

## Golf Club – Supplementary Questions

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Hill referred to a DEFRA document entitled 'UK Biodiversity Indicators 2017'. The UK was a signatory to the Convention on Biological Diversity. One of the first measured goals was 'public awareness and engagement in biodiversity issues.' The vision document said that the masterplan would result in the loss of some areas of woodland habitats, off site compensation would be explored, the extent of which would depend on the detailed masterplan. However the masterplan was not going to be discussed in Part I. Was the Lead Member satisfied that the council had satisfied the DEFRA guidelines on public participation in biodiversity, understanding and engagement if they were not privy to the options how the council was dealing with the biodiversity issue?

The Biodiversity Indicators Report acknowledges the variety of all life on Earth. It includes all species of animals and plants, and the natural systems that support them.

Some of the Golf Course woodlands are designated as priority habitats and there is the potential for a range of protected or notable species to be present. The masterplan allows for the retention of those habitats assessed as being of greatest ecological value including the larger woodland parcels, with new built footprint falling predominantly within habitats of low ecological value.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Hill commented that in the Local Plan not all sites would be required to achieve 30% affordable housing, for example those of fewer than 10 dwellings. This meant the borough could only achieve its goal of 30% if it aimed to put a higher percentage on land it owned. Was this the plan?

The Council will ensure that land which is in its control will deliver 30% affordable housing. We will build sustainable developments, which are socially, environmentally and economically sustainable.

The Council will also be pushing for all developers to meet the provision of affordable housing as per planning policy and working within the parameters set by Government contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Serjeant asked if the Lead Member would agree that the most likely route to success for planning permission would be to have included a Green Belt review in the Local Plan?

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Serjeant asked the Lead Member if he would agree that the council's most likely success in achieving planning permission

for such a development would be most likely successful if a Green Belt review had been carried out so the Inspector could understand the thinking behind the site selection?

As these two questions were almost identical a single answer is set out below.

Once a site is allocated in an adopted plan then the principle of development has been accepted. If a planning application is made on site which is not part of a local plan then the principle of development has to be considered as part of the determination of the planning application. This is different to building the evidence base to a local plan. As part of that plan making process the Council has produced an Edge of Settlement Study in two parts, these are on the Council website.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Frost commented that the DCLG had recently issued a consultation paper called 'Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places' and invited a consultation process. This had been spearheaded by Sajid Javid and he had asked everyone who was affected to make a proposal by email or writing. The consultation paper was to help to ensure the planning for the right homes in the right places. He asked for reassurance that the borough would use their best endeavours in exercising their skill, care and diligence to confirm to the Minister's request. Local authorities would be very clear and transparent so that every community and local area understood the scale of the housing challenge they faced. The Minister did not want local authorities wasting time on complex, inconsistent and expensive processes which only created lengthy bureaucratic arguments often behind closed doors and isolated local communities.

The Council has already responded to the consultation and will give due regard to any legislation that follows as a result of it.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Lloyd stated that he believed the council had to make a formal application to remove the land from the Green Belt. There were two Supreme Court decisions from May 2017 that may have an effect. Had the council considered this and would it make a formal application to remove the land?

The removal of land from the Green Belt would be achieved through the Local Plan Process.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Midgeley asked why then was the council proposing to borrow money and buy properties at this stage? Why did the council not wait until the approval, not approval or moderation of the BLP took place? It was only a question of waiting a few months. The council was putting a lot of people under pressure. It was not how he would expect the council to behave.

The Council went ahead to secure funding in 2018/19 and 2019/20 to acquire third party properties that would benefit access to the site. This provides the best opportunity to secure these properties through the open market and negotiation so that this issue can be resolved in a consensual way to help to reduce the concerns of local residents as quickly as possible.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Grant asked if this meant there was no intention to move the deer elsewhere; they would just be jammed into the little bits that were left?

There will be significant amounts of priority woodland left (over 7.3 hectares) and based on the advice we have sought the deer would be likely to move naturally.