

Executive – 9 October 2013

Present: Councillor Williams (Chairman)
Councillors Cavill, Edwards, Hayward, Mrs Herbert and Mrs Stock-Williams

Officers: Penny James (Chief Executive), John Lewis (Parking and Civil Contingencies Manager), Tim Burton (Planning and Development Manager), Jo Humble (Housing Enabling Lead), Nick Bryant (Policy Lead), Roy Pinney (Legal Services Manager) and Richard Bryant (Democratic Services Manager and Corporate Support Lead)

Also present: Councillors Coles, Horsley, Morrell and A Wedderkopp

(The meeting commenced at 6.15 pm.)

38. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 10 July 2013, copies of which had been circulated, were taken as read and were signed.

39. Public Question Time

- (1) Mr Mehan referred to the Settlement Policy Boundaries being altered which appeared to have had led to a number of speculative development proposals being made for North Curry.

A local consultation exercise held earlier in the year had seen 60% of those local people who had taken part stating that they opposed development at Knapp Lane. Now the site had been included as one of Taunton Deane's 'preferred options'. How did this happen?

In response the Policy Lead, Nick Bryant, stated that the Sustainability Assessment had been used in connection with the various site being proposed at North Curry and Knapp Lane had been assessed as the strongest site. He confirmed that Somerset County Highways considered that the access arrangements to the site were adequate.

Mr Bryant went on to say that the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (SADMP) was a draft for public consultation and that all responses received would be carefully considered before any final proposals were made.

- (2) Councillor Coles referred to the proposal for Milverton in the Minor Rural Centres section of the SADMP. He was concerned that with the Council identifying a gold and silver housing need of 11 units and only five likely to be delivered through the proposed allocation at Butts Way that the Council would fail to meet affordable need in the village.

Nick Bryant responded by saying that the situation at Milverton was complicated by the possible future development of up to 80 dwellings on land at Creedwell Orchard. Whilst this site would not necessarily deliver further affordable units, he

was mindful of ensuring that the village was not committed to a level of development which might adversely affect its character. Housing need was one of the considerations in arriving at the preferred options but consideration had also been given to capacity of local services and facilities, the character and setting of the settlement and its existing size.

He also confirmed that the Choice Based Lettings figures quoted in the SADMP was as at 1 July 2013. The Housing Enabling Lead, Jo Humble, confirmed that the October gold and silver figure was now only six. This would appear to be as a result of the recent (and un-related to the SADMP) proposal to develop land at Butts Way which had yielded five affordable dwellings.

(3) Councillor Morrell asked three questions:-

- (i) Could he be supplied with Gross Domestic Income figures for Taunton Deane between 1997 and now? He felt sure that these would demonstrate that the area had become poorer in recent years.
- (ii) 'Taunton Forward', which comprised local business people, was a newly formed group which had been set up to help rejuvenate Taunton. Would the Council provide any resources to this group to assist them in their task? Would the findings from these 'wealth creators' be listened to?

Councillor Williams responded by stating that Taunton Forward had already been informed that the Council was not in a position to provide either financial or staff resources. However, the group had been given a means of bringing their ideas into the Council. These would be welcomed particularly if they integrated with the work of Project Taunton and Somerset County Council.

- (iii) Reference was made to the earlier announcement that Taunton Deane and West Somerset Council's bid for Government Transformation Grant finance had been unsuccessful.

Following the failure of Southwest One and now the news relating to the Transformation Grant, why should the public continue to trust the Leader in relation to the West Somerset Project?

Councillor Williams replied that it would be for Councillors to decide whether to continue with the West Somerset Project. Although the news from the Government was disappointing, the Business Case had identified savings of £1,900,000 per annum for Taunton Deane if the Project was to proceed. This was an opportunity to save money – otherwise there would have to be significant cuts to services.

- (4) Mr Ormes stated that he was against the site at Knapp Lane, North Curry being proposed as a 'preferred option'. This site, by far, would have the most impact as the field was higher than surrounding land which could increase run-off. There were flooding problems at this location last year.

He went on to compare the width and alignment of Knapp Lane with Windmill Hill

and could not understand how County Highways had reached the view that access arrangements for Knapp Lane would be adequate. He also pointed out that much of the traffic generated from a site in Knapp Lane would come into the village at Queen Square, greatly increasing the number of vehicles in the centre of North Curry.

Nick Bryant referred to his previous response. The Council would always be guided by County Highways. The responses received from County Highways would be published alongside the SADMP.

40. **Financial and Performance Monitoring – Quarter 1 2013/2014**

Submitted for information a report on the financial position and the performance of the Council to the end of Quarter 1 of 2013/2014 (as at 30 June 2013).

The monitoring of the Corporate Strategy, service delivery, performance indicators and budgets was an important part of the overall performance management framework.

The detailed 2013/2014 financial position for Quarter 1 was provided in Annexes A-J To the report although a high level summary was also included in the Scorecard.

The overall financial position of the Council remained within 1.1% of the approved budget.

The current forecast outturn for the financial year 2013/2014 was:-

- General Fund Revenue was an overspend of £149,000; and
- Housing Revenue Account (HRA) to remain within budget overall.

The Corporate Scorecard (aims, objectives, measures and targets) had been refreshed to reflect the new 2013 – 2016 Corporate Business Plan.

Analysis of the overall performance of the Council revealed that 60% of all performance measures were on target.

Of the five 'Red' alerts within the scorecard, information had been provided in additional 'Key Risks/Issues/Impacts' sheets for the 'Family Focus' project, Fly-tipping and the Equality Action Plan.

Resolved that the information report be noted.

41. **Somerset Flooding Summit – Draft Final Report**

Considered report previously circulated, concerning the draft final report of the Somerset Flooding Summit.

The report – a copy of which had been circulated to Members – outlined the process

undertaken and the subsequent conclusions reached by the County-wide Joint Scrutiny review. Councillors Simon Coles and Gill Slattery had represented Taunton Deane on the Joint Steering Group.

This exercise was never about 'solving' the issue of flooding in Somerset. This had been, and continued to be, the subject of detailed and complex discussions at many levels.

Instead, the Summit had been an opportunity for Somerset residents, local agencies and the business community to come together and share experiences and suggestions for improved water management across Somerset. It was very much an evidence gathering exercise and the recommendations contained in the report reflected the information gathered as part of this Scrutiny process.

Noted that the fourteen recommendations that had been included in the draft final report had been informally considered by the Somerset Leaders and Chief Executives who had broadly supported these recommendations.

When the draft final report had been considered by all six Somerset authorities, the Joint Steering Group would meet again to collate the responses and finalise the action plan and future monitoring arrangements. The Action Plan would identify for each recommendation, the following:-

- The proposed action;
- Who was responsible for the action;
- The desired outcome;
- The resources required to deliver the outcome;
- The target date for delivery.

As such, a further report on this matter was therefore likely to be submitted to the Community Scrutiny Committee in due course.

Resolved that the contents of the Somerset Flooding Summit draft final report be accepted.

42. **Local Development Scheme 2013**

Considered report previously circulated, concerning the Local Development Scheme (LDS) 2013.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended by the Localism Act 2011, required Local Planning Authorities to prepare a LDS.

The draft document, a copy of which had been circulated to Members of the Executive, was the seventh LDS prepared by the Council. The previous LDS had been submitted to the Government Office in March 2011 and it was now considered appropriate to revise the Scheme.

The LDS was a rolling project management plan for the preparation of planning policy documents – often referred to as Local Development Documents (LDD's) - that would direct future planning decisions in Taunton Deane.

Unlike previous versions of the LDS, the document was no longer required to be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval. It now had to be displayed on the Council's web site following a resolution by Full Council.

At its recent meeting, the Local Development Framework (LDF) Steering Group had requested that, if it was possible to do, any future revisions to the LDS be agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation following consideration by the Steering Group, rather than taken back each time to Full Council.

The LDS identified the relevant Development Plan Documents for Taunton Deane, and other related documents such as the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Authorities Monitoring Report which the Council would prepare and the timescale for their delivery.

It set out the staff resources available for the preparation of documents, the range of the evidence base required in their preparation, together with a profile of each programmed document prepared by the Council and the anticipated timetable over the next three years.

Noted that the Development Plans would provide the framework for delivering the Council's growth agenda and inward investment into Taunton Deane. Related measures such as CIL and the New Homes Bonus would contribute towards physical and social infrastructure improvements throughout the district. CIL was projected to raise around £7,500,000 over the next five years, whilst the New Homes Bonus was projected to amount to around £12,000,000 over the period to 2016.

Resolved that Full Council be recommended to:-

- (a) Adopt the Local Development Scheme and timetable for the preparation of planning documents; and
- (b) Agree that any future changes to the Local Development Scheme be agreed through the Local Development Framework Steering Group and Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation.

43. Taunton Deane Borough Council Planning Obligations Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document

Considered report previously circulated, concerning the proposed introduction of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) concerning affordable housing.

The purpose of the proposed SPD was to provide greater detail on Policy CP4 Housing in the Council's Core Strategy 2011-2028 which was adopted in September 2012.

Policy CP4 aimed to ensure that affordable housing was provided as part of all development schemes of five or more net additional dwellings. The policy stated that 25% of all new housing should be in the form of affordable units.

The Council operated an Affordable Housing Development Partnership which delivered affordable housing in Taunton Deane and the adoption of this SPD would provide a clear guide for the partnership to work with.

This proposed SPD would be processed through the Statutory Consultation process in line with the Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Development Framework (LDF) Steering Group and Strategic Planning Working Group (SPWG) had already been consulted on the content of the document.

A summary of the key points of the SPD were as follows:-

- Tenure - The Council would seek a tenure split of 60% social rented housing and 40% intermediate housing or Affordable Rented on affordable housing provision of three affordable dwellings or more.

On schemes yielding three or fewer affordable dwellings the Council might seek a partial financial contribution in lieu of housing in order to bring the total overall provision within a development up to the required 25% affordable housing.

- Site Viability - In instances where applicants claim that full or partial delivery of the affordable housing was not possible on viability grounds, the Council would consider in the first instance a revised tenure split and unit types for the development. In the event that viability issues cannot be resolved through changes to the tenure and/or unit types, the applicant will be expected to submit a viability statement.
- Off site provision - In exceptional circumstances, where the Council agrees that affordable housing can be provided off-site, its location will be sought in the following priority order taking into account local need and site availability:-
 - Adjacent to the development;
 - Elsewhere within the Parish (or Taunton urban area in the case of the Unparished Area);
 - Elsewhere in the District.

It is expected that such off-site provision will accommodate the same number and type of units that would otherwise be required on the application site.

- Financial Contribution - The Council would likewise only accept financial contributions in-lieu of on-site provision in exceptional circumstances. In such cases the applicant would be expected to set out a detailed statement outlining the reasons why on-site provision was not considered to be appropriate. The Council would use the financial contributions in the following ways:-
 - To fund the provision of new affordable housing through Registered Providers;
 - To purchase land for new affordable housing schemes either directly by the Council or through Registered Providers; or
 - To fund activities relating to the delivery of affordable housing.
- Exception Sites - The Council intended as far as possible to plan for meeting

affordable housing needs within or adjacent to rural settlements by identifying and prioritising sites for housing development through the site allocations process.

Within the adopted Core Strategy, Development Management Policy DM2 stated that affordable housing would be supported outside of defined settlement limits in certain circumstances which were detailed in the report.

Such developments would be small scale and would be expected to meet or help to meet a proven and specific local need for affordable housing in the Parish or adjoining rural Parishes, which would not otherwise be met and be within or adjacent to the settlement boundary, well related to existing community services and facilities and sympathetic to the form and character of the village.

- Design, Quality and Sustainability Standards - Policy CP4 expected the delivery of mixed, balanced and sustainable communities with affordable housing would be integrated with market housing. The affordable housing should be built to meet the latest design and quality standards.
- Housing Need - The Council would refer to Housing Needs data held within the Choice Based Lettings System in the first instance. If further information was deemed necessary, the applicant would be expected to provide a local Housing Needs Survey for approval.
- Local Connection - A local connection clause would be included in Section 106 Agreements in relation to all schemes outside the Taunton and Wellington urban area to ensure that the Parish which was accommodating the development had the priority access to the affordable homes which could contribute towards absorbing the Parish's housing need.
- Occupancy - Affordable housing for social rent and Affordable Rent secured through planning obligations would be allocated in accordance with the Choice Based Lettings System, Homefinder Somerset.

In the first instance, applicants for intermediate housing secured through the planning obligations would be taken from either the Homefinder Somerset register or the Homebuy Agent list.

Resolved that the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document be approved for public consultation.

44. **Site Allocations and Development Management Plan – Preferred Options**

Considered report previously circulated, concerning the Council's Preferred Options Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (SADMP), a full copy of which had been provided to Members of the Executive.

The SADMP represented an important Planning Policy Document as it would guide the future location of development across Taunton Deane and establish policies used to

inform decision-making through the Development Management process.

Planning Regulations guided the procedure to be followed in preparing Development Plan Documents (DPDs). This procedure required the Council to undertake consultation prior to the publication of its Draft Plan, which itself had to be subjected to a more formalised representation period prior to its examination by an independent Planning Inspector and adoption.

An initial 'Issues and Options' consultation on the SADMP had been undertaken in early 2013. This took the form of a series of public exhibitions and gave an opportunity for communities, developers, landowners and other key stakeholders to comment on a range of sites and policy options.

Having reflected on the substantive issues raised through this consultation, the Preferred Options SADMP had been drafted. It was intended to publish the SADMP for public consultation towards the end of October.

The options put forward in respect of both sites and policies had been subject to detailed consideration through a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which had allowed the likely sustainability implications of choosing a particular policy direction as well as possible mitigation measures to be considered.

The identified Preferred Options reflected the findings of the SA but also the deliverability of particular options since National Planning Policy Framework placed significant weight on the deliverability of plans.

Preferred Options for Taunton

Central to the Preferred Options for Taunton was the proposed allocation of two strategic site allocations at Comeytrove/Trull and Staplegrove. Both of these sites were identified as 'Broad Locations' within the adopted Core Strategy and anticipated to be allocated in the SADMP.

The Council had recently commissioned consultants Parsons Brinkerhoff to undertake further technical work to inform the proposed 'red-line' boundaries identified for these proposed allocations. In both cases, there was a clear need for comprehensive masterplanning to be undertaken consistent with the requirements of Core Strategy Policies SS6 and SS7. In the event that applications were promoted in either Broad Location ahead of the Plan's adoption, the Council would need to be satisfied that appropriate masterplanning had been undertaken,

The Core Strategy also identified the need for a new strategic employment site for the town. The SADMP proposed a second strategic employment site at Junction 25/Ruishton. This site would serve the qualitative need for future employment growth to enable Taunton to fulfil its full economic potential.

In addition to the Broad Locations, the Council needed to identify a range of smaller sites to help ensure that the new homes target of at least 13,000 new homes within the Taunton over the Plan period could be met. This was particularly critical given the acknowledged high degree of reliance that the Plan would otherwise have upon the strategic sites at Monkton Heathfield, Nerrols, Staplegrove and Comeytrove/Trull.

Further reported that Ford Farm had previously been identified as a sustainable site for allocation. Whilst the site currently lies within a Flood Plain, its identification for development would see the completion of a flood scheme, channel work improvements and ground-raising. These works would complement the wider Norton Fitzwarren Flood Risk Management Strategy and ensure that new properties at Ford Farm were protected to a 1 in 100 year plus climate change standard of protection. It would also secure the completion of the Norton Bypass which would reduce traffic through the heart of the village. The inclusion of this site within the Preferred Options Plan was therefore strongly recommended.

It was also recommended that land at Longrun Farm and St Augustines School should be safeguarded in the Plan for potential future education uses at this stage. Although both of these sites performed very well against the sustainability objectives, in view of the continuing uncertainty around secondary school provision, it was considered premature to release these sites for housing without prior assurance that the sites could not be used for education uses.

Land at Bishops Hull was proposed for around 70 dwellings. The site's development would be dependent on addressing improvements to surface water drainage at Shute Water. Officers are also proposing the allocation of a small site at Pyrland Hall Farm for up to 60 units. This site would need to be sensitively designed to respect the setting of the listed farm complex and also provide appropriate mitigation for Lesser Horseshoe Bats and landscaping.

Reported that detailed work addressing the proposed Urban Extension at Comeytrove/Trull had also identified the potential for a development at Higher Comeytrove Farm. This site could only logically come forward after an initial northern phase of an Urban Extension at the A38 had been delivered and would have potential for up to 150 dwellings. A small site for approximately 10 dwellings at Kingston Road was also proposed for inclusion. This site lies within the existing settlement limits and was compliant with development plan policies.

Preferred Options for Wellington

In view of the number of plots already consented and delivered within the town, it was not considered appropriate to make any further allocations through the SADMP. Even without making any allowance for future 'windfall' unplanned development, the housing trajectory indicated a projection of more than 2,800 new homes over the Plan period set against the Core Strategy target of at least 2,500.

Preferred Options for the Major Rural Centres

The Core Strategy had identified Wiveliscombe and Bishops Lydeard as 'Major Rural Centres' to accommodate up to 200 new homes through allocations.

In Wiveliscombe planning permission or resolutions to grant planning had been made on land in and around Style Road / Burges Lane. These sites would deliver around 120 of the 200 homes envisaged by the Core Strategy. The most favoured site currently without planning permission was land at Croft Way would represent a logical rounding of the town and adjoined the recently constructed Doctor's Surgery.

Sites at the southern end of Bishops Lydeard were strongly favoured through the Issues and Options consultation. These sites would not exacerbate congestion and parking problems through the heart of the village and, on this basis, they were recommended for allocation through the SADMP.

Preferred Options for the Minor Rural Centres

Five Minor Rural Centres were identified in the Core Strategy at Creech St. Michael, Cotford St. Luke, Milverton, North Curry and Churchinford. These villages were anticipated to accommodate allocations of at least 250 new homes between them.

The character, setting, size and capacity of key infrastructure had been considered prior to recommending the following apportionment of new homes across the Minor Rural Centres:-

- Creech St. Michael - approximately 110;
- Cotford St. Luke - approximately 60;
- Milverton – approximately 20;
- North Curry – approximately 40;
- Churchinford – approximately 20.

It was considered that the three sites which in and around Hyde Lane, Creech St Michael which had been granted planning permission represented the most appropriate options to accommodate development. No further sites would therefore be identified.

In Cotford St Luke, the preference was to see land to the east of the settlement, a combination of Sites 2 and 3, as the Preferred Option. This would help limit the extent of encroachment into the surrounding countryside. A vehicular though route linking both sites with the southern and northern ends of Dene Road would be required.

The Council would however require evidence from the site owner that such a route is achievable to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority and is financially deliverable without detriment to other planning requirements for the allocation. If this could not be demonstrated the Council would progress an allocation on Site 2 only as this can be readily accessed from Dene Road (north).

It was also considered that a small development of up to 20 dwellings at Butts Way, Milverton should be identified through the SADMP. Whilst this site is less accessible than some of the options identified, its likely impact on landscape, nature conservation and historic character would be lesser.

The preferred sites for North Curry are Overlands and land off Knapp Lane. Overlands performed well against the SA criteria although it would be important to ensure that any new development provided footpath links to the village and protected the sensitive setting of the Grade 2* listed farm complex. The site was considered likely to accommodate up to 20 units. Knapp Lane could accommodate the remaining 20 homes for North Curry.

Further reported that it would not be appropriate to recommend land at White Street for inclusion despite the support of the Parish Council. This site had previously been

dismissed on appeal and was recently refused planning consent on the grounds of impact on the setting of the listed buildings.

Ford Farm, Churchinford was the only site identified for potential allocation through the SADMP. It was proposed to accommodate up to 20 units and would need to be carefully designed to minimise impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Development Management Policies

In the case of more detailed Development Management policies, the need for additional policies had carefully been considered taking into account the Framework, the existing Local Plan policy coverage and the Government's desire to avoid un-necessary policy duplication.

The Preferred Options had structured a limited number of proposed new and carried forward Local Plan policies against the eight strategic objectives framed by the adopted Core Strategy, namely:-

- Climate Change;
- The Economy;
- Town and Other Centres;
- Housing;
- Inclusive Communities;
- Accessibility;
- Infrastructure; and
- Environment.

A series of design policies to help guide and inform planning proposals was also felt to be appropriate.

Proposed Changes to Settlement Boundaries

The SADMP process also presented an opportunity to consider the appropriateness of existing settlement boundaries. A significant number of potential amendments were put forward through the Issues and Options consultation. A small number of changes as set out in the Plan had been proposed.

Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Provision

The Council had recently commissioned an update to the 2010 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment.

The adopted Core Strategy stated that provision for gypsy and traveller sites would be made through the SADMP. Unfortunately, to date no sites had been promoted for such uses despite numerous 'calls for sites' and requests for land to be put forward.

The failure to identify potential sites could, in part, be traced back to landowner expectations. Many landowners and site promoters would understandably want to maximise the return from any site and consequently did not wish to promote land for gypsy and travellers where 'hope value' exists.

As a relatively advanced stage had been reached in identifying preferred options for allocation, it seemed appropriate to contact those who had previously promoted land for allocation with a view to identifying sites which could be considered for gypsy and traveller pitches.

In the event that some landowners were prepared to promote land for pitches, the Council would need to consider these sites against its criteria-based Core Strategy policy. Further public consultation would then need to be undertaken on these sites.

Whilst this exercise might not necessarily yield any further sites for consideration, this exercise was important in taking steps to ensure the soundness of the SADMP. Failure to take proactive steps to identify land for gypsies and travellers would not only represent a significant risk to the Development Plan but would also increase the potential of planning permissions being granted on appeal on sites the Council might wish to resist.

Reported that the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) set out how the Council would involve the community and stakeholders in the preparation, alteration and review of local planning policy and the consideration of planning applications.

The Council's last SCI was produced in 2007 and this was consequently out-of-date.

The 2013 review simplified the 2007 SCI document. It took account of changes to planning policy nationally and the way in which the Council was structured and organised. The aim is to create a clear and concise document which set out:-

- When and how people could get involved with the preparation of local planning policy and comment on planning applications; and
- How the Council would notify people of the opportunity to engage with the planning policy and development management process.

It was proposed that the Council should consult on this new draft SCI at the same time as the SADMP and draft Affordable Housing SPD.

Noted that it was intended to publish the Preferred Options for consultation towards the end of October 2013. The consultation would run for a period of not less than six weeks and would comprise a series of public consultation events to be undertaken in a range of locations likely to be affected by the growth planned by the SADMP.

Beyond the Preferred Options, the further comments made in respect of the Plan would be considered and further evidence gathering required to support the document would be undertaken.

A separate report had been prepared outlining the Project Plan for preparation of the SADMP. This was referred to as the Local Development Scheme (Minute No 42 refers) and anticipated that the Draft Plan would be published in Summer 2014. The SADMP was likely to be adopted in Spring 2015 following independent examination in early 2015.

Reported that the Community Scrutiny Committee had considered the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan Preferred Options at its meeting on 8 October 2013.

The Committee had expressed reservations and concerns regarding the proposed alterations and reductions in size of some of the current Green Wedges and asked for these views to be submitted to the Executive.

In response, Councillor Edwards reported that he would be reviewing the situation relating to the Green Wedges.

The Community Scrutiny Committee had also resolved to recommend the Executive to delete Knapp Lane, North Curry as a preferred option site, to be replaced with a proposed development at White Street for five dwellings with the remainder of the North Curry allocation of 35-40 houses being accommodated on the site near Overlands/Canterbury Drive but developed in three phases of 18 dwellings, 10 dwellings and seven dwellings, each five years apart.

The Executive took the view that this recommended change should not be made to the preferred options. It was felt that the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan should proceed to consultation in its present form. The suggested change to the preferred option at North Curry could be considered at the conclusion of the consultation period.

Resolved that:-

- a) The contents of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan Preferred Options be noted;
- b) It be agreed that the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan be published for consultation as soon as practicable (subject to any necessary minor amendments to be agreed with the Portfolio Holder);
- c) It also be agreed that independently of the Preferred Options consultation, officers be authorised to write to the promoters of appropriate sites not proposed to be included for allocation in the Plan to ascertain if these sites could be considered for gypsy and traveller pitch provision; and
- d) Publication of the Council's revised Statement of Community Involvement for consultation be approved alongside the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan.

44. **Executive Forward Plan**

Submitted for information the Forward Plan of the Executive over the next few months.

Resolved that the Forward Plan be noted.

(The meeting ended at 7.54 pm.)