

Public Document Pack

SHEPWAY DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes for the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber - Civic Centre Folkestone on Wednesday, 18 January 2017

Present: Councillors Mrs Ann Berry, Miss Susan Carey, John Collier, Malcolm Dearden, Alan Ewart-James, Peter Gane, Clive Goddard, David Godfrey, Miss Susie Govett, Ms Janet Holben (Chairman), Mrs Jennifer Hollingsbee, Mrs Claire Jeffrey, Mrs Mary Lawes, Rory Love, Philip Martin, Ian Meyers, David Monk, David Owen, Dick Pascoe, Stuart Peall, Damon Robinson, Carol Sacre, Mrs Rodica Wheeler and Roger Wilkins

Apologies for Absence: Councillors Len Laws, Michael Lyons, Frank McKenna, Paul Peacock, Peter Simmons and Mrs Susan Wallace

163. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

164. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 December 2016 were submitted, approved and signed by the Chairman.

165. Chairman's Communications

The Chairman wished everyone a Happy New Year and said given the Kent County Council Elections in May and the US inauguration this week she expects it to be an interesting year.

She informed members that Councillor Michael Lyons, who has been quite ill was improving and getting stronger and there was a card circulating for members to sign if they so wish.

166. Petitions

There were no petitions.

167. Questions from the Public

The questions asked, including supplementary questions (if any) and the answers given are set out in Schedule 1 to these minutes.

168. Questions from Councillors

The questions asked and the answers given are set out in Schedule 2 to these minutes.

169. Announcements of the Leader of the Council

Council - 18 January 2017

The Leader of the Council, Councillor David Monk wished everyone a happy and healthy new year and updated members on what is happening with Otterpool Park, Arcadis informing that the team responsible for the master planning will be going out in early March with the next stage of the consultation, the details of which will be published shortly.

He informed that there is a Councillor briefing being held at 5pm prior to the Council meeting on 15 March when everyone will be updated.

The Leader informed that he, Dr Susan Priest, Corporate Director and Chris Lewis, Planning Advisor met with civil servants in the DCLG to press for the planning easements promised in the Green Settlement prospectus and was confident of some help coming to the Council.

He informed members that on Wednesday 25 January at 5pm the business case for an East Kent Council will be published online and that at 7pm the same day a presentation of the report will be given by the Chief Executive to all Councillors in the Council Chamber.

Councillor Ian Meyers, Deputy Leader, UKIP Group thanked the Leader for his updates and informed that the group would work robustly to scrutinise the decisions of the Executive and through scrutiny hopefully make a difference. He looked forward to working on numerous projects this year.

170. **Opposition Business**

There was no opposition business.

171. **Council Tax base 2017/18**

The Council is required to decide its tax base which will be used in the calculation of Council Tax for 2017/18. Report A/16/21 proposes the tax base for the Council's approval.

Proposed by Councillor Ms Susan Carey
Seconded by Councillor Alan Ewart-James and

RESOLVED:

- 1. To receive and note report A/16/21.**
- 2. To recommend that the Council Tax bases set out in appendices 1-31, which have been calculated in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulations 1992 (as amended), be the amounts so calculated by the Council as its Council Tax bases for the year 2017/18.**

(Voting: For 24; Against 0; Abstentions 0)

172. **Motions on Notice**

There were no motions on notice.

This page is intentionally left blank

Council – 18 January 2017

Schedule 1

Public questions and answers

1. From Christopher Deane to Councillor ms Susan Carey, Cabinet Member for Finance

My question relates to Council Tax and the more vulnerable members of our community. At the Shepway District Council meeting on Wednesday 21st December you spoke with pride, in answer to question from the public, that the council had both reduced Council Tax payments for all (in real terms) while protecting essential service provision. Later in the same meeting did not the reduction in Council Tax Relief, amounting to a saving of approximately £187000 for Shepway, that was passed by all members of the Conservative group mean additional hardship for 6000+ of the poorer and more vulnerable members of our community?

ANSWER:

Thank you for your question unfortunately this does not reflect the decision which was taken at council. Mr Deane may recall that when the Council Tax Reduction Scheme was introduced, the funding for this was reduced by 10% nationally leaving local authorities having to design schemes which either replaced that funding in order to avoid making cuts to services. The latest scheme, which was agreed by Council in December, has to work within those financial realities.

When considering the scheme, the Cabinet looked at the options before going out to a wide scale consultation. The scheme was considered by both Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny before going out to consultation, and then by both committees after the results of the consultation were known. Following consideration of the consultation comments, the final decision decided to **exclude** those items relating to self employed income, reduction in the capital limit and taking into account child maintenance or child benefit in the calculation.

The effect of this is that the level of potential income for Shepway District Council is not £187,000 but is lower by an estimated £65,700 than it would have been had we agreed to all the recommendations. This shows that as a Council we do listen and we do consider the impact of our policies when they are being implemented.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION:

There is a lack of hardship schemes and it would seem fair to say that the impact is particularly felt by single women with children?

ANSWER:

I refer you to the answer given at the last meeting and again inform you that there is a need to get the balance right and the people who are poorest will benefit. The benefit will not only help Shepway but the Police, KCC and Kent Fire and Rescue.

2. From Nick Southgate to Councillor Mrs Jenny Hollingsbee, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities

With reference to the council's Health and Well-Being "Priority 1: Tackling Health Inequalities". How will this chamber ensure that our region's proposed NHS Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) addresses the disproportionately high diabetes and lung disease issues prevalent in East Folkestone?

ANSWER:

Some East Folkestone residents experience stress and strain through the effects of deprivation and health inequalities, with very little focus on their personal health and well being. The effects are seen in high levels of diabetes and respiratory disease occurring earlier in life than in other areas.

Services are in place locally to support people with diabetes and respiratory disease. However, as a member of the South Kent Coast Health and Wellbeing Board, the Council works alongside Clinical Commissioning Group and Kent Public Health colleagues to support the East Kent STP's aim to increase prevention, personal responsibility and improved social and community networks. Alternatives to solely clinical models are being sought for improving resident health and wellbeing, encouraging healthy lifestyles and social inclusion. This may include a wide range of physical activity options, healthy eating and access to a vibrant voluntary and community infrastructure.

However, the Council can also directly influence these health issues. For example, you are more likely to smoke, misuse drugs or alcohol, live in overcrowded housing, be out of work if you are from a disadvantaged area – all of these factors will damage your health. Our private sector housing, community safety and economic development teams work together tackle these issues.

The Council will continue to work with health colleagues to ensure the East Kent STP ensures a comprehensive, integrated care and health services to address local needs across the district.

Examples of Practical Projects:

At the Dover Road community hub we worked with people from deprived communities and the KCHFT to provide health MOT checks for 50+ checks were carried out. Dietary advice and healthy eating projects were also carried using health trainers as obesity levels affect diabetes incidence.

Within the troubled families programme health outcomes are addressed by advising families on the impact of smoking and referring to GPs, pharmacies or smoking cessation programmes (this usually forms part of a discussion on budgets / debt and money spent on cigarettes).

The SKC CCG have reported through its self care and prevention sub-group that Shepway has a poor rate of take up on health screening so more work is being done to ensure health screening opportunities are taken up. The delivery of services through GP practices is being reviewed through this group and other structures alongside the SKC HWBB.

Age UK Personal Independence Programme

SKC CCG was successful in its bid to provide a personal independence programme locally, initially for 500 people. A phased roll-out is planned for 1st January 2017. Workshops are being arranged to bring together all related staff including care navigators, district nurses, talking therapies etc. Personal independence workers will be aligned to cohorts of identified patients across SKC. It is hoped numbers can be increased. People must have up to 2 or more long term conditions, be over the age of 65 and have received an unplanned admission in the last 2 years in order to qualify for this programme.

All GP surgeries in Shepway will be involved and will be able to refer patients through which workers will provide 121 advice and health interventions in the home to the vulnerable elderly and prevent worsening conditions and likely admission to hospital. This programme will complement the re-launch of the Care Navigation Service from the 1st January (care navigations staff and proactive health trainers will combine to a single role of care navigator).

The SKC Local Children's Partnership Group (LCPG) is focusing its work on a number of priorities including a key priority set as: To reduce childhood obesity by promoting healthy weight and positive self-image

The CSP has commissioned GFC to run the Shape up project where cohorts of young people are referred into a specialist programme that is seeing significant reductions in weight amongst young people participating.

A Health Inequalities Action Plan is being developed within the communities team and this will help guide where work needs to be focused to address these and other health issues. The plan will be ready by mid – February 2017. As a result new and ongoing projects according to need and including the issues raised will be commissioned in the future.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION

With medical services cut so deeply already, will Shepway District Council follow the lead of Hammersmith and Fulham, Ealing, Telford and Wrekin councils, in rejecting any Sustainability and Transformation Plan which includes a loss of service or facility to the people of Shepway?

ANSWER:

This is a question for the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to answer.

3. From Viv Kenny, The Shorncliffe Trust to Councillor David Monk, leader of the Council

Following a question raised at Council by Cllr Peter Gane on 20th July 2016 regarding Shepway DC adhering to the intention of the original Shorncliffe Garrison Masterplan to involve stakeholders including the Shorncliffe Trust, we would ask having;

(a) presented Shepway's Leader and Cabinet Member for the District's Economy with documentation outlining the potential of regeneration and job creation through tourism for this site (*linking also in the future, to further growth from opportunities through increased tourism for other undesignated buildings on the Shorncliffe Garrison Site such as the War Horse Stables; which aspiration has the support of 'War Horse' Author Michael Morpurgo*); and

(b) taking account of the work currently being undertaken by Shepway which gives support for such opportunities being developed comprising the Places and Policies Document; the Heritage Strategy which signifies the importance of this land and its heritage assets; and the Destination Management Plan which highlights its potential for tourism.

Why, without any meeting or discussion with the Shorncliffe Trust (*a stakeholder in the original Garrison Masterplan*), have Shepway removed themselves from the opportunity to take the Back Door Training Area with its significant dowry (£1m+), thus releasing all future rights and opportunities to control and manage this site through a local partnership (Sandgate Parish, White Cliffs CP and the Shorncliffe Trust and potentially others); which project to create a Heritage and Education Park would offer significant economic benefit to the district for tourism and job creation; instead allowing the Developer to choose their own method of land management; not necessarily in the best interest of the district's future economy?

ANSWER:

As previously set out in correspondence with the Shorncliffe Trust the planning permission granted to Taylor Wimpey for the redevelopment of the Garrison was fully in accordance with the requirements of adopted Core Strategy Local Plan policy SS7 which states that

f. Land at Seabrook Valley as shown in Figure 4.6 is released from military use for public and natural open space purposes, and a management strategy is in place to enhance biodiversity and to increase accessibility to the countryside where appropriate. Development proposals shall include an appropriate recreational access strategy to ensure additional impacts to Natura 2000 site(s) are acceptably mitigated against, in accordance with policy CSD4.

With regards to the planning application, The committee report made it clear that a number of options for the future management of the Seabrook Valley transferred by the MOD to Taylor Wimpey alongside the phase 1 land were to be explored

13.9 At present the long term ownership and management arrangements for the BTA have not been finalised, however given the stringent management requirements set out above it is likely one of the following scenarios will materialise, following more detailed consideration post committee:

- 1. Transfer of BTA to Shepway District Council with long term management carried out by itself or alongside a partner (such as the White Cliffs Countryside Partnership)*
- 2. Transfer of BTA to a newly formed Trust*
- 3. Transfer of BTA to an established 3rd party organisation, such as the Land Trust, Kent Wildlife Trust or WCCP*
- 4. Incorporation of BTA in to the area controlled by the development Management Company*

13.10 The finalised arrangements, or provision for the above will be set out within the s106 legal agreement, alongside conditions relating to the requirements of the various BTP management plans and provisions for monitoring of the BTA by the planning department

Taylor Wimpey explored options with both the District Council and other parties before reaching the conclusion that the management of the area should be under their control (option 4), albeit working alongside a partner. A principle reason for doing this was the ability to provide funding in perpetuity for the management of the open space, heritage assets and biodiversity area via the housing delivered on the site, whilst also ensuring that the developer has control of the site to deliver the planning requirements placed upon them to mitigate the impact of the development.

It is very clear that the management and continued ownership of this area by Taylor Wimpey is in accordance with the requirements of the planning permission and the adopted strategic site policy, which itself was subject to detailed consultation and external scrutiny.

The Council continues to work closely with Taylor Wimpey regarding the significant improvements works to the Seabrook Valley and its management required by the planning permission that will enhance the ecological, recreational and heritage use of the land far beyond that which has been experienced for many years under MOD ownership and control. The Council can confirm that Taylor Wimpey is in advanced discussions with the White Cliffs Countryside Partnership (WCCP) regarding the management of the Seabrook Valley, whilst Taylor Wimpey have also confirmed to the Council that the Shorncliffe Trust have already met with the WCCP regarding the role they may be able to play in the future of the Seabrook Valley. As such, in these early days since the transfer of the land from the MOD to Taylor Wimpey there is still significant opportunity for the Shorncliffe Trust, Sandgate PC and others to be directly involved in the management of the area,

alongside the WCCP with Taylor Wimpey as landowner. The District Council will continue to support and facilitate such discussions.

With regards to the Heritage and Education park mentioned in the question. A number of historic buildings, including an historic barrack block, the Victorian water tower and the Racquets Court are required to be repaired and retained within the development, directly opposite the Shorncliffe Redoubt. Taylor Wimpey has confirmed that the Shorncliffe Trust's interests in these buildings has been registered, however at present these building remain in MOD ownership and control. This gives opportunity for the Shorncliffe Trust to form and demonstrate a business case to Taylor Wimpey to support their plans for these buildings so that Taylor Wimpey can be convinced that they can be maintained in the long term. It has previously been made clear to the Shorncliffe Trust, by both Shepway and Historic England that the reuse of existing historic buildings within the former barracks would be far more appropriate than any plans for the construction of a new building on or adjoining the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Shorncliffe Redoubt, whilst it is also a requirement of the planning permission that this land be managed for ecological and recreational purposes, alongside the enhancement of the military heritage within the area.

Schedule 2

COUNCIL MEETING – 18 JANUARY 2017

COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. By Councillor Ian Meyers of Councillor David Monk, Leader of the Council

How many properties, private and commercial have gained immunity from prosecution by the planning department due to time lapsed in the last ten years?

ANSWER:

On average the Council receives just over 200 alleged breaches of planning control every year, with this information largely received from the general public.

Upon investigation many of these require no action or a planning application is invited for consideration. Where further investigation and/or action is needed the Council has a number of tools that can be used, and these include the serving of Enforcement Notices, Beach of Condition Notices, temporary and permanent Stop Notices. Generally about 10 -15 of these notices are served every year, usually as a result of collaboration between the Planning and Legal departments. Ultimately failure to comply with Enforcement Notices can lead to prosecution in the courts or the Council undertaking direct action, for which there are measures in place to aid with cost recovery. The serving of an Enforcement Notice ensures that such a use cannot become lawful by reason of continued use after the notice is served.

Within the last 10 years approximately 20 Lawful Development Certificates have been granted relating to the use of land or buildings for residential purposes, with six of these relating to occupation in breach of an Agricultural Occupancy Condition where permission has previously been granted for an agricultural worker. Six of the Lawful Development Certificates relate to the use of buildings or caravans as self contained dwelling houses where occupation has taken place continuously for 4 years, whilst a single application was recently granted for the use of land in Lydd as a residential caravan park due to 10 years occupation.

The Council's Licensing, Legal and Planning Departments continue to work closely so as to ensure that controls in place are appropriate and that any licenses granted reflect the planning permission that is in place.

Fees for Lawful Development Certificates are set out in the National Planning Fees Regulations. For applications for existing use the fee is identical to that of a planning application for the same proposal.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION:

Will there be a more robust way of publicising the actions of defenders?

ANSWER:

Yes we will be doing this and it is seen as a high priority of the Council.

2. By Councillor Ian Meyers to Councillor Stuart Peall, Cabinet Member for the Environment

Could the Cabinet Member for Environment please advise how prevalent are incidences of Japanese Knotweed in the District and what methods do the council use to eradicate this highly invasive weed?

ANSWER:

The method of removal for Japanese knotweed:

Japanese Knotweed (JK) is treated once annually from August to September to target the roots and rhizomes. A phosphate based weed killer is used.

If the plants are big enough glyphosate is delivered by stem injection.

If the stems are not big enough for injection then the herbicide is applied to the leaves either by brushing or spraying depending on surrounding vegetation etc.

Prevalence in the District:

Japanese Knotweed is widespread in the District, however the full extent of this is not known as much will reside in private gardens without the Council or the resident knowing about it.

In 2016 Japanese Knotweed was treated on 11 SDC sites, 11 East Kent Housing sites as well as 6 private residents via Oportunitas.

SDC hotspot sites are Folkestone Warren and the woods behind Encombe in Sandgate. Both these sites have extensive stands of Japanese Knotweed and the Council is doing its best to reduce the plant within the resources available.

Prevalence is based on anecdotal evidence and what operatives note whilst out on the District and from clearance work carried out in areas such as those cited above.

The distribution of Japanese knotweed reports can be found at the following link :

<http://www.plantracker.org.uk/map/knotweed>



Actions that can be taken to address Japanese Knot weed

The Environment Agency or Natural England would be the enforcing body rather than the LA.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/prevent-the-spread-of-harmful-invasive-and-non-native-plants> is a good link to answer common queries around the legislation they enforce.

The EA issue licenses to transport Japanese Knotweed so they would have the information about local companies. Grounds Maintenance advise that most people treating the plant leave it in situ (as to avoid this aspect). It is either left to rot away, burnt on site or buried. The District Council does not advise on companies to use.

If neighbours report nuisance from Japanese Knotweed there is the possibility of using new legislation to deal with nuisance. In 2014, reform of antisocial behaviour powers made it possible for community protection notices (CPNs) to be issued against anyone unreasonably having a detrimental effect on those nearby due to INNS (invasive non native species). The supporting [Home Office guidance](#) makes specific mention of Japanese Knotweed, the species against which the new power has mostly been directed.

The Council has not received complaints that have warranted this legislation to be used to date.

Details of the Power are provided below:

ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR, CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014 - SECTION 43 - COMMUNITY PROTECTION NOTICE

The Community Protection Notice (CPN) is intended to deal with particular ongoing problems or nuisances which negatively affect the community's

quality of life by targeting those responsible. It is intended to stop a person, business or organisation committing ASB which spoils the community's Quality of life.

To serve a CPN authorised organisations must need to be satisfied that the behaviour is:

- Having a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality;
- Of a persistent or continuing nature; and
- Unreasonable.

Before a CPN can be served a written warning must be issued informing the perpetrator of the problem behaviour, requesting them to stop, and giving the consequences of continuing. The CPN can then be issued if the behaviour does not stop. The CPN must include a required to stop things, do things or take reasonable steps to avoid further ASB. A council can also carry out works in default on behalf of a perpetrator.

The breach of a CPN is a criminal offence; however a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) can be issued of up to £100 if appropriate. A fine of up to £2,500 or £20,000 for businesses can be imposed by the courts. The terms of a CPN can be appealed against by the perpetrator within 21 days of issue; in addition the cost of works carried out in default by a council can be challenged by the perpetrator if they think they are disproportionate.

SUPPLEMENATRY QUESTION:

Thank you for your comprehensive answer and are you aware that the Council's Princes Parade is supposedly infested with Japanese Knotweed and, as the process for destroying and removing it can take up to 3 seasons will agree that, at the moment, this makes it impractical for the proposed development to proceed.

ANSWER:

This would be picked up later.

3. By Councillor Mrs Mary Lawes to Councillor Mrs Jenny Hollingsbee, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities

Nothing is being done and has not been for many years with regard to deprivation in Harbour Ward, and it is getting worse. There is a lack of locally affordable housing, severe lack of employment, overcrowding leading to health & Safety issues and lack of play areas/open spaces.

Could the Leader explain what SDC Council has planned in order to reduce deprivation and improve residents lives?

ANSWER:

Ensuring that local people are engaged and are at the heart of decision making are key priorities for the Council. Enabling communities to have the resilience and capacity to support themselves will become increasingly important as public sector resources continue to shrink. If the Council is to have the most impact in terms of allocating this resource, it needs to target activity in those areas where deprivation persists.

The council's Private Sector Housing team are actively working with private sector landlords and tenants in the Harbour Ward and other areas of the district to deal with housing related hazards (including overcrowding) where they are identified. The work also includes measures to improve the energy efficiency of homes and also a focus on bringing empty homes back into use. Where necessary the council has used and will continue to use its enforcement powers to ensure that landlords bring their properties up to standard. The team are also working to promote good landlord practice through our Landlord Forum. If Councillors have specific properties where problems such as overcrowding are evident, please do report them to council's Private Sector Housing Team.

In terms of providing more homes for the local community, the council continues to work with its affordable housing partners to maximise the new affordable homes provided in the district. 104 additional affordable homes for rent and low cost home ownership were provided in the district during 2015/16. The council is also working to deliver its own build and acquisition programme. Although not in the Harbour Ward, work will shortly be commencing on the council's 35 affordable home development in Military Road in Shorncliffe. So far this year the council has also acquired 8 existing properties in the district which are being made available for affordable rent through the Shepway Housing List and more are in the pipeline.

With regards to community engagement, the Dover Road community hub has been in place for nearly a year and has resulted in excellent partnership working across agencies to support the local community in terms of community cohesion, health and wellbeing and environmental aspects. The SHAPE and Active Shepway projects have seen a higher proportion of adults and young people referred from the Harbour Ward into its sports, play, health and wellbeing programmes, supporting those who need a higher degree of agency intervention.

The district boasts many play and open spaces, therefore, the council is currently working with consultants to develop a new play strategy for Shepway, which will identify areas of under and over provision in play space and open space across the district.

Shepway District Council successfully submitted a stage 1 application for a European-funded Community Led Local Development programme in Folkestone which aims to help tackle the issues of deprivation by helping residents in an area that includes the East Folkestone, Folkestone Central and Folkestone Harbour wards. The aim of the programme is to secure future job opportunities and support local businesses in the area to grow. The

Programme Strategy submitted at the end of August 2016, sought a total programme of nearly £5million, to be delivered over the 2017-2022 period, with half the funds coming from the European Regional Development Fund and European Social Fund. Should the Council be successful with this application, the programme is expected to start in Autumn 2017.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION:

Do you believe what plans you have in place will reduce the difficulties, particularly in Harbour Ward?

ANSWER:

There are plans in place, projects in Harbour Ward and the Council is supporting these as much as possible.

4. By Councillor Mrs Mary Lawes to Councillor David Monk, Leader of the Council

Could the Leader explain the reason for rejecting the petition of 5,433 people who objected to any development on Princes Parade, and is he aware that 91.2% of the individuals who made representation to Princes Parade policy UA25 in the Places & Policies preferred options consultation also objected to the proposed development.

ANSWER:

Over the past few weeks/months the committee services team has been liaising with the Petition organiser for the above petition because the petition did not meet all requirements of the Constitution and therefore the Petition could not be accepted. The Petition organiser has now submitted an E-Petition which now “live on our website” and is currently available for signature by members of the public on the Council’s website. I would ask you to note that at least 250 valid signatures are needed before the Council can take any further steps in relation to this petition.

You have raised a second point about the representations received as part of the Places and Policies Local Plan Preferred Options consultation. I am aware of Dr Burrell’s analysis of the Princes Parade representations as he has recently circulated this to Members, however the Planning Policy team are carrying out their own analysis of comments received.

The next stage in the plan making process is for the planning policy team to consider the representations received from members of the public, statutory and other consultees, together with any new evidence base information and changes in Government legislation, and make any necessary amendments to the Plan if it is considered these are required for the plan to meet with legislation. This Plan will then be published for further public consultation prior to submission to the Secretary of State for consideration. Before it is published, the proposed Plan, including any modifications and commentary on

how the representations received were considered will be reported to Cabinet for their agreement.

Once submitted to the Secretary of State there will be an Examination in Public, held by an independent Planning Inspector, where all policies, as well as any outstanding objections will be considered. The planning Inspector will then make the final recommendations of what should be in the Plan to the Council.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION:

Prior to the planning application will the council make available the responses to the consultation?

ANSWER:

As far as I am aware, yes.

This page is intentionally left blank