

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Meeting held: 19th April 2017

Present: Councillor Mike Tebbutt (Chair)
Councillors Duncan Bain, Ash Davies, Ruth Groome, Ian Jelley and Mark Rowley

16.PP.31 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Linda Adams, Cedwien Brown and Jan Smith.

16.PP.32 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mark Rowley declared an interest in item 5 (Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan – Housing Land), as Chair of Geddington Parish Council

Councillor Cliff Moreton attended the meeting as Ward Councillor and declared an interest in item 5 (Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan – Housing Land), as a resident of Cransley Rise, Mawsley.

Councillor James Hakewill attended the meeting as Ward Councillor and declared an interest in item 5 (Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan – Housing Land), as a landowner in Braybrooke.

16.PP.33 MINUTES

RESOLVED

that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 25th January 2017 be approved and signed as a correct record by the Chair subject to the following amendment:

16.PP.30 Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan – Monitoring Update (pg 5 – should read, Kettering continued to perform below average in terms of vacancy levels.

16.PP.34 SITE SPECIFIC PART 2 LOCAL PLAN – HOUSING LAND

ALLOCATIONS (VILLAGES)

A report was submitted to update Members on the assessment of sites for the allocation of housing land in the villages, for inclusion in the draft Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan, and to agree a draft list of housing sites to be included in the emerging draft plan (outlined in Section 3 of the report) to be developed further and published for consultation purposes.

Members recalled a report was considered on 23rd November 2016, which provided a summary of the assessment of sites for the allocation of housing land in the villages still under consideration for inclusion in the forthcoming draft Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. An updated shortlist of the sites was presented along with a series of 'next steps' of work still required for particular sites. These next steps were endorsed by Members. These included carrying out further work on outstanding matters, in order to assess the suitability of sites for allocation. This work also included carrying out a new site assessment for a late submission site at Broughton (site reference RA/096); a site Members agreed should be considered.

The first part of the report presented at the meeting set out the expected outstanding rural housing requirements, discounting housing completions and commitments, and a windfall allowance. This resulted in a residual requirement to allocate land for at least 143 dwellings to meet the Joint Core Strategy requirement. At the time, the rural sites under consideration for allocation had the potential to provide in excess of 200 dwellings in total.

As previously reported, four villages had been designated as Neighbourhood Plan areas. These were at Broughton, Mawsley, Great Cransley and Pytchley. In light of the Localism agenda, the Council continues to support those groups in the preparation of neighbourhood plans for their areas. Given the varying stages in Neighbourhood Plan preparation, the overall number of additional dwellings likely to be allocated through neighbourhood plans was difficult to predict at this stage.

At this stage in the preparation of the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (SSP2), and given that the neighbourhood plans were still working their way towards submission to the Council, it was considered prudent to retain those sites still being considered for allocation. This was until such time as there was a clearer understanding of the contents of the Neighbourhood Plans in those villages affected. This was the case at Broughton, where the neighbourhood plan was advanced, but not sufficiently so for the Council to consider withdrawing its SSP2 allocations in

favour of those of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Broughton Neighbourhood Plan was expected to be submitted for consultation and then Examination shortly.

Members considered the Rural Area Housing Site Options for each area as follows: -

Broughton

At the Planning Policy Committee on 23rd November 2016, Members resolved that all sites under consideration in Broughton required further work to be undertaken before concluding which sites should be progressed as housing allocations. The sites were RA/094b, RA/99a; RA/101 and RA/127. Members agreed that a new site (RA/096) recently promoted required assessment.

RA/099a (Broughton Allotments; site yield: 28 dwellings) –

As previously reported, there were three issues that were raised in relation to this site which is promoted for 28 dwellings. Further work was required on the following points - 1) encroachment to a water recycling centre in the vicinity of the site in relation to the risk of odour nuisance; 2) loss of existing allotments and measures to provide alternative; and 3) traffic calming measures due to the proximity of the site to the A43 road.

With regards to the asset encroachment issue of the Broughton Water Recycling Centre (WRC) raised by Anglian Water, an assessment to assess the impact of odour on the site had been commissioned by the land owner. An odour assessment report had now been received and was currently being reviewed by both Anglian Water and KBC's Environmental Protection Team. The qualitative assessment did indicate that the facility was located to the east of the proposed development site and therefore odours would not regularly reach this area as the prevailing wind was from the south-west. Added to this, there was a buffer of 130 metres between the two sites, which was noted as being substantial and helped to ensure dilution between the source and receptor. When both of these factors were combined, the potential for odour was low as the odour was not regarded to be distinct or offensive 70 metres downwind of the odour source. It was not considered that the facilities would potentially cause a loss of amenity or nuisance to potential residents. No mitigation was therefore advised.

The issue of traffic calming was considered appropriate to be dealt with through any future planning application where further detail on what should be required would need to be agreed. If the site was allocated, a development principle to this effect could be included in the draft policy. In relation to the existing allotments, these would be relocated to the north of the site. It

was acknowledged that this may result in some disruption through their relocation. Again, a specific criterion could be included in a housing allocation policy requiring the provision of replacement allotment facilities of an appropriate quality.

RA/101 (Land to the rear of 22 High Street; site yield: 12 dwellings) – It was previously reported that this site was not favoured to be progressed for allocation. This is because Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) Highways considered that development to the rear of Bentham Close was not achievable as a proposed access could not be met to an adoptable standard. A planning application for 8 dwellings on this site had recently been determined (KET/2017/0081), which was less than the amount being considered through the allocation process. The proposal had been refused planning permission. For these reasons, the site was not recommended to be progressed as an allocation and was therefore rejected.

RA/127 (The Paddock, Meadow Close; site yield: 20 dwellings) – It was previously reported on 23rd November 2016, that further discussions were required with the site promoter to agree on a more appropriate yield for the site. Previously the site was identified for 10 dwellings, but the site promoter then put forward a higher figure of 26 dwellings.

Through negotiations officers agreed with the site promoter that the site could come forward for up to 20 dwellings instead. This would provide for a density of approximately 22 dwellings per hectare. Although this did not match the previous lower figure, it was considered that this yield would be appropriate given the density of the development in the vicinity, on Grange Road, the new Cransley Hill development, adjacent to site RA/127, as well as the conservation area which was situated to the south of the site.

In relation to contaminated land it was considered that as a result of comments from the KBC's Environmental Protection Team, this issue could be addressed at the planning application stage and could be covered in a development principle in any policy allocating the site.

RA/094 (part) / RA/094b (Land south east of Northampton Road; site yield: approx.15 dwellings) – This linear site along Northampton Road was within 3 different ownerships as previously reported. It was concluded on 23rd November 2016, that further work was required in order to address the issue of the deliverability of the site, as only 2 of the 3 parcels of land, either side of the Anglian Water land, were being promoted. Anglian Water specified in writing that they did not wish to have this land considered for development as it included an

operational pumping station. It would also require a suitable buffer around it to reduce risk of nuisance of noise to any neighbouring residential properties. It was stated that discussions would be required with the site promoter of the parcel of land closest to the village. This was in order to determine whether a smaller frontage development along the front of Northampton Road could be delivered given their desire to develop the previously discounted larger site (ref. RA/094), which had been put forward for around 55-65 dwellings. To date, a further response had not been provided by the site agent and, therefore, there was no evidence to suggest that this site was deliverable. Neither had a response been received regarding the most southern parcel of land. The site was therefore rejected as a potential housing allocation due to continued concerns regarding deliverability.

RA/096 (Land west of Darlow Close and Cransley Hill; site yield: 50 dwellings) – The site was brought to the Planning Policy Committee meeting as a new submission. It was agreed that an assessment of the site work would be undertaken. Consultation with statutory consultees has been undertaken, allowing for this site to be compared with other sites in Broughton and the rest of the rural area through the assessment process. It was noted that this site was previously discounted at the earlier Options stage of the SSP2 in 2012 due to concerns over access. Information received more recently through the submission in 2016, showed a larger site area than previously considered, where it was now considered the site would accommodate between 50 – 60 dwellings.

The assessment raised a number of issues with this site. The first and most significant was access, where it had been proposed the site would share an access with the adjacent primary school, although the proposed layout had indicated that there was scope to provide additional parking to the school and a drop off area. Further discussions with NCC Highways would be required to determine the requirements of the access off Cransley Hill for the site and the school.

Other issues included archaeology and biodiversity. NCC Archaeology had advised there could be a potential impact on significant archaeological features, most notably ridge and furrow. Any development layout of the site needed to consider the presence of significant archaeological features, ensuring compliance with relevant policies in the adopted JCS. An assessment would be required to assess further ecological potential on site. NCC Archaeology had advised that, however this would be a pre-requisite to investigate further if a planning application was made of the site.

The scale of this development was deemed significant in Broughton, and given the recent development of 60 dwellings at Cransley Hill, in close proximity to the site. Consideration was required as to whether this scale of development was appropriate in Broughton. The policies in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sought to distribute development to strengthen the network of settlements in accordance with the roles defined within Table 1 of the JCS. This identified the role of villages, such as Broughton, as focal points for development to meet locally identified need, unless those needs could be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement. At this stage, site RA/096 was recommended to be dismissed as a housing allocation.

Taking account of the above commentary and recommendations, there were only two sites that remained in contention for allocation purposes – RA/099a and RA/127. Both sites were approximately similar in terms of distance to the village centre. However, in terms of pedestrian access to the village centre, site RA/127 was more suitably located, and was considered to be more within the existing fabric of the village and therefore better related than RA/099a. Pending the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan being completed in draft for submission and examination and the outcome of this process, it was recommended that both sites remain as potential housing allocations during this time. The matter of housing allocations in Broughton would be brought back to a future meeting of the Planning Policy Committee for decision.

Councillor Hillary Bull attended the meeting and spoke on behalf of Broughton Parish Council. Concerns were raised regarding the weight being given to the direction taken by the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan and the number of allocations proposed by KBC, the committee were urged to discount both sites.

Members heard that the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan had not yet reached a stage where we could be confident that it would be adopted, therefore investigations should continue on the proposed sites to provide a plan B and help protect pressure for development of unplanned development at other sites at Broughton.

Councillor Hakewill attended the meeting and reiterated the points raised by the previous speaker. Concerns were also raised in relation to the timing of the meeting during the holiday period, potential sites being outside of the village boundary, potentially giving false hope to developers, and the size of allocation for Broughton compared to the other villages.

In response to the speaker, members heard that the Council now had a five year land supply and were working hard to maintain that.

Malcolm Gates addressed the committee and raised concerns about the relocation of allotments and the effect it would have on elderly allotment owners, odours, soil quality and structures.

Councillor Groome supported all comments raised by the speakers and proposed that sites RA099A and RA127 be discounted immediately. There was no seconder for the motion.

Members requested clarification that the allocations would only be progressed if the Neighbourhood Plan was not adopted. Members were assured that at this time the sites were not being recommended to dispose of or advance, but were options that remained available.

Councillor Jelley proposed and Councillor Rowley seconded and it was

RESOLVED that both sites remain as potential housing allocations during this time and the matter of housing allocations in Broughton be brought back to a future meeting.

Geddington

At the Planning Policy Committee meeting on 23rd November 2016, it was recommended that further work be undertaken in relation to sites RA/107 and RA/109 before concluding the assessment process and recommending which of the shortlist of sites was put forward for allocation.

There were no outstanding matters pertaining to site **RA/110 (Old Nursery Site, Grafton Road, Geddington; site yield: 8-10 dwellings)** and it was recommended that the site be progressed as a potential housing allocation. The same recommendation was made this time for the site to be designated as a draft housing allocation.

Site RA/107 (Geddington Sawmill, Grafton Road; site yield: 10 dwellings) - Two areas which were raised to look at further were 1) encroachment of a water asset (water main pipe) running through the site; and 2) potential noise impacts from the retained sawmill use.

Further information had now been provided by Anglian Water confirming the approximate location of the water main which appeared to follow the route of the existing access to the existing sawmill and the farm beyond.

The site promoter had relied on this information to confirm that the water main would not be affected by the location of the proposed residential development, referring to the indicative housing site layout provided. No additional site survey work had been carried out to identify the exact location of the water main. Anglian Water confirmed that impact on any of its assets would be required at detailed design stage, and that any diversion of assets will require formal application to Anglian Water. On balance, it was considered that this issue should not preclude allocation of the site.

In order to demonstrate that the potential noise matter could be adequately mitigated, the site promoter prepared a noise assessment which had been sent to KBC's Environmental Protection Team for comment. They have agreed the information was satisfactory to conclude on this matter. A set of development principles would be prepared to cover issues relating to noise and water asset encroachment together with other relevant issues being included in a draft allocation policy. The site was recommended for progression as a potential housing site.

RA/109 (Geddington South East; site yield: 11 dwellings) -

Two areas to look at further were 1) potential odour impact from the nearby WRC; and 2) encroachment of a water asset (water main) running through the site.

The site promoter submitted an odour assessment report to determine the probable impact of the nearby WRC. The assessment observed that the proposed housing site was upwind of the waste recycling centre. A verified 'sniff' test did not identify this as a significant issue. The report concluded that the site was sufficiently located away from the WRC that it would not generate significant odour issues with respect of the proposed housing site. The odour assessment report had been sent to both KBC's environmental protection team and Anglian Water for comment.

Further information had now been provided by Anglian Water confirming the approximate location of the water main which appeared to follow the route of the highway verge or hedgerow/tree line. The site promoter relied on this information to confirm that the water main would not be affected by the

location of the proposed residential development, referring to the indicative housing site layout provided. The exact location of the water main was less clear than on other sites and had not been verified, however, should there be encroachment on this asset, the site promoter would intend to re-configure the site layout accordingly so that this matter could be overcome. This approach was considered satisfactory given the size of the site, and current indicative layout which could be further enhanced. Diversion of water assets also remained an option.

Subject to consultation advice from Anglian Water confirming that the recently provided odour assessment report was satisfactory to conclude the odour issue, the site was recommended for progression as a potential housing site. An update on the outstanding consultations would be presented to Members when this report was formally considered 19th April 2017. If this site was endorsed for progression, development principles would be prepared to cover issues relating to odour and water asset encroachment together with other relevant issues.

Geddington was a sustainable settlement with a number of community facilities capable of supporting the delivery of all three sites over the plan period. Subject to all outstanding matters set out above being resolved, it was recommended that all three sites be progressed for allocation.

Councillor Rowley confirmed that Geddington Parish Council supported all three sites.

Councillor Groome proposed and Councillor Rowley seconded and it was

RESOLVED that subject to all the outstanding matters set out above being resolved all three sites be progressed for allocation.

Mawsley

RA/115 (Land adjacent to Mawsley; site yield: 83–143 dwellings) – Further work was identified in relation to layout and provision of access for site RA/115. The site promoter submitted an indicative layout for two options, 83 dwellings and 143 dwellings. As previously reported, a development of 143 dwellings would result in a level of growth which was beyond that which would be envisaged.

The site promoter was continuing to explore access options, including clarifying the ownership of third party land and made contact with the Parish Council to seek to arrange a meeting to discuss access through the Community Centre car park. However the issues relating to provision of appropriate access remained unresolved at this stage.

RA/174 (Land to the West of Mawsley; site yield: 50 dwellings) – It was recommended that further work was required in relation to layout and capacity of the site and in relation of Cransley Rise. Members also raised concerns about gaining a satisfactory access off Cransley Rise.

Further discussions had taken place with NCC Highways and the site promoter in relation to the widening of Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened.

The site promoter confirmed that the site could be restricted to 50 dwellings. If this site was progressed it was recommended that the site be restricted to 50 dwellings and that development principles would also include a requirement for a loop road.

Given the scale of development which could be accommodated on the two sites under consideration in Mawsley it was considered that only one of these sites would need to be progressed as a housing allocation to contribute towards meeting the rural housing requirement in the plan period.

When comparing the sites, RA/174 provided a more logical extension to the village which was better related to the existing built form than RA/115 and would integrate better with the village. This site also provided the opportunity to connect the two ends of the cycle route. RA/174 had existing residential development around three sides whereas RA/115 would result in an intrusion into the countryside to the east of the village which would cut across the field in an arbitrary manner. There were limited opportunities for providing linkages between RA/115 and the existing village. While the site promoter was continuing to explore options, issues relating to provision of a suitable access to RA/115 remained unresolved and there was a lack of assurance at this stage that the site was deliverable. It was therefore recommended that site RA/174 is progressed as a housing allocation in the draft plan.

Councillor Moreton addressed the committee and raised his concerns regarding the accessibility of documents to the public for consultation prior to the meeting.

The committee heard that public can attend the Planning Policy Committee but it was not a statutory requirement and a public consultation would be taking place in due course.

Councillor Moreton continued his address and raised concerns regarding the infrastructure in the village being unable to cope with any more development.

Members heard that Mawsley was one of the larger villages in the borough and was better able to accommodate growth over a 20 year period.

Councillor Jelley proposed and Councillor Rowley seconded and it was

RESOLVED that i) site RA/115 be rejected as a housing allocation in the draft plan; and
ii) site RA/174 be progressed as a housing allocation in the draft plan.

(Councillor Groome abstained from the vote)

(Councillor Groome left the meeting at 8.05pm)

Braybrooke

RA/128 – the previous recommendation to allocate the site as a draft housing allocation was carried forward to this committee.

Councillor Jelley proposed and Councillor Rowley seconded and it was

RESOLVED that site RA/128 be allocated as a draft housing allocation and a set of site specific criteria covering development principles for the site would be included in the draft allocation policy

Stoke Albany

Site RA/120 (Farm and Land at Stoke Farm, Ashley Road, site yield: 8 dwellings) and RA/221 (Land to the south of Harborough Road, site yield: 16 dwellings) – At the Planning Policy Committee meeting on 23rd November 2016, consideration was given to whether it was appropriate to allocate one of two potential housing sites, or both sites over the plan period. No decision was arrived at during this meeting, and the issue remains outstanding.

Members were advised that Stoke Albany was a small rural village with few community facilities or services. As a result, the village performed less well in terms of sustainability when compared with larger villages within the Borough which benefited from a wider range of amenities and services. If both sites were progressed for allocation, this would result in an increase of 24 new dwellings over the plan period which was comparable with the level of potential housing allocations being considered at larger villages within the Borough. It was considered that this level of growth within Stoke Albany was not appropriate for the above reasons. With this in mind, officers further considered the merits of the two sites in order to assist Members with determining housing allocations for this settlement.

Using the sustainability assessment criteria, both sites scored similarly on a number of issues. As a result, in deciding which site to recommend for progression, focus was placed on considering how sites performed differently in terms of the sustainability criteria.

Out of the two sites, RA/120 scored more positively in terms of its potential impact on the built environment and soil and land criteria, as it was a brownfield site with existing historic agricultural buildings which were suitable for re-use as part of the redevelopment. In addition to preserving the long term use of historic barn buildings, the removal of block and steel framed agricultural buildings and expanse of concrete yard area had the potential to enhance the appearance of the site, although it could equally be argued that the removal of these buildings would detract from the agricultural heritage of the settlement. Given that part of the site was located within Stoke Albany Conservation Area and within relatively close proximity of a number of listed buildings and a Scheduled Ancient Monument; as a result any scheme required a very careful and sensitive design.

Whilst Site RA/221 was greenfield land and abuts the conservation area, its position in relation to the main part of the village was considered more central to the main core of the village, and better related to the existing built form which was primarily residential in character. As a result, site RA/221 scored more positively in terms of its proximity to public transport connections which already served the surrounding population. The site was also considered less sensitive in terms of its potential impact on historic assets. When accessibility to individual services was considered separately, site RA/221 scored more positively in terms of its proximity to the local park/play area.

By contrast, the surrounding character of development in relation to site RA/221 enabled greater scope to offer a larger number of dwellings, with some requirement for affordable housing, which would help to meet local need. A concern for RA/221 was the impact of noise from the adjacent A43 which would require mitigation, although this was technically possible.

Both sites scored positively in terms of highways access and highway capacity, and had similar scores with respect to all other aspects of the sustainability criteria. In order to provide sufficient access to RA/120 it was likely that established trees would need to be removed from the highway verge in order to secure satisfactory visibility. This had the potential to detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area. On balance, it was considered that bringing forward site RA/221 would be preferable over RA/120, due to its less sensitive, and more central location adjacent the existing settlement, which assisted with access to the limited local services and connectivity. In addition, it would aid with the delivery of affordable housing within this rural settlement. Whilst RA/120 benefited from a number of strengths, it was located in a more sensitive and isolated position which related less well to the main hub of the village, and would result in the displacement of an existing active agricultural use.

It should be acknowledged that site RA/120 previously had historically benefitted from planning permission for 3 large dwellings which responds to the low density character of historic development in this part of the village. This development could come forward in addition to any allocation made elsewhere in the village, and would provide a different offer to the local housing market which had already been considered an appropriate form of development for this part of the village. In general, a higher density of development was considered more appropriate for site RA/221 where the surrounding pattern of development was similar.

It was recommended that site RA/221 be progressed to be taken forward, and site RA/120 be discounted on the basis that allocating both sites would be detrimental to the character and integrity of the settlement and a higher density of development at site RA/120 would be less preferable. A set of site specific criteria covering development principles for site RA/221 will be included in a draft allocation policy.

Alex Brodie addressed the committee and detailed the reasons for keeping site RA/120 as a potential site which included enhancing the appearance of the site, reducing commercial vehicle movements and amending the number of dwellings on the site.

Members felt it would be beneficial for further work to be undertaken on site RA/120.

Councillor Jelley proposed and Councillor Rowley seconded and it was

RESOLVED that both sites be deferred for further investigations.

Cranford

It is recommended that both sites continue to be considered for allocation, to seek to ensure the delivery of some affordable housing in Cranford and to then conclude on whether there are constraints regarding the WRC which would put at risk their development potential. This matter will be brought back to a future meeting of the committee for decision.

Councillor Jelley proposed and Councillor Rowley seconded and it was

RESOLVED that both sites continue to be considered for allocation.

Great Cransley

No significant issues were identified.

Councillor Bain proposed and Councillor Davies seconded and it was

RESOLVED that site RA/146 be allocated for up to 15 dwellings, with the delivery of affordable housing to benefit the community being specified in the draft allocation policy/development principles for the site.

Newton

The sustainability of Newton as a location for further development must be considered given its small scale and the lack of facilities that serve the village. Although development of the site would only be for 4 dwellings, it is recognised that there are more sustainable locations within the rural area of the Borough, which require less mitigation and present fewer constraints to development. The site is therefore not recommended for progression as an allocation and is rejected for these reasons.

Councillor Rowley proposed that conversations carry on as the Parish Council supported the development. It was noted that there was no solution to the highways issues, therefore this

would not be possible.

RESOLVED that site RA/130 be recommended for future investigation for housing allocation in the draft plan.

Pytchley

Isham Road, the location of site RA/117, was linear in character and development of the site would provide a logical extension to the existing residential development in Pytchley and was considered proportionate to the size of the village. It was deemed that development of the site, given its potential yield of 8 dwellings, was unlikely to have a significant detrimental impact on the village in terms of the capacity of existing facilities.

Councillor Rowley proposed and Councillor Jelley seconded and it was

RESOLVED that the site be recommended for allocation, with a set of criteria covering applicable development principles to accompany the draft policy.

Weston-By-Welland

Development of site RA/136, which currently comprised derelict farm buildings would provide a more attractive entrance into the village. Although it was recognised that it was a relatively small village within the context of the rural area, it was deemed that this scale of development was appropriate for this location. Due to its previous use, further investigation of the potential for contamination would be required prior to the submission of a planning application.

Councillor Jelley proposed and Councillor Rowley seconded and it was

RESOLVED that Site RA/136 be recommended as a housing allocation for up to 10 dwellings with a set of site specific criteria covering development principles for the site included in a draft allocation policy.

16.PP.35 KETTERING BOROUGH HOUSING COMPLETIONS UPDATE 2016/17

A report was submitted to inform Members of the numbers of housing completions in Kettering Borough for the period 2016/17.

Members heard that officers annually review the number of housing allocations with the target being 10,400 dwellings within a 20 year period from 2011-2031. This equates to 520 dwellings per annum. At the meeting of this committee on 8th June 2016 a shortfall in housing completions against the JCS targets was reported.

It was reported that between 1st April 2016 and 31st March 2017 704 dwellings were completed. This still finds the Council with a shortfall against the targeted numbers of completions required for this point in the JCS, but it reduced the gap substantially.

The numbers of affordable housing completions for 2016/17 rose to 200 dwellings.

Following discussions it was

RESOLVED that Members noted the content of the report

(The meeting started at 6.30 pm and finished at 8.30 pm)

Signed
Chair

AN