
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK PANEL

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 19 May 2016 from 7.00 - 10.20 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Andy Booth, Gerry Lewin (Chairman), Bryan Mulhern (Vice-Chairman), Prescott, George Samuel, Roger Truelove and John Wright.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Alan Best, Julie Davies, Natalie Earl, James Freeman, Kellie MacKenzie, Shelly Rouse and Anna Stonor.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Cameron Beart, Tina Booth, Lloyd Bowen, Bowles, Mike Cosgrove, Duncan Dewar-Whalley, Paul Fleming, Nigel Kay, Nicholas Hampshire and Mike Whiting.

679 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Resolved: That Councillor Gerry Lewin be elected Chairman for the Municipal Year 2016/17.

680 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Resolved: That Councillor Bryan Mulhern be elected Vice-Chairman for the Municipal Year 2016/17.

681 FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chairman ensured that those present were aware of the emergency evacuation procedure.

682 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

No interests were declared.

683 FAVERSHAM CREEK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - EXAMINER'S REPORT AND NEXT STEPS

The Senior Planner introduced the report which formally received the report of the Independent Examination into the Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Development Plan following the public hearing held in October 2015, and to endorse and make the recommended modifications to the Plan as requested by the Examiner, to agree to publicise the Council's decision, (a decision statement), and to approve the organisation of a local referendum. The Senior Planner stated that the referendum area was the town of Faversham.

The Senior Planner reported that the main findings of the Independent Examiner's report were that he was satisfied that Faversham Town Council undertook the public consultation seriously and that sufficient consultation resulted. She further reported that the Examiner thanked all those that had participated in the hearing and considered they had done so in a courteous and intelligent manner, and he was impressed with their knowledge and dedication to the project. He also commended the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for being well written, logical, clear, appropriately concise and intelligible.

The Senior Planner reported that the Examiner proposed 27 modifications to the plan. The most significant modifications were the addition of an Archaeology Policy in the creek-wide section, and changes to the site-specific policy for site 5, Swan Quay. The Senior Planner advised that Officers were content with the proposed modifications and that this was a significant step in the NP's journey.

The Senior Planner explained that Swale Council were responsible for the arrangements for the referendum, and officers had been liaising with colleagues in Democratic Services and a provisional date was Thursday 20 October 2016. The Senior Planner advised that if more than half were in favour, the NP must be brought into force as soon as practical.

The Senior Planner drew attention to the tabled paper from the planning agent for the Swan Quay site who had taken Counsel advice about the Examiner's report. The Senior Planner stated that their Counsel suggested that the examiner had acted unlawfully and outside the scope of the provisions of the act. The Senior Planner stated that officers had taken legal advice from Counsel which was that there were no issues that should prevent the LDF Panel agreeing the recommendations set out in the report. The Senior Planner stated that as Counsel's opinion was covered by strict legal privilege it could not be made public.

Members welcomed the report.

Recommended:

- (1) That the modifications to the Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan as set out in the Examiner's Report (Appendix I) be accepted;**
- (2) That the Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions and complies with the provision made by or under Sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 be agreed;**
- (3) That the decision to accept the Examiner's recommendations be publicised; and**
- (4) That the organisation of a local referendum to cover the Faversham Town Council area be approved.**

684 LOCAL PLAN PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

The Chairman reminded Members that they were being asked to recommend modifications to Cabinet in respect of Bearing Fruits which accord with the findings of the planning examination, following the Examination in Public last November and December 2015. The Planning Inspector had approved the Council's plan-making approach and methodology but had asked the Council to increase its housing targets and re-consult on green spaces. The Chairman considered that if the Council varied from the Planning Inspector's guidance on housing targets, the Council risked the Plan being found unsound which would result in developers proposing unallocated sites that only satisfied National Planning Policy Framework sustainability criteria.

The Chairman explained that Members were being asked to allocate 16 additional sites following the recent call for sites. He explained that if agreed by the Panel, and then Cabinet, the proposed Local Plan modifications would then be put out to consultation and any representations received would be forwarded to the Inspector.

The Spatial Planning Manager introduced the report and stated that the Council needed to consider the Planning Inspector's recommendations and that the Council needed to deliver a five year housing supply. She explained that the Inspector's interim findings were available to view on the Council's website.

The Spatial Planning Manager drew attention to appendices 1 to 5 of the report, and also the tabled paper which detailed the submissions previously made (LGS01-LG31), plus additional sites submitted, in response to the Call for Sites which closed on 22 April 2016. She advised that further updated evidence was available in the Members' Room and would be available on the Examination website.

The Spatial Planning Manager reported that a briefing on the Local Plan for Members and Parish Councillors was arranged for 16 June 2016. The public consultation would commence 24 June and end on 5 August 2016, and a leaflet would be included with the June edition of Inside Swale. The results of the consultation would then go back to the Inspector for consideration and she would use the responses to form an agenda for the examination which officers expected to reconvene in December 2016.

The Principal Planner gave a presentation on the report and focused on the following four key points:

1. Swale was not in a unique position. Councils across the south east were faced with increased housing targets and he advised that both the Inspector and officers appreciated that Members needed to make difficult decisions in this regard. He explained that the Council were being required to move from a place where it, and local communities, had had genuine concerns over levels of housing needed and that Members now needed to balance the risks of the recommendations outlined in the report, with the risks of having an unsound Local Plan.
2. It was not that there was no manoeuvrability and flexibility open to the Council, but that the Council had some pre-set parameters which severely limited it. He added that these included the Inspector's interim findings following the Examination. These included: the fixing of the two planning areas of the Thames Gateway and Swale planning area, albeit there was discussion about the 'proportional boost' in the context of Faversham and the rural areas; the settlement strategy as set out by Policy ST3; the handling of environmental constraints; and the timetable set out with the Inspector.

If the Council agreed to allocate the 16 sites with the 2,999 dwellings recommended, those parameters would give the Council the ability to reject around 170 others, via a discounting process.

3. The Council needed to allocate numbers both to meet the housing target of 776 dwellings per annum – 13,192 for the plan period, but also to achieve a 5-year supply. This, in officers' view, would mean allocating a higher figure. Paragraph 1.5 of the report recommended allocations sufficient for some 3,000 dwellings, whilst paragraph 3.199 of the report advised that there would, as a result, be an extra 938 dwellings over and above the plan target to create a more robust five year supply.

Members were strongly recommended not to reduce this number for three reasons: achieving a five year supply; current unknowns in the supply yet to be resolved; and other risks and contingencies such as existing allocations not coming forward quickly as needed.

4. Paragraph 3.193 of the Committee report was highlighted. This summarised the preferred recommended approach, and Members were advised that the draft Sustainability Appraisal indicated the preferred recommended approach as best performing, compared with other options considered. Members were also informed of the implications of the recommended sites for the settlement strategy and individual settlements and were advised that the appropriate emphasis for the two planning areas

would be maintained, whilst meeting the Inspector's findings in respect of Faversham and the rural areas.

Members raised points which included: Members must have flexibility and have the opportunity to comment on all proposed sites, particularly as they were sites the Council had originally agreed should not be allocated; the Council's Local Plan was based on an out-of-date Thames Gateway policy; the Thames Growth Commission would embrace the whole of the north Kent coast and it was imperative we based our future housing policy on current models of delivery; if we are to be successful in seeking funding for items such as road improvements at junction 5 and a bypass at Ospringe, we must deliver house building in that area; should indicate agreement to consult on the zoning principle in the light of funding coming forward from the Thames Growth Commission; inclusion of options SW/80 and 778 would ease the burden on Sittingbourne and sensitive sites at Faversham; and thanked officers for a concise and detailed report.

The Panel then considered each of the boxed recommendations set out in the Committee report. The Chairman reported that the numbering for some of the recommendations was incorrect and would be corrected for the minutes.

Recommendation (i) – Development Targets. Please note that this was listed as Recommendation 1 on page 13 of the Committee report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

Members raised points which included: within the zoned approach the 776 housing target was not desirable or deliverable; and to have Local Plan found unsound and a further 170 sites not in sustainable area would be a disaster for Swale leading to piecemeal development.

In response to a query, the Principal Planner reported that the past five year housing levels were at levels lower than 776. The Principal Planner noted that historically over the long-term Swale had managed dwellings figures in excess of 600 and 800 but these were in periods of economic buoyancy and were not consistent over sustained periods. Meeting the target and 5-year supply would require a significant step up by the housing market.

On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Recommendation (ii) – Changes to Local Plan Allocations. Please note that this was listed as Recommendation (2) on page 16 of the Committee report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

In response to queries from Members, the Principal Planner reported that if the Council did not meet the supply, this would then trigger a review of the plan. He stated that unless there was a review of national policy, the risks of not having a 5 year supply would always be there. The Principal Planner explained that housing figures could change at sites over time as planning applications progress or further evidence emerges. As an example, he referred to additional dwellings proposed at Crown Quay Lane following discussions with the developer and the Environment Agency addressing issues relating to flood risk.

On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Recommendation (iii). Please note that this was listed as Recommendation 3 on page 29 of the Committee report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

The Principal Planner reported that the parameters he had earlier set out gave the Council clear scope to discount or reject sites that were either contrary to the strategy, too small or had significant constraints.

Members raised points which included: concern of inconsistency that we are discounting some sites because they are either within a countryside gap or flood risk zone whereas other sites such as SW/703 (Wises Lane and Cryalls Lane, Sittingbourne) were also a countryside gap and flood risk zone but being put forward for allocation; procedural risk that we discount sites because they have constraints and by the time we get to other sites that have the same constraints then have to allow; land at Selling Road SW/778 should not rule this out as has potential to deliver large numbers of houses and reduce the burden on Sittingbourne and would also help us to seek funding for Brenley Corner; and SW/169 HBC Engineering already granted permission seems silly not to include and get housing numbers up.

The Principal Planner reported that any sites not allocated due to flooding were because of the severe risk of flooding and they were categorised as Flood Zone 3. With regard to concerns about the wording for SW/777 Kent Science Park, the Chairman reported that the wording for the Kent Science Park had been directed by the Local Plan Inspector.

On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Recommendation (iv) – Faversham Sites. Please note that this was listed as Recommendation 4 on page 39 of the Committee report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and included the following amendment: that e) land at Graveney Road (SW/783) not be allocated. This was seconded.

The Principal Planner reported that with regard to recommendation e) officers were now recommending this not to be allocated for housing because the site sought by the developer was in fact for a larger site than that allocated for employment. Officers considered the visual impacts would be great enough for it not to be allocated. With regard to recommendation f), the Principal Planner reported that whilst there were merits and impacts associated with both Preston Fields and Ham Farm, the Preston Fields site was the preferred option, principally due to its location further from the SPA, its visual self-containment and better location relative to services and the main road network.

Members raised points which included: community infrastructure levy (CIL) was more for development of sites in Faversham and if proportionate boost was focused more on Faversham then sites in Sittingbourne and Isle of Sheppey could proceed because of the increased CIL; junction 5 improvements were much overdue the road is already at capacity; SW/080, SW/430, SW/431 and SW/795 could easily meet the shortfall if SW/703 (Wises Lane and Cryalls Lane, Sittingbourne) was not allocated; should allocate SW/080 as it would help assist with funding for Brenley Corner; if SW/080 allowed Faversham would be effectively moved into Boughton and Courtney ward; officer approach for these sites was sensible; agree with assessments in table 6; Preston Fields was the better site but consider that the KCC depot should be re-sited to enable a better entrance into Preston Fields.

The Head of Planning advised that the improvements at junction 5 were from the Government and not CIL. He explained that a lot of the funding for transport improvements on the Isle of Sheppey was through the HCA and not CIL.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19(2) a recorded vote was taken on the motion and voting was as follows:

For: Councillors Andy Booth, Gerry Lewin, Bryan Mulhern, Prescott, George Samuel; Roger Truelove and John Wright.

Against: Councillors Mike Baldock and Richard Darby

Recommendation v – Isle of Sheppey Sites. Please note that this was listed as recommendation 5 on page 55 of the Committee report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

The Principal Planner introduced the recommendations and indicated that a further provision would need to be made at the Isle of Sheppey, particularly at the western settlements.

Members raised points which included: the upgrade to junction 5 was needed now and should not be used as a reason to allow further development; urbanisation of rural landscape and access to services also applied to SW/703 which also had no provision for a GP service and school; SW/194 would pay for Lower Road highway improvements, but these improvements were needed now; SW/169 Power Station Road already approved 142 dwellings, should not include SW/165 for 140 dwellings as this is on prime agricultural land; did delete Barton Hill Drive originally and need to ensure road improvements would be forthcoming if we are to allocate; lack of infrastructure on Isle of Sheppey; against development at SW/194 Barton Hill Drive; need to consider western part of Isle of Sheppey which was not Minster but Neats Court and west to Rushenden and Queenborough; and proposals would have a catastrophic impact on the infrastructure of the Isle of Sheppey.

The Principal Planner reported that many sites across the Borough shared common impacts, but when considering them, Members had to consider the totality of impacts of each site relative to the benefits of allocating them. The Principal Planner reported that the planning permission granted for the HBC site at Halfway would be counted toward the housing land supply from the appropriate monitoring year. In the specific case of the recommended site to the west of Barton Hill Drive, Lower Road improvements design schemes were progressing, and would build in both existing and planned growth.

The Spatial Planning Manager reported that with regard to road improvements at Cowstead Corner to Barton Hill Drive, Minster these were to be pursued by the local growth fund round 3 – which would enable a roundabout to be provided at Barton Hill Drive.

On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Recommendation (vi) – Sittingbourne Sites. Please note that this was listed as Recommendation 6 on page 66 of the Committee report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

The Principal Planner introduced the recommendations. He spoke about options to the south-west, south, and south-east of Sittingbourne and that there were understandable concerns and harm associated with each, but it was officers' view that one must be chosen and it was believed that recommendation d) SW/703 for SW Sittingbourne was, on balance, the most appropriate for allocation, however he acknowledged that the site had some issues which needed to be worked through as we move to the Examination.

Members raised concerns relating to site SW/703 which included: concerned with impact on the highway particular at Wises Lane; traffic will go through Borden to avoid using A2; no transport grounds to allow this; can not keep overloading the A249; loss of countryside gap; Borden conservation areas would be affected; huge swathe of prime agricultural land would be lost; countryside gap needs to be maintained; room at Brenley Corner for 564 dwellings; unacceptable site; massive development which would change the landscape; improvements to junction 5 only 'promised'; will cause massive congestion and traffic problems at Wises Lane end; access roads were not viable and will impact on Adelaide Drive and Borden Lane; would become a rat-run; should not go forward until the A249 road improvements have been carried out; this high density housing with no infrastructure will cause division between communities; would need to increase width of roads to allow; the road infrastructure currently can not cope; loss of rural view; and site was not deliverable.

A Member raised concern about the lack of proposed health services under any of the proposed developments.

The Principal Planner advised that with regard to transport concerns raised on site SW/703, transport modelling work would be undertaken to establish the impacts on junction 5 and the phasing of that site would have to reflect the timing of those improvements. He highlighted that there were safeguards in the plan that if the proposed junction 5 improvements were significantly delayed or not forthcoming, this would trigger a Local Plan review. With regard to infrastructure, the Principal Planner reported that the plan would be accompanied by an implementation and delivery plan which would set out how increases in the capacity of primary health services would be met. Officers were liaising with the two commissioning groups to identify these needs which would be funded by either CIL or Section 106. The Principal Planner reported that a primary school was proposed for SW Sittingbourne which would be funded by development. The Principal Planner advised that there were difficult choices to be made at Sittingbourne, but that the alternatives elsewhere were either more harmful or contrary to the settlement strategy.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19(2) a recorded vote was taken on the motion and voting was as follows:

For: Councillors Andy Booth, Gerry Lewin, Bryan Mulhern, Colin Prescott, George Samuel and John Wright.

Against: Councillors Mike Baldock, Richard Darby and Roger Truelove.

Recommendation (vii) – Sites at Rural Local Service Centres. Please note that this was listed as Recommendation 6 on page 85 of the Committee report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation subject to the following amendments, that g) and j) not be included. This was seconded.

The Principal Planner reported that Rural Local Service Centres (RLSCs) comprised Eastchurch, Leysdown, Newington, Iwade, Teynham and Boughton. He explained that these villages could support the 5-year supply and the Inspector had stated that there should be a boost to supply in the rural area. The Principal Planner explained that sites at Eastchurch and Leysdown had already been discounted and with no suitable sites at Boughton the focus was on Newington, Iwade and Teynham.

The Principal Planner explained that with regard to Teynham, officers recognised the growth already taken place, but the village's location relative to the strategic road network and Air Quality Management Areas might not make it as suitable a location for further growth as other RLSCs. If Members agreed with this strategic view, then none of the sites at Teynham should be allocated. The Principal Planner advised that Table 9 in

recommendation b) should be amended to read Table 10. Iwade was recommended for more significant growth, whilst a lesser focus was recommended at Newington. Sites were proposed for allocation at both villages. In respect of recommendation h) the Principal Planner reported that figure 25 on page 84 of the report, together with the concept plan in Appendix 1, needed to be corrected because the owners had purchased an adjacent property to the proposed access.

Members raised points which included: welcome the recommendation that Teynham should not be the focus for any allocations; The A2 at Teynham could not take any more traffic especially given number of road accidents; note the recent appeal at Norton Ash refused on appeal because of infrastructure and road network issues; the Tracies, Newington was a difficult site to access so agree it should not be allocated; welcomed no allocation at Boughton which was largely due to the local community working on their neighbourhood plan; reconsider whether Boughton was still a RLSC; do not believe that Iwade can accommodate further development and still retain its village character; Pond Farm was not a good place for further development and goes against the character of Newington; and concerns land north of High Street, Newington would impact on traffic and 'snarl-up' the A2.

On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Recommendation (viii) – Sites at other villages. Please note that this was listed as Recommendation 7 on page 88 of the Committee report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Recommendation (ix) – Gypsy and Travellers. Please note this was listed as Recommendation 8 on page 99 of the Committee report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

In response to a query from a Member, the Chairman reported that the Council's policy approach on Gypsy and Travellers had been supported by the Inspector as we have completed most of the sites we were required to allocate prior to the change in national legislation in August 2015, enabling us to downgrade the amount of sites to allocate. The Inspector accepted a shortfall of 10 pitches between now and 2031 and her view was that they would come forwarded as windfall sites. A site allocation policy for them was not therefore required.

On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Recommendation (x) – Affordable Housing. Please note this was listed as Recommendation 9 Gypsy and Travellers on page 100 of the Committee report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Recommendation (xi) – Area Site Policies. Please note this was listed as Recommendation 7, New Regeneration Area Policies, on page 100 of the Committee report.

The Chairman moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded.

A Member queried the wording on page 238 of the report paragraph 6.7.83 relating to proposals to expand the Kent Science Park. She considered that it should say 'beyond or within' the existing site boundary as set out on the proposals map.

The Principal Planner stated that the policy was intended to deal with both possibilities and paragraph 6.7.82 of the modifications document sets the context. He agreed to look at whether the text could be further clarified post meeting.

On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Recommendation (xii) – Local Green Spaces. Please note this was listed as Recommendation 8 on page 101 of the Committee report.

The Chairman drew attention to the tabled paper which set out a table of submissions previously made (LGS01-LG31), plus additional sites submitted in response to the Call for Sites. Members then went through the document page by page.

A Member considered that LGS39 amenity areas at Wells Way should be allocated.

At this point there was some discussion about how this recommendation should be dealt with. It was agreed that any comments from Members about the allocation or non-allocation of green field sites be sent to Julie Davies (Senior Planner) by 5pm Monday 23 May 2016. This was agreed by Members and any changes would be discussed and agreed with the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman.

The Chairman then moved Recommendations (1), (2), (3) and (4) of the main report and these were seconded and agreed by Members.

Recommended:

(1) That the recommendations as set out below be agreed:

(i) That the housing target of the Local Plan to 776 dwellings per annum (13,192 dwellings for the revised plan period), with a 'B' class employment target of 130,000 sq.m (60 ha) be agreed.

(ii) That the reported changes to the land supply of existing Local Plan allocations amounting to an additional 325 dwellings be agreed.

(iii) That the sites in Tables 2-5, in the report, be discounted from further consideration.

(iv) That the site allocations at Faversham be agreed as set out below:

a) the sites within Table 6 of the report be discounted from further consideration;

b) That an additional 60 dwellings at Lady Dane Farm be allocated;

c) The allocation of SW/441 and SW/413 at Brogdale Road and Perry Court Farm for 66 and 370 dwellings respectively, together with 18,525 sq.m of employment floorspace at Perry Court Farm;

d) Allocation of SW/334 at the former Nova premises for 90 dwellings.

e) Land to the east of Faversham at Graveney Road (SW/783) should not be allocated from employment to housing for 40 dwellings;

f) that the allocation of SW/233 at Preston Fields for 217 dwellings be agreed and the allocation of SW/700 at Ham Farm not be allocated.

v) That the site allocations for the Isle of Sheppey be agreed as set out below:

- a) sites in the report at Table 7 on eastern Sheppey and in Table 8 at Minster and Halfway be discounted from further consideration;
- b) SW/128 at The Bunnybank and SW/197 to the north of Eastchurch not be allocated for housing;
- c) SW/133 to the east of Scocles Road, Minster not be allocated;
- d) SW/184 at Parsonage Chase, Minster, not be allocated, but incorporated within the allocation at SW/194;
- e) SW/721 (extended site) at Barton Hill Drive, Minster not be allocated;
- f) SW/321 at Southsea Avenue, Minster not be allocated, SW/457 and SW/705 to the north-east and east of Minster be allocated for housing for 10 and 50 dwellings respectively; and
- g) SW/165 at Belgrave Road, Halfway and SW/194 at Barton Hill Drive, Minster be allocated for 140 and 620 dwellings respectively.

(vi) That the allocations for the Sittingbourne sites be agreed as set out below:

- a) The sites in Table 9 of the report be discounted from further consideration;
- b) SW/343 land at the former Bell Centre, Bell Road be allocated within Policy Regen 1 for mixed use with a minimum of 120 dwellings;
- c) SW/126 at Cryall's Lane not be allocated; and
- d) SW/703 at SW Sittingbourne is allocated as an additional mixed use allocation including 564 dwellings.

(vii) That the allocations for sites at rural local service centres be agreed as set out below:

- a) SW/435 and SW/714 at Boughton not be allocated;
- b) Teynham not be a focus for further allocations and that sites in Table 10 at Teynham be discounted from further consideration;
- c) Land, subject to Policy MU3, at Frogнал Lane, Teynham, be retained for employment use and not allocated for housing;
- d) Sites in Table 11 of the report at Iwade not be allocated;
- e) SW/117, SW/183 and SW/123 at Iwade be allocated for a total of 572 dwellings;
- f) Sites in Table 12 of the report at Newington not be allocated;
- g) Site SW/010 at The Tracies, Newington not be allocated;
- h) Land north of High Street, Newington be allocated for a total of 115 dwellings;
- i) SW/164 at Pond Farm, Newington and at SW/732 Ellen's Field not be allocated;
- j) SW/707 (140 dwellings), at Pond Farm, Newington not be allocated.

(viii) That the allocations for sites at other villages in Table 13 of the report be discounted.

(ix)

- a) that the revisions made to the pitch need assessment for Gypsy and Travellers; and
- b) that the modifications to Policies CP3, DM10, DM8 and DM9 to remove the requirement for larger housing allocations to include pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and to reflect up-to-date planning policy on Gypsy and Traveller sites be agreed

(x)

- a) That the modifications in respect of the percentage need and split of affordable housing products; and
- b) That the on-going national debate on starter homes may require further modifications to policy before the Local Plan is adopted.

(xi) That the Policies New Regen 3 (Port of Sheerness) and New Regen 4 (Kent Science Park) be agreed.

(xii) That the Panel agree the additional list of Local green space sites as submitted at the meeting, subject to review of those sites highlighted by Panel Members and delegate finalisation of the list to the Head of Planning Services in consultation with the Chairman.

(2) That it be agreed that, subject to any further amendments, the publication and consultation of the proposed Local Plan modifications, as set out in Appendix 1, and that it, together with the representations received, be forwarded to the Inspector as speedily as possible after the close of consultation;

(3) That delegation be given to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman in respect of:

(i) any further drafting of the modifications consultation document undertaken prior to its publication;

(ii) finalising the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment (Appendix 4 and 5) and published for consultation;

(iii) revisions to Technical Paper No. 2 on Local Green Spaces and the subsequent main modifications required; and

(ix) the publication for consultation of the Implementation and Delivery Schedule.

685 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Members agreed to the suspension of Standing Order in order that the Local Development Framework Panel could complete its business.

Chairman

Copies of this document are available on the Council website <http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/>. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All Minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel