

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 13 June 2013 at 6.00 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor F J W Scales

Councillors: J S Back  
P M Beresford (In place of T A Bond)  
B W Butcher  
G Cowan (In place of P J Hawkins)  
J A Cronk  
B Gardner  
K E Morris  
R S Walkden  
P Walker (In place of P M Wallace)

Officers: Head of Regeneration and Development  
Principal Planner (Development)  
Principal Heritage Planner and Urban Designer  
Principal Infrastructure and Delivery Officer  
Principal Solicitor  
KCC Highways Officer  
Chief Executive  
Head of Inward Investment  
Team Leader – Democratic Support  
Democratic Support Officer

The following persons were also present and spoke in connection with the applications indicated:

<u>Application No</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>
DOV/13/0142	Mr A Wood	Mrs J Brophy
DOV/12/0440	Mr R Prince	Mr B Lloyd
	Mr M Jaenicke	Ms S Thomas

62 APOLOGIES

It was noted that apologies for absence had been received from Councillors T A Bond, P M Hawkins and P M Wallace.

63 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4, Councillors P M Beresford, G Cowan and P Walker had been appointed as substitutes for Councillors T A Bond, P M Hawkins and P M Wallace respectively.

64 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

65 MINUTES

In respect of Minute No 648, it was noted that, although not included in the Minutes, details of appeals would be included on future agendas as a standing item.

The Minutes of the meetings held on 16 and 30 May 2013 were approved as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

66 ITEMS DEFERRED

The Chairman reported that Application No DOV/13/00142, which had been deferred on 16 May 2013, appeared later on the agenda.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted

67 APPLICATION NO DOV/13/0142 – OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF A DETACHED CHALET BUNGALOW - PINE COTTAGE, MANOR AVENUE, DEAL

The Committee viewed photographs of the site. The Chairman reminded Members that the application had been deferred at the meeting held on 16 May 2013 in order for a site visit to take place to assist Members in considering the effect on the street scene and whether the site could accommodate an additional dwelling. All matters were open for discussion.

The Head of Regeneration and Development reminded the Committee that the proposed development site was situated within the Deal urban confines and was therefore considered an acceptable location for residential development. Members would need to consider whether there were any specific site factors that would militate against development. In terms of visual amenity, Members would need to consider its impact on the character of the street scene and spatial setting, as well as its impact on trees and the frontage hedge. On residential amenity, as an outline application only, all matters were reserved and it was likely that a design which did not adversely effect neighbouring properties could be achieved. Other factors raised by objectors were highways and harm to wildlife. The KCC Highways and Transportation Engineer confirmed that, as a private road, KCC would not be concerned with matters of on-street parking and would only consider junction access which was deemed acceptable.

Councillor B W Butcher reported the outcome of the site visit held on 11 June 2013. Members had noted that the distance between some houses in the road was less than that proposed between the application site and adjacent properties. The height of the proposed dwelling was also consistent with the height of adjacent dwellings. However, Members had concerns relating to the protection of mature trees at the site, including an oak and pine trees. A majority of Members had voted in favour of granting permission, recommending that conditions be attached to address concerns relating to trees and a frontage hedge and an informative regarding bats, with all matters relating to the full application to be reserved for the Planning Committee.

Councillor B Gardner stated what, whilst the site was large enough to accommodate a dwelling, he was concerned that the attractive frontage hedge would be removed to make way for off-street parking. Access at this point was also likely to affect the oak tree, particularly during construction works.

- RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/13/0142 be APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:
- (i) Application for reserved matters of a single storey dwelling;
  - (ii) Plans and particulars to be submitted and carried out as approved;
  - (iii) Application for reserved matters to be made within 3 years;
  - (iv) The development shall be begun before the expiration of 2 years;
  - (v) Full details of hard and soft landscaping, including boundary treatment;
  - (vi) No side windows at first floor level;
  - (vii) The ridge height shall not exceed 7 metres;
  - (viii) All landscaping to be carried out within 12 months;
  - (ix) Landscaping to be replaced if it dies or is removed within 5 years;
  - (x) Measures to protect existing trees and frontage hedge during the construction period;
  - (xi) Material samples;
  - (xii) Space to be laid out for the parking of cars;
  - (xiii) Sight lines at the vehicle access to be provided 2 metres x 33 metres to the south;
  - (xiv) Pre-code assessment to be submitted with reserved matters application;
  - (xv) Code for sustainable homes level 4;
  - (xvi) Provision of a shed for secure bicycle storage.
- (b) Bat Informative.
- (c) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

APPLICATION NO DOV/12/00440 - LAND AT GREAT FARTHINGLOE FARM AND WESTERN HEIGHTS, DOVER

The Committee viewed plans and photographs of the sites at Farthingloe and the Western Heights. The Head of Regeneration and Development advised Members that the application was a highly significant one both locally and nationally. At a national level neither English Heritage nor Dover District Council was aware of any other application that had offered improvements to a heritage asset in the way proposed. Locally it offered an opportunity to reverse the decline of the Drop Redoubt (part of the Western Heights Scheduled Monument) by turning it into an economically beneficial heritage asset. However, this had to be balanced against the proposal to build on land at Farthingloe that was within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and on land at the Western Heights near the Drop Redoubt which was also within the Scheduled Monument, both of which were protected at the highest level by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Whilst parts of the application were consistent with some objectives of the Council's Core Strategy - for example making better use of heritage assets - it was not in accordance with the Development Plan. It was therefore incumbent upon Members to consider whether material considerations indicated that, nonetheless, permission should be given and that, in particular, whether the heritage and economic benefits of the proposal and the additional housing outweighed its harmful impact on the environment.

The Committee was advised that the application had been assessed principally against NPPF policies rather than the Core Strategy due to the Council's reliance on national policies as a result of its being unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. The proposed development would contribute significantly to the latter, as well as offering significant economic and heritage benefits. The application was being presented as an inter-linked regenerative package, with each element as important to the whole. All reasonable steps had to be taken to moderate the impact of the proposals on the AONB, and for that reason the recommendation included a condition reducing the number of houses at Farthingloe. Conditions were also proposed to ensure that all the components of the application would be implemented in order to ensure that all of the economic and heritage benefits were delivered.

The Principal Planner reported that a holding direction had been received from the Department for Communities and Local Government, acting under powers conferred by Article 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order (England) 2010, advising the Council (as the Local Planning Authority) that it could not grant planning approval without specific authorisation from the Secretary of State. However, the Committee was advised that this direction did not preclude the Committee from making a resolution to grant permission at the meeting, although permission would be subject to the application not being called in by the Secretary of State. For this reason it was recommended that an additional recommendation should be added to the report. Members were also advised that the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) had formally requested that the application be called in by the Secretary of State on the grounds that neither the Council nor the applicant had demonstrated that there were exceptional circumstances, that development would be in the public interest or that there was no alternative location outside the AONB. Furthermore, the CPRE had cited that the detrimental impact of the development on the AONB landscape had not been properly recognised.

The Principal Planner also advised that, since the report was written, a further letter had been received from a member of the public objecting to the hotel and residential units at Western Heights, stating that an alternative site should be found for the scheme.

The Committee was advised that the applicant contested a number of matters, including the recommended restrictive conditions. On the basis of legal advice received, the applicant argued that the change to the number of dwellings was so significant that it could not be carried out by the Council without the approval of the applicant. The Council had, however, received its own legal advice that it was possible to impose such conditions.

On viability, the applicant's consultant, BNP Paribas, had stated since the report was written that they disagreed with the conclusions of the sensitivity analysis carried out by Smiths Gore, the Council's advisers. In their view, a lower density scheme would turn a positive land value into a negative value and, on this basis, it would not be able to secure the necessary funding. The viability of the scheme would be further undermined by the report's recommendation for graduated payments, when a substantial up-front payment of £1 million had been offered. It was suggested that the density details outlined in the report did not fairly or accurately represent the applicant's proposals. The Principal Planner advised the Committee that, having considered the further views of BNP Paribas, Smiths Gore stood by their analysis that a lower density scheme would be viable and would deliver the same monetary benefits as currently on offer. Officers therefore recommended that a lower density scheme should be approved as it was viable, not excessive for the site and would be compliant with the Core Strategy.

In terms of phasing, the applicant had raised concerns over the recommendation by Officers that construction of the hotel should be phased in with the Farthingloe development. It was argued that a hotel operator would be looking for assurance that heritage improvements at the Western Heights were progressing before making the decision to invest. To delay housing construction at Farthingloe, when it was this element of the scheme that would fund the heritage improvements at the Western Heights, was illogical. Moreover, delaying development at Farthingloe-B until Farthingloe-C had been completed would slow the delivery of the heritage payment. On the first point, Officers were of the view that the delivery of £3.4 million would make a significant contribution to investor confidence and, on the second, the heritage payment, if made when 80% of the development was completed, would be late coming forward in any event.

The applicant had also raised objections to the recommendation that the care home should not be located in Farthingloe-B but rather in the village centre area at Farthingloe-C which was not favoured by prospective operators. The applicant argued that there was a growing need for this type of accommodation and constraining its delivery was unhelpful to those who most needed it.

Turning to other matters, the applicant had contested that the report understated the extent to which the scheme had evolved in response to concerns raised during consultation. Development at the Farthingloe site would not be contrary to Policy DM11 of the Core Strategy as it would provide realistic options for using forms of transport other than the car. The bus operator had indicated that no subsidy would be required, provided buses could enter one end of the development and exit the other. It was not accepted that the commercial uses on site would compete with Dover town centre as they were primarily designed to meet local provision. The development would compare favourably with the Whitfield development in terms of

the number of car trips that would be generated, and KCC and the Highways Agency had confirmed that the projected traffic movements could be accommodated.

In summary, the applicant's agent had advised that the original scheme would deliver on the district's housing shortfall and heritage benefits. The Committee was requested by the applicant not to support the Officers' recommendations but to approve the scheme of 521 units at Farthingloe, as submitted. Moreover, it was argued that there should be no linkage between the hotel and commencement of development at Farthingloe, and that development at Farthingloe-B should not be dependent on completion of Farthingloe-C. Finally, Members were requested not to relocate the care home or delegate the Section 106 agreement to the Head of Regeneration and Development.

The Principal Planner then took Members through the details of the application, starting with the proposals at the Western Heights. English Heritage, which was the custodian of the Drop Redoubt as well as the regulatory authority for granting Scheduled Monument consent, had advised that, on the basis of the information submitted, it was willing to accept the principle of a hotel at the site, provided it was the right location in Planning policy terms. It also sought the re-use of existing buildings within the Drop Redoubt for a visitor centre rather than new construction. Technically the site was outside the Dover urban confines and contrary to the Council's Development Plan. However, the application offered economic and heritage benefits and would contribute significantly to the district's five-year housing land supply. Having undertaken a sequential assessment in accordance with the NPPF, Officers were content that it was the right location.

The original application had sought planning permission for 54 additional dwellings within the Western Heights which had been revised following the receipt of objections from English Heritage. The revised proposal was for 31 residential units and the conversion of the Victoria Halls into a further 9 residential units. The Victoria Halls were of historical importance, having been part of the garrison, and English Heritage had been particularly keen to see these retained. The hotel development would involve the retention of a building which had historically been used for the storage of artillery. The topography of the site was sloping in nature with a significant number of trees present. The site was a challenging one and approximately one third of the trees would be lost. As well as the conversion of the Drop Redoubt into a visitor centre with the help of the £5 million heritage payment, it was proposed to refurbish the Grand Shaft and make substantial improvements to the landscape.

Development at the Farthingloe site would fund these heritage improvements. Proposals at Farthingloe included the construction of 521 residential units, a 90-apartment retirement village, a health facility, the conversion of a barn to a bar/pub restaurant and the conversion of a farmhouse to a bed and breakfast facility. The Farthingloe-C site – previously the location of the Channel Tunnel construction worker camp – was in the AONB landscape but was not as prominent as Farthingloe-B. Farthingloe-B was on the side of the valley in open countryside in the AONB. The sloping nature of the site and its visibility from the west meant that the visual impact of any development would be considerable. In respect of the application, Officers had had concerns about the overly urban form of the proposals for the site and the risk of skyline development. For these reasons they had recommended that the density of buildings should be reduced and their interface with the open countryside graduated more sympathetically and, in particular, that a 2 hectare area (approximately) be safeguarded from development within

Farthingloe-B. Officers had also recommended that development at Farthingloe-C should commence first, with development at Farthingloe-B started only once the hotel at Western Heights had commenced.

The Principal Infrastructure and Delivery Officer referred Members to the recommendations circulated at the meeting from the Developer Contributions Executive Committee to the Planning Committee on the use and priorities for developer contributions. The requests made amounted to more than the sum being offered by the developer and it had therefore been necessary to prioritise the requests, rejecting some that were not considered to be justified. Priorities included the provision of primary school places, sustainable travel between sites and green infrastructure. The Developer Contributions Committee had also requested that the Chairman of the Committee be consulted by the Head of Regeneration and Development in respect of the conclusion of any Section 106 matters.

The Head of Inward Investment highlighted the heritage and economic benefits of the application. The Drop Redoubt was in the top 10 of English Heritage's most endangered sites. This and other heritage assets at Western Heights were deteriorating rapidly, and there was no alternative plan for their restoration given the significant levels of funding that would be required. The proposals would significantly improve the Dover tourism 'offer' and support east Kent's 'Grow for It' campaign. A significant number of jobs would be created both during and after construction. There were conflicting views as to whether refusal of the application would dent investor confidence, but approval would certainly signal that Dover was 'open for business'.

Councillors G Cowan, R S Walkden and P Walker spoke in favour of the proposals, stating that the application offered a rare opportunity for regeneration and investment and should be grasped. Its approval would encourage developers to invest in Dover and act as the catalyst for further regeneration of the town. Moreover, it would assist in safeguarding the town's heritage assets and revive the Western Heights area of the town as a tourism destination. Dover lacked a first-class hotel and building one with conference facilities would help to realise the potential of Dover's High Speed rail link and cruise terminal. Approval would be a courageous step but was necessary to give Dover's young people a future. However, it was felt that the application should not be restricted in the way proposed in the recommendation as this could jeopardise the viability of the scheme, deter other developers and be less effective in delivering the economic benefits. The Committee had to assess whether the advantages outweighed the harm that would be caused to the AONB. When seen from the ground and with effective screening, it was believed that this could be minimised. In these exceptional circumstances it was considered that the advantages did outweigh the harmful impact on the AONB.

Councillor B Gardner raised concerns regarding the security of the £5 million heritage payment, the phasing of the development to ensure that all the houses were built and English Heritage match funding. Given the significance of the heritage benefits, it was imperative that the development went ahead as planned to ensure that heritage assets were restored. The Principal Heritage and Urban Designer advised that English Heritage could not provide funding, but the developer's £1 million up-front payment would be used to kick-start funding from other sources. The Principal Planner referred Members to paragraphs 2.388 and 2.389 of the report, confirming that the application - where the financial viability of one part of the scheme was to fund another part of the scheme - was now compliant with Community Infrastructure Levy regulations, the applicant having made some amendments to the proposals and legal advice having been sought on this point.

Councillor J A Cronk commented that, whilst the development would bring significant benefits, such as employment and restoration of heritage assets, these would be to the irreversible detriment of the AONB and contrary to Core Strategy policies DM15 and DM16. The site had not been included in the Council's Land Allocations Document or Core Strategy and would ordinarily have been dismissed for this reason. Using the NPPF's public interest test, he was not convinced that development within the AONB would be in the public interest and was fearful that it could set a precedent for further development in the AONB. Councillor Cronk indicated that he would vote against granting planning permission.

Councillor K E Morris welcomed the public speakers' contributions which had given the Committee food for thought. It was felt that the proposed development would have a balancing effect on recent job losses in the district. The fact that there were developers who were still interested in Dover despite wider economic uncertainties was to be welcomed. There were questions around the scheme's commercial sustainability and for this reason it was suggested that the density of housing at Farthingloe-C should not be reduced as recommended by Officers, nor should linkages be made between construction at Farthingloe-B and the Western Heights. Councillor P M Beresford added that there was a responsibility to make Dover an attractive place to live and work, and to care for the town's heritage. Dover was in great need of regeneration, and by construction and conservation working hand in hand this could be achieved in a sustainable way.

The Principal Planner advised Members that if they did not wish to reduce the number of dwellings at Farthingloe from 521 to 365, nor have linkages between the phasing of the two developments, the report's recommendations would require further consideration and possible amendment, for example in respect of hotel phasing, the phasing and scope of construction of Farthingloe-B and the graduation of heritage payments. If the Committee was minded to approve the application on the grounds that the economic and heritage benefits, and the addition to the housing supply, outweighed the harmful impact on the AONB, it was important to consider whether these benefits should be tightly controlled. The developer had indicated that they did not want to use a bond as security for the heritage payment, and it was therefore suggested that smaller, more practical staged payments should be sought.

It was proposed and duly seconded that recommendation I (A) and (B) of the report be approved, subject to the amendment of (A) 1 from 365 to 521 residential units, and, on being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED.

Further discussions followed on recommendation I (i) and (ii) of the report and how it should be amended to reflect payment and construction phasing concerns. Given the complexity of the report and its recommendations, it was suggested that the meeting be adjourned for a short time in order for Officers to re-word recommendation I (i) and (ii) for the Committee's further consideration.

It was proposed and duly seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 9.00pm and, on being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED.

The meeting resumed at 9.25 pm.

The Principal Planner read out a revised recommendation I (i) and (ii). In addition, condition (ix) on page S135 of the report had been amended from Code Level 3 to 4. With a reduced number of residential units, Officers had recommended Code



Level 3 to assist with the scheme's viability. However, now that the Committee had voted in favour of retaining the original number of 521 units, it was appropriate to revert to the Code Level included in the original application. Recommendation II had also been amended to reflect the fact that the Chairman of the Developer Contributions Executive Committee would also be consulted by the Head of Regeneration and Development in respect of Section 106 matters.

Councillor Morris suggested that it would be appropriate to include conditions relating to the use of local labour and provision for relevant apprenticeships and training for local people. The Committee was advised that this would best be achieved through the Section 106 agreement.

RESOLVED: Notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation

- (a) That, SUBJECT to the following:
  - (i) The application not being called in by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.
  - (ii) The resolution of any outstanding details to be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development, including: Clarifications regarding the extent, content and funding arrangements of the Countryside Access Area (CAA) and maintenance responsibilities/measures (see 2.206 to 2.208); and the wording of the 'reasons for approval' to the application.
  - (iii) The completion of a necessary Section 106 agreement (to include English Heritage and other parties) and any other legal procedure to facilitate: The achievement of the objectives outlined at 2.131 (i), (iv) and (v) of the report as follows:
    - (i) Seeking the phasing of the £5 million heritage payment relative to the completion of 20%, 40% and 60% of the development with the final payment for any phase being no later than the completion of 80% of the development within that phase. The payment of the £5 million should be index-linked to ensure no devaluation over time;
    - (iv) Agree appropriate legal mechanisms to ensure that any outline planning permission for a hotel could only be taken up by a quality (4/5 star) operator;
    - (v) Dover District Council and English Heritage set out a joint 'position' that would provide sufficient clarity and

commitment to demonstrate that the proceeds from the heritage payment (£5 million) could reasonably be expected to be used in the manner outlined in the heritage benefits works at Appendix 3 of the report (or similar), together with some estimation as to the timing of their use. It is anticipated that such an agreement should be achieved as English Heritage have recently confirmed that they would (if it is resolved to grant permission) use best endeavours to deliver a successful project at Western Heights;

the phasing of the £5 million heritage payment to the Local Planning Authority to be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development, in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee; the first heritage payment of £1 million being upon the commencement of any development; any other measures to support the S106/legal agreement and to ensure proper development including (if not addressed by planning condition) a phasing schedule to cover relevant works subject of both the outline and detailed elements of the scheme; and resolution of S106 trigger points for payment.

(A) Outline planning permission be GRANTED (with all matters reserved except access) for the construction of:

1. Up to 521 residential units (Use Class C3);
2. Up to 9,335sqm 90 apartment retirement village (Use Class C2)
3. Up to 730sqm health facility (Use Class D2);

together with associated landscaping and ancillary infrastructure and works at Great Farthingloe Farm, Dover; and (with all matters reserved except layout and access) for:

4. Construction of up to 31 residential units (Class C3); and

(with all matters reserved) for:

5. Construction of up to 7,400sqm 130 bed hotel and 150 person conference centre (Class C1);

together with ancillary infrastructure and works at land at Western Heights, Dover; and

6. Provision of a pedestrian access network to facilitate enhanced recreation access together with associated landscaping and works on land at Great Farthingloe Farm and Western Heights, Dover; and

(B) Full planning permission be GRANTED for:

1. Conversion of thatched barn to pub/restaurant (Use Class A4/A3);
2. Conversion of stable block to retail shop (Use Class A1/A2); and
3. Conversion of farmhouse to bed and breakfast (Use Class C1);

together with associated landscaping and ancillary infrastructure and works at Great Farthingloe Farm, Dover; and

4. Conversion of the Victoria Halls to provide 9 residential units (Use Class C3); and
5. Conversion of the Drop Redoubt to a Museum/Visitor Centre (Use Class D1)

together with associated landscaping and ancillary infrastructure and works at land at Western Heights, Dover,

SUBJECT to conditions (relating to the outline and/or detailed permission) to include: (i) Time conditions; (ii) Development in accordance with approved plans; (iii) Conditions in accordance with the recommendations at 2.227 of the report relating to a masterplan, design code and phasing; (iv) Details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of development as appropriate; (v) Archaeology conditions; (vi) Environmental Health conditions; (vii) Surface water drainage conditions; (viii) Foul sewerage conditions; (ix) Sustainable construction conditions including code level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM 'very good'; (x) Ecology conditions, including necessary bat surveys in respect of tunnels associated with (A)5 above; (xi) Details to confirm the retention of existing structures to be converted; (xii) Material

samples, joinery details and other detailed matters; (xiii) Highways conditions, including a condition seeking early implementation of the new access to Farthingloe-C; (xiv) Landscaping conditions, including a landscape/open space management plan; (xv) Details of provision of play space; and (xvi) Any variation/deletion of these conditions and/or additional conditions as appropriate.

- (b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to conclude the Section 106 agreement and settle any necessary planning conditions (in accordance with issues set out in the report and as resolved by the Planning Committee), in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee and, in respect of Section 106 matters, in consultation also with the Chairman of the Developer Contributions Executive Committee.
- (c) That Informatives be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development.
- (d) That the recommendations of the Developer Contributions Executive Committee in relation to the monetary Section 106 requests be accepted as follows:
  - (i) Provision of 130 new primary school places and 25% of a new site – That discussions continue with Kent County Council regarding an appropriate level of contribution, having regard to the overall development viability and the priorities given to the other development contribution requests by the Planning Committee, as informed by the Developer Contributions Executive Committee.
  - (ii) That, should any sums allocated for educational provision not be spent within the timescale, these should be allocated to other infrastructure needs arising from the development as determined by the Developer Contributions Executive Committee and the Planning Committee.
  - (iii) Community Hubs and Building Community Capacity, Co-location with Health, Accommodation Solutions, Assistive Technology – That the claim from Kent County Council be rejected.
  - (iv) Additional Stock/Equipment and Staffing Support for Dover Discovery Library – That the claim from Kent County Council of £37,518.31

for library stock at Dover Discovery Library be accepted, but the other element of the claim be rejected, with this allocation accorded the lowest priority.

- (v) Community (Adult) Learning (Additional Stock/Equipment and Class Provision) – That the claim from Kent County Council be rejected.
- (vi) Sustainable Travel (Pump-priming a new or revised bus route to serve the development at Farthingloe) – That the claim from Kent County Council of £400,000 be accepted, subject to further investigations and, in the event that the sums or part of the sums allocated are not required for this purpose, the monies be allocated to other infrastructure needs arising from the development as determined by the Developer Contributions Executive Committee and the Planning Committee.
- (vii) Sustainable Travel (Subsidy for a bus service to the proposed hotel at Western Heights) – That the claim from Kent County Council of £100,000 be accepted, subject to further investigations and, in the event that the sums or part of the sums allocated are not required for this purpose, the monies be allocated to other infrastructure needs arising from the development as determined by the Developer Contributions Executive Committee and the Planning Committee.
- (viii) Sustainable Travel (Travel plan monitoring) – That the claim from Kent County Council of £5,000 be accepted, subject to further investigations and, in the event that the sums or part of the sums allocated are not required for this purpose, the monies be allocated to other infrastructure needs arising from the development as determined by the Developer Contributions Executive Committee and the Planning Committee.
- (ix) Sustainable Travel (Mitigating possible impact of increased trips to the Western Heights) – That the claim from Kent County Council of £100,000 be accepted, subject to further investigations and, in the event that the sums or part of the sums allocated are not required for this purpose, the monies be allocated to other infrastructure needs arising from the development as determined by the Developer

Contributions Executive Committee and the Planning Committee.

- (x) Sustainable Travel (Contribution towards the cost of adopting the track from Farthingloe to the ridge above the proposed development) – That the claim from Kent County Council of £27,000 be accepted, subject to further investigations and, in the event that the sums or part of the sums allocated are not required for this purpose, the monies be allocated to other infrastructure needs arising from the development as determined by the Developer Contributions Executive Committee and the Planning Committee.
- (xi) Sustainable Travel (Upgrade of informal tracks between the two development sites) – That the claim from Dover District Council of £98,550 be accepted.
- (xii) Policing (Proportion of new custody cells, proportion of new officers and their start-up costs) – That the claim from Kent Police be rejected.
- (xiii) Primary Health Care (Increasing capacity of GP surgeries in Dover Town) – That the claim from the NHS of £106,580 be accepted, subject to the sum being allocated for intermediate care beds and, should this not be deliverable, allocated to the extension/conversion of Pencester Health Surgery or as appropriate.
- (xiv) Outdoor Sports (Improvements to increase capacity of sports pitches to meet the standard proposed and consulted upon in the Land Allocations Pre-Submission Local Plan and Open Space Policy and Standards documents) – That the claim of £289,200 be accepted, subject to the allocation being used where it is most needed within the Dover sub area.
- (xv) Affordable Housing (Policy DM5 of the adopted Core Strategy states that the Council will seek 30% affordable housing) – That it be accepted that a contribution will only be sought where the funds set aside by the developer for necessary infrastructure, as agreed by the Developer Contributions Executive Committee and the Planning Committee, have not been fully allocated.

- (xvi) Green Infrastructure (Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar) – That the claim of £26,117.40 be accepted.
- (e) That the recommendations of the Developer Contributions Executive Committee in relation to improvements to be secured under Section 278 of the Highways Act be accepted as follows:
  - (i) Junction Improvements on Elms Vale Road/Folkestone Road – That the improvements requested by Kent County Council Highways be accepted.
  - (ii) Junction Improvements on York Street/Folkestone Road – That the improvements requested by Kent County Council Highways be accepted.
- (f) That provision be included within the Section 106 agreement for securing employment, training and apprenticeship opportunities for local people as appropriate.

(Councillors J A Cronk and B Gardner left the meeting upon adjournment and were not present when the vote took place.)

69 ACTION TAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ORDINARY DECISIONS (COUNCIL BUSINESS) URGENCY PROCEDURE

The Committee noted that no action had been taken since the last meeting.

The meeting ended at 9.38 pm.