discussions then took place. Ward Member and Committee Member Councillor Boughey congratulated the report writer for producing a comprehensive and extensive analysis of a planning application although she did not agree with the recommendations and conclusions. The report painted a picture of a piece of Green Belt land that was open and picturesque without any visual intrusion whilst the reality was a direct opposite. This was a large area of land which was definitely not pleasing to the eye and did not give the appearance of openness. It was dominated in the centre by a four storey former sports pavilion and numerous outbuildings. Flamingo Park was historically a sports and leisure facility for the community, providing many football pitches and a large sports pavilion but was now home to a nightclub that had lost its licence after numerous incidents of anti-social behaviour and drug taking, a scaffolding yard, a van hire company, hosts of regular car boot sales, funfairs and circuses all of which attracted large numbers of people causing anti-social behaviour and traffic issues within the local area. There was also an extensive enforcement history in relation to this site for various unauthorised operational developments and uses. Over the years enforcement action had been taken against the operators but they were akin to pop-ups – as one was removed, another took its place.

The scheme would provide Cray Wanderers Football Club with a purpose built stadium and football pitches with community and leisure facilities linked to the stadium. The mixed residential development was required for the financial viability of the scheme. As the site was situated within Green Belt land, certain criteria would need to be met to enable built development. The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 80) set out the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which was to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Once Green Belt had been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance beneficial use such as opportunities to provide outdoor sport and leisure facilities. That would be achieved on this site through the provision of seven new football pitches all of which was a significant upgrade on the currently under-utilised playing fields.

Paragraph 89 stated that new buildings in the Green Belt were inappropriate unless very special circumstances could be demonstrated. There were a number of exceptions to the definition of inappropriate development – the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sports and recreation was one

and the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land whether redundant or in continuing use was another. Recently, the London Borough of Bromley challenged an Inspector's decision regarding development at Bromley Livery Stables. The case was lost as the Judge upheld the Inspector's conclusion that the Livery Stables and associated buildings constituted built development in the Green Belt. Therefore, as the site was considered a brownfield site, redevelopment was appropriate. The same criteria must then apply to all the buildings and hardstandings on the Flamingo Park site which should be considered a brownfield site.

If Members did not support this application, the site could be redeveloped as residential only. The brownfield area was in the centre of the site and ran parallel with the A20. The worst case scenario would be built development without any sports or recreational facilities. An opportunity to regenerate the site back to recreational sports use by Cray Wanderers Football Club and the wider community would be lost. It should be recognised that good sporting facilities more often than not were provided by collaboration between established sports clubs run by people not only with a real interest in the game but also able to provide the finance to facilitate the building and the development of them. The Kent County Cricket Ground in Beckenham and Bromley Football Club were good examples of this. Both schemes were only possible because of the inclusion of residential housing and community leisure uses. The Chislehurst Society supported the application in principle, Sport England raised no objections to the proposal and the Football Association expressed support for the development. There were no objections from the Council's conservation officers nor from highways or the tree officer. Mention had been made about noise and lighting but it must be remembered that currently the site was a football ground and could be used for that purpose at any time without the need for planning permission. A similar application was previously approved by the Committee and the amended plan was an improvement on that whilst providing an additional 14 affordable housing units. The 3 bed homes and 16 flats are all to be affordable, a mixture of rented and shared ownership – the type of tenure desperately needed. One concern raised which was the entrance to the footpath had been resolved by way of condition. There were important issues which needed to be addressed i.e. materials to be used, planting, screening, drainage and parking provision which could all be covered by the addition of planning conditions. The scheme would bring a much abused derelict piece of land back into sports use for the wider community plus much needed affordable housing.

Councillor Boughey moved that permission be granted subject to conditions to cover the different aspects as previously mentioned.

Ward Member and Committee Member Councillor Bosshard agreed that the land was a brownfield site in desperate need of regeneration. If the Council were to do this, it would cost approximately £500k, so the application should be seen as a means of regenerating this piece of land. The height of the buildings had been reduced, the pitch had been turned around and there was less encroachment on the land. Enabling residential homes to be built was a

matter of course so the development could be paid for – a small price to pay. He supported the application and seconded the motion for permission. It was better to have a guardian who would look after the site for the community at large. He suggested a condition be added that the Football Club would be responsible for looking after the other pitches.

The Chairman supported the current application and agreed it was an improvement on the previous application. It did comply with Green Belt policy because there were very special circumstances. This was a very similar application to that submitted by the Kent County Cricket Club and the Chairman was delighted at the inclusion of the affordable housing element in the scheme.

Whilst Councillor Buttinger agreed that very special circumstances had been met, she pointed out that there was a very high bar in terms of the volume of housing on the site. She advised Members not to put too much weight on the belief that the site was poor quality Green Belt land as there had been instances in the past where developers had deliberately let the land deteriorate which was not a good enough reason to allow development to take place. As Green Belt designated land, Members should automatically view it as high quality land. However, because of the desperate need for outdoor play facilities for young people and to support the high end calibre of the sporting youth, this was a very important element which met the very special circumstances requirement.

With reference to the high likelihood of bat activity and use, Councillor Buttinger requested a condition be added to ensure bat boxes were installed on trees around the perimeter of the site. A further condition should also be included to ensure that green spaces around the periphery were left fallow or cut less frequently in order to promote biodiversity.

Councillor Reddin agreed that the principles of Green Belt land should not be put aside because the site was untidy and illegal activity had taken place on the land. Were the Committee to refuse the application Members would want officers to take enforcement action and issue untidy site notices as appropriate. However, this was a vulnerable site and this thoughtful development with limited building in terms of the overall area, would help to secure the majority of the Green Belt site. It was not always possible to build housing in close proximity to transport hubs and the buyers would take that into account themselves. He therefore supported permission of the application.

Councillor Fawthrop considered the scheme would be an over-development of the site which did not enhance the Green Belt as much as it should. The scheme would benefit from moving the housing element to the other end of the site and establishing a car park in its place. One of the reasons the costs may have escalated could be due to the fact the utilities would need to be installed at the furthest end of the site. Councillor Fawthrop could not, therefore support the application.

Councillor Turner supported the current proposals and reminded Members that the previous scheme had been permitted by Committee but was overturned by the Mayor of London. The current application was an improvement on that scheme. As the second oldest football club in the world, people in the Borough should be proud and the Committee should do all they could to keep them in the Borough and make life easier for the Club.

Councillor Scoates believed that such a large plot of land should be removed from the Green Belt before consideration of the application took place. The clearance of unauthorised development from the site did not amount to very special circumstances especially when it was replaced by overdevelopment - this would send the wrong message to landowners across the Borough about what the Green Belt meant. The way to clear the site was simply for unauthorised development to be removed. He considered the housing element to be inappropriate and no special circumstances existed to grant the application. He therefore, proposed refusal of the application.

Councillor Mellor referred to the officer recommendation for refusal which had been made following close study of the application and in accordance with the Local Plan, saved policies of the UDP and all other policies detailed in ground 1 for refusal. However, permission for a limited sports development had been granted in his own ward which had proved extremely successful. On balance, whilst it was a principle of the Green Belt, he accepted that there may be special circumstances in this case. He was concerned with the London Borough of Bromley's objections on the grounds of transport and car parking and should the application be granted, these could be subject to conditions to ensure they are fully satisfied. The ground had degenerated into an appalling level of illegal use, container storage and odd car park transactions which, unfortunately, was due to a lack of enforcement by previous Councils. This was not an individual criticism of an officer or department but the Council as a whole which had failed residents by not preserving the site. Councillor Mellor supported refusal of the previous application but on balance was minded to accept this application provided it was subject to conditions which satisfied the London Borough of Bromley's objections.

Councillor Buttinger advised it was preferable to retain the rights of the Green Belt land to prevent more inappropriate development from occurring. Should the Green Belt status be removed, other developers could build houses over the entire site without any sporting facilities at all.

Councillor Michael considered the report set great store by Green Belt policy. Council Policies were made at great length and this application flew in the face of this. Very special circumstances were subjective - what may be a very special circumstance to one person, may not be to another. Whilst she fully accepted and was not against the need for sporting facilities, it was uncomfortable to go against Council Policy. In this regard, the site should be removed from the Green Belt prior to consideration of an application. Councillor Michael seconded the motion for refusal.

Councillor Livett reported that a survey carried out by the FA in 2015 showed the Crays were poorly provided with community sporting facilities. The FA had offered Kemnal Manor School £500,000 to build an all-weather pitch. Unfortunately the loss of amenity to the immediate local residents was considered to outweigh the benefits to the community and was turned down so the sporting deficiency continued. This application addressed some of those shortcomings in that it provided pitches, some of which had independently been identified as missing. The Council should plan positively for sporting facilities within the Green Belt. Sporting facilities and affordable housing were sorely needed and this proposal provided the area with both. The scheme was a great improvement on the original application and one which Councillor Livett supported.

Councillor Allen suggested a special statement be prepared going forward because in the event that permission was granted, the application would need to be submitted to the Secretary of State. The statement should emphasise the need for this scheme and highlight the current state of the site which was not pristine undeveloped Green Belt. The Chairman confirmed that this could be done.

Prior to a vote being taken to permit the application, the Chief Planner outlined that the preparations of conditions and planning obligations be delegated to officers in consultation with the Chairman. A full list of conditions would be prepared following the meeting and would include:-

- a change to the footpath;
- the installation of bat boxes;
- a phasing agreement condition (to be secured via a S106 Legal Agreement);
- affordable housing; and
- general sporting and community facilities.

Members were reminded that the benefits of the scheme had to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. In summary Members had considered the following:-

- sporting benefits;
- the scheme provided a new suitable home for the Football Club;
- community benefits;
- provision of affordable housing;
- a lack of alternative sites for the Club;
- cessation of existing uses on previously developed land; and
- general improvements to the appearance of that part of the Green Belt.

**Members having considered the report, objections and representations, RESOLVED (by a vote of 11-3), that PERMISSION be GRANTED**

**(SUBJECT TO ANY DIRECTION BY THE MAYOR OF LONDON and THE SECRETARY OF STATE) and SUBJECT TO THE PRIOR COMPLETION OF A SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT TO INCLUDE (BUT NOT LIMITED TO) AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND PHASING OF THE DEVELOPMENT. Members also resolved that permission be subject to conditions and heads of terms for the S106 Agreement to be finalised under powers delegated to officers in consultation with the Chairman.**

**60 AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT 2016/17**

**Report DRR18/010**

Members considered the Council's proposed Authority Monitoring Report for 2016/17 which contained key information about the planning system in the London Borough of Bromley and the extent to which the Council's planning policies were being implemented.

The AMR met the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), the Localism Act 2011 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The Chairman advised that this report was annually submitted to Committee and amongst other things, reflected progress achieved on the Authority's house building targets.

Councillor Michael referred to page 112 which stated the amount of footfall in all of the Town Centres had steadily declined between December 2016 and December 2017. She suggested this may be the result of more people shopping on line or travelling to other centres such as Lewisham. The Chief Planner confirmed that the statement was based on factual data however the precise reasons for the decline were unknown.

Referring to figure 8 on page 105 of the report, Councillor Allen noted the percentage figures for completed 1 and 2 bedroom units had been reversed in the graph's supporting text. The sentence should read:- '39% were completed as 1 bedroom units and 47% as 2 bedroom units.'

The Chief Planner confirmed to Councillor Allen that the total completion figures set out on page 104 of the report did include offices which had been converted into dwellings. In regard to Appendix 1 which set out completed Section 106 Legal Agreements, some of those had only recently been included however, information would be provided wherever possible to show monies paid or action taken as a result of those agreements. The Council's E&R PDS Committee received regular updates on this, so more detail would be provided at the Scrutiny Committee.

**RESOLVED that the proposed Authority Monitoring Report for 2016/17 be agreed.**

**61 BROMLEY DRAFT LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION - APPROVAL  
FOR MAIN MODIFICATIONS CONSULTATION**

**Report DRR18/009**

Following submission of the Council's Draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State in August 2017, a series of public Hearings were held in which representors were given the opportunity to make their concerns directly known to an independent inspector.

To address some of the issues raised at those Hearings, Members were now requested to consider some main Modifications to the Draft Local Plan and to review the classification of Minor Modifications to establish whether any of these should be considered as Main Modifications.

The Chairman explained that this was one of the final phases for the Local Plan to be accepted. The Chief Planner reported that in mid-2017, the Draft Local Plan was agreed for submission by DCC, the Executive and Full Council. It was then submitted to the Secretary of State in August 2017 for examination by the Secretary of State's Independent Inspector. Hearings were held at the Civic Centre in December 2017. Through the hearing sessions and subsequent advice received from the Inspector, further main modifications to the Plan (Appendix 1) had been identified which were needed to make the Plan sound. Appendix 2 contained modifications proposed by the Council in 2017 which the Inspector had requested be reclassified as main modifications. A six-week period of public consultation would be required on these modifications and the responses would be submitted to the Inspector. Once the Inspector's final report had been received the Council would have the option of accepting that report with its changes and modifications for soundness and adopting the final plan.

Referring to the removal of wording in relation to Tree Protection Orders on page 164, para 5.3.2, Councillor Buttinger sought clarification of Policy 43 as her understanding of the existing Plan was that if a tree was situated within a Conservation Area, it would automatically be covered by a blanket TPO. She was concerned that the protection of trees was being downgraded. The Chief Planner reported that all changes were agreed by Full Council in 2017 and nothing had altered since that time. Trees in Conservation Areas had a basic level of protection and Policy 43 set out the criteria for protecting them in the event that someone wanted to fell them.

Councillor Buttinger queried the rationale behind the removal of the words 'of native species' from Draft Policy 73 as the inclusion of 'native species and local provenance' had been included in other Policies. The Chief Planner advised that the inclusion of 'native species and local provenance' was to clarify what type of planting would be required in the event that new trees were to be planted under condition or through a planning obligation. In the case of Draft Policy 73, the words had not been totally deleted but simply been moved for inclusion in the supporting text.

Referring to the first paragraph on page 152 (Provision of Affordable Housing) which stated 'the Council will seek affordable housing on all housing developments capable of providing 11 residential units or more....' Councillor Harmer asked if the Council were proactively looking for large developments in order to provide more housing. The Chief Planner advised that Bromley's housing provision was made up of a mixture of dwelling size but tended, in the main, to consist of smaller sites. As long as the housing target for the Borough was reached and appropriate sites identified, the Council was not concerned with the size of sites.

Councillor Fawthrop asked if any feedback was forthcoming from the Inspector in regard to the introduction of a Basement Policy which was raised during Examination of the Plan. The Chief Planner advised that although nothing specific could be added to the Plan at this late stage, the objectives sought for basements could be achieved through the expansion of supplementary policies. In this case it would be advisable to prepare the document for introduction following adoption of the Draft Local Plan. Councillor Fawthrop requested (and the Chief Planner agreed) that this be undertaken.

**RESOLVED that the Executive be recommended to approve the suggested Main Modifications to the Draft Local Plan for consultation.**

---

As this was the last meeting of the Municipal Year, the Chairman thanked Members for their hard work and continued support.

The meeting ended at 8.50 pm

Chairman