

Cabinet

Minutes of a Meeting of the Cabinet held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Tannery Lane, Ashford on the **10th October 2019**

Present:

Cllr. Clarkson (Chairman);
Cllr. Bartlett (Vice-Chairman);

Cllrs. Barrett, Bell, Buchanan, Clokie, Feacey, Pickering, Shorter.

Apologies:

Cllrs. Gideon, N Ovenden.

Also Present:

Cllrs. Burgess, Chilton, Dehnel, Forest, Iliffe, Harman, Hayward, Howard-Smith, Krause, Ledger, Link, Mulholland, Smith, Spain, Sparks, Wright.

Chief Executive, Director of Law and Governance, Director of Finance and Economy, Head of Legal and Democracy, Head of Corporate Property and Projects, Head of Community Safety and Wellbeing, Head of Planning and Development, Head of Housing, Head of Finance and IT, Spatial Planning Manager, Housing Operations Manager, Development and Regeneration Manager, Principal Solicitor (Strategic Development), Principal Urban Designer, Funding and Partnerships Officer, Member Services Manager (Operational).

173 Minutes

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Cabinet held on the 12th September 2019 be approved and confirmed as a correct record.

174 Leader's Announcements

The Leader said he was pleased to have seen an article in last week's Sunday Times listing Ashford in the country's top six "turnaround towns". It quoted 11.9% population growth and 11.4% employment growth in Ashford between 2009 and 2017, as well as a 16.9% increase in house prices since June 2016. Whilst there was still much to do and there was no complacency, the Leader said it was interesting to see progress in Ashford being spoken about in this way.

The Leader also advised that Kent County Council had agreed to appoint Roger Gough as its new Leader, replacing Paul Carter who had stood down after serving in this

position since 2005. He read from a note he had written to Roger Gough on behalf of Ashford Borough Council congratulating him on his appointment and advising that they looked forward to continuing to work closely with him and KCC in the future.

175 Adoption of Village Envelope Boundaries – Wye and Warehorne

The report advised that the newly adopted Local Plan included policies that referred to the 'built-up confines' of settlements and that, in consultation with Parish Councils, Officers had prepared a series of village envelope maps to indicate where the Council currently considered the existing built-up confines of settlements were. These would help to clarify the written definition in the Local Plan for the purposes of decision-making on planning applications. The report sought the Cabinet's approval to adopt the village envelope boundaries for Wye and Warehorne villages as informal guidance for development management purposes.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Reece, Chairman of Wye with Hinxhill Parish Council, spoke on this item. He thanked the Cabinet for giving them the opportunity to speak on the next three agenda items. He particularly wanted to thank the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group for their dedication and hard work in producing their report on the Masterplan process. Taken together, these items were closely interrelated and required decisions which would profoundly affect the shape and future of Wye. Turning to the proposed Wye settlement boundary, he said that the Parish Council agreed that the ADAS site was outside the built confines and much of the proposed boundary, so also was Withersdane, although it was part of Wye3 and was arbitrarily excluded from the Masterplan. The report further acknowledged that there were minor inconsistencies - one related to the incorrect boundary of the covenanted land, on which the Council had received a letter. However, the Wye Neighbourhood Plan was currently being reviewed, therefore he asked the Cabinet to defer Recommendation (i) as it related to Wye to form part of the current review. Mr Reece further advised that the implications of Recommendation (ii) greatly disturbed the Parish Council. This proposed to delegate powers to amend the boundary of the settlement envelopes in the Borough. The report stated that the village envelope maps would become material considerations in the application of Local Plan Policies HOU2, HOU3 and HOU5. The Parish Council's legal advice was that any changes should therefore only be addressed through a formal Development Plan Document and public consultation. Delegating open and indefinite powers to make changes would remove future decisions from any democratic scrutiny by the public and statutory consultees, or Elected Members, and he considered this was both unjust and unlawful. The consequence of this recommendation was that new proposals on sites currently near (but not touching) Wye3, could be subsumed into the settlement confines, creating a new boundary. Further applications could then be added to this new boundary, which became a licence for the boundary to creep ever eastwards. In his view this smacked of policy making on the hoof. The report before the Cabinet supporting this agenda item did not consider Recommendation (ii). Neither did the earlier Cabinet report on 11th April 2019, for other villages in the Borough. Therefore he considered that Cabinet had not had the implications and risks explained to it and was un-briefed on Recommendation (ii). So, in his view, a decision to adopt this recommendation would have failed to have regard to a material consideration and risked

legal action. The Parish Council asked the Cabinet to refuse Recommendation (ii) and retain control over boundary changes.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Jarman, representing Telereal Trillium, the owners of the site spoke on this item. He advised that when they had become aware of the proposal to establish a village confines for Wye in the nature set out in this report, it was fair to say that there were initially concerns as it appeared to be in conflict with the Wye Neighbourhood Plan. On the instructions of the Examiner, Policy WN1PA – the village envelope - specifically stated that between Olantigh Road and Scotton Street the village envelope would be defined by the Masterplan (on the agenda later at this meeting) and therefore this proposal was inconsistent with those provisions. However, having been assured by Officers, and it being set out clearly within the report, it had been made clear that there was no inconsistency in having different boundaries for Wye – the one in this report for the village confines of the application of the present Local Plan policy, and secondly the one in the Masterplan which showed the form of development to be set out in the Masterplan itself. There was an assurance that these could sit side by side, and on that basis they were happy to accept that this apparent inconsistency could be overlooked. In terms of the detail of the boundary itself, he noted the Officers' comment that there were elements of subjective judgment involved and he considered that must always be the case out of necessity. As a result of the agreement that the boundaries could be different and have different implications, he considered that there was not a need to go into any greater detail on those points at this stage.

The Portfolio Holder advised that a lot of the issues referred to had been looked at in great detail by the Local Plan and Planning Policy Task Group and an enormous amount of work and consideration had gone in to that, so it was not entirely true to infer that Members had not had proper oversight. This had all been done in the context of the approved Local Plan, and Policies HOU3 and HOU5 had been reflected in the considerations within the report. As Portfolio Holder he was therefore comfortable to support the soundness of the two recommendations in the report.

In response to questions about Recommendation (ii) and whether relevant Ward Members or Parish Councils should be more directly involved in decisions to amend village envelope boundaries, the Spatial Planning Manager clarified that the purpose of this recommendation was to allow the amendment of a village envelope boundary to account for the construction of new development. So this would be reactive to anything that had been built “on the ground”, and any such development would have already been considered through the statutory channels. The recommendation did not provide an opportunity to create areas for development “by the back door”. The Portfolio Holder further advised that Ward Members would be directly involved in the consultation and invited to Local Plan and Planning Policy Task Group meetings when considering such matters in order to give that local view, in liaison with their Parish Council. This was in fact one of the recommendations to come out of the Overview and Scrutiny review – the next item on the Agenda for this meeting. He was therefore comfortable with what was already going to be in place. The Chairman of the Task Group also gave an assurance that such an invitation would be made. To aid clarity it was agreed to add the words “that has taken place” to the end of the recommendation.

Resolved:

- That (i) the village envelope boundaries shown in the Appendix to the report be adopted as informal guidance for development management purposes.**
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Spatial Planning Manager, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Development to amend, where relevant, a village envelope boundary to account for the construction of new development that has taken place.**

176 Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Review into Wye3 Masterplan Process

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had undertaken a review of the Wye3 Masterplan process. In its review the Committee had made 12 recommendations which were now presented to the Cabinet. The report also included the advice of Management Team on those recommendations.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Reece, Chairman of Wye with Hinxhill Parish Council, spoke on this item. He said of the twelve recommendations made by Overview and Scrutiny, Recommendations (ii) to (xii) related not to Wye but to improvements to future masterplans. So on those, the Parish Council had no comment except to state that in their view having to make 12 recommendations dramatically highlighted how flawed the process had been from the beginning to today. The Parish Council attended one of the Task Group's meetings and laid out the flaws, as they had done previously in letters to the Chief Executive and Head of Planning, referencing dozens of documents. They had requested answers, information and meetings and most of this had gone totally unanswered. He hoped that future Masterplans would be better handled. On Recommendation (i) however, the Parish Council considered this could still influence the future of Wye for the better. He wanted to dispel any impression that there were two parallel traffic analysis reports. The Parish Council had commissioned the MLM traffic report to examine the data and methodology of the TPP traffic report and particularly to answer a question KCC Highways had that remained unanswered - regarding the frequency of delays "sometimes" at Wye level crossing, asking "how often is sometimes?" As many would know, the level crossing was the key to all traffic flow in Wye. TPP asserted that traffic was always able to clear the level crossing before the next train. He said that this was false and contrary to common experience. MLM considered a video which covered a whole week at the level crossing and showed clearly that on nine occasions the gates had to be shut in the face of oncoming traffic. Despite having asked the question, KCC had not reacted to this evidence. The MLM letter sent today stated that the TPP report was skewed in favour of the developer and erroneous and outdated in detail. Despite the fundamental importance of traffic issues, the ABC Case Officer, in his own words, "forgot to deliver the MLM report until the day before the Cabinet" last September. He said that KCC claimed to have found nothing to discredit the TPP report, but in the time available he considered that KCC could not have done the MLM report justice. He said it should also be noted that KCC Highways had not accepted the Task Group's invitation to attend a meeting. He concluded by asking that now there was new evidence, notably changes at ADAS covered in the next agenda item, and Network Rail's 2019 data on Wye level crossing risk and usage, the

Cabinet uphold Recommendation (i) to consider the MLM traffic report with the new evidence.

The Spatial Planning Manager said that on Recommendation (i) particularly he would point the Cabinet to Management Team's response which set out the issues clearly in that the substantial traffic evidence put forward by TPP on behalf of the developers had been robustly assessed by KCC. This matter had been reported to and accepted by the Cabinet in September 2018. The work undertaken by MLM on behalf of the Parish Council had not been intended as a parallel exercise and had not therefore dealt with all of the same issues. A letter had been received that afternoon from the MLM Group and whilst there had not been a lot of time to consider it, amongst its content it did state that MLM would not have necessarily expected KCC to formally respond on their assessment as the Highway Authority, despite previous concerns on this point by the Parish Council. They also did not assert that their video evidence in any way invalidated the conclusions of the TPP work. So in summary he advised that the transport evidence in support of the Masterplan had been assessed thoroughly by KCC and they had reached their own independent view. That view was open to debate and disagreement, but Officer's advice was that the matter had been properly considered and did not need to be re-opened as part of the masterplanning process.

One of the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group said he wanted to comment on Management Team's advice to reject four of the twelve recommendations. On Recommendation (i), he considered that the Parish Council had been poorly treated and felt so aggrieved that they had spent money on their own transport report, and the seven day consideration was in stark contrast to the Developer's one day. The assertion that TPP's conclusions were sound did have to be called in to question as two reports on the same village differed so much. He did not think KCC had done justice to the MLM report and the refusal to attend the Task Group meetings meant they had not been able to get to the crux of the matter over the variations in the reports. Independent advice would give everyone confidence to make the right decisions which is why he supported Recommendation (i). It did not undermine any trust or working relationship and he was sure that the short time it would take to allow for a proper analysis would not place any detriment on the already delayed process. Regarding Recommendation (ii), he accepted this was a wide and all-encompassing one, but having been let down in Wye, the Task Group considered there were times when KCC did the bare minimum and agreed to traffic reports without proper analysis. Independent assessments, or even a qualified Officer employed by the Council were seen as the way forward in order to be able to judge whether traffic reports were sound. Management Team's suggestion that relationships with KCC were strengthened was welcomed, but it was important that the whole process, not just the methodology, was thoroughly assessed. On Recommendation (iii), he considered that the review had demonstrated that there was a need for adequate support for Officers with large caseloads who were also trying to complete a Masterplan process. The recommendation was seeking a commitment from the Council to ensure that such processes continued and were not undermined when other factors intervened. He understood that it was early days for the new Planning structure, but that was still bedding in and he considered adoption of this recommendation would guarantee an ongoing level of support for future masterplanning processes. Finally, with regard to Recommendation (vii), this had been made with a recognition that the overarching Local Plan and Planning Policy Task Group may not have the time to take on such specific work, and a smaller, more focussed group would

be able to meet more often as required and ensure a simpler process to support Officers and the major stakeholders.

The Portfolio Holder said he wanted to thank the Task Group for the way it went about its business in undertaking this review. Of the 12 recommendations made, eight had been clearly supported by Management Team and he also urged the Cabinet to approve those eight. With regard to the other four, firstly it was important to say that this Council had to respect KCC's view as the Highway Authority. He also wanted to make clear that the new structure for Planning would make significant positive changes to the Service and he was confident that when everyone was in place early next year the Service would be transformed, so to talk about further changes at this stage was premature. As mentioned in the previous item, he considered that the Local Plan and Planning Policy Task Group was the right 'Member led vehicle' to deal with masterplanning issues, with that previous caveat that Ward Members be formally invited to relevant meetings to reflect the local view. He therefore supported Management Team's comments on Recommendations (i), (ii), (iii) and (vii) and asked the Cabinet to reject those four recommendations for the reasons given.

Resolved:

- That**
- (i) a clearly defined scope and timeline be agreed at the commencement of any future masterplanning exercises.**
 - (ii) where masterplanning exercises are to be carried out collaboratively with a steering group, clearly defined terms of reference for the steering group including the roles of each partner to the steering group are jointly agreed prior to the commencement of any future masterplanning exercise.**
 - (iii) where masterplanning exercises are to be carried out collaboratively with a steering group, an independent chair should be engaged to lead the steering group.**
 - (iv) an independent external facilitator be retained for all workshop elements of any future masterplanning exercises.**
 - (v) in order to ensure continuity as far as possible throughout future masterplanning exercises, a single list of invitees should be maintained for all workshop events.**
 - (vi) the Council ensure it provides clear, regular updates on the development of any masterplan to stakeholders throughout any future masterplanning exercise.**
 - (vii) the Council maintain a single point of contact throughout any future masterplanning process for the gathering and dissemination of any and all information related to the masterplanning exercise.**
 - (viii) the Council ensure that any and all responses to consultation or engagement exercises conducted on masterplanning be submitted directly to the Council.**

(ix) the remaining four recommendations be not adopted.

177 Adoption of the Draft Wye 3/WNP11 Masterplan

This report was a follow-up to the Cabinet report of September 2018 and considered issues raised at the time of the Cabinet resolution and subsequently in respect of the former ADAS site that formed part of the draft masterplan area. The Cabinet was asked to approve the draft masterplan as informal guidance for development management purposes, subject to the suggested changes in the recommendations, to assist decision-making on applications within the Masterplan's boundary.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Jarman, representing Telereal Trillium, the owners of the site spoke on this item. He said he was pleased that, after a long gestation period, the Masterplan had reached the point of adoption and he hoped the Cabinet would follow Officers' advice to adopt. Like all parties to the Masterplan process there had been frustrations at delays along the way, but they did feel that the plan in its current form would be of great value in guiding the re-use and re-development of the former Wye College building complex. There was one point of detail that he wanted to address the Cabinet on and that was the proposal to reduce the number of buildings proposed at the former ADAS complex from 20 to 15. As a brownfield site with substantial existing buildings, that already had been subject of extensive negotiations with Officers, he asked that this be reconsidered and retained at 20. Indeed, during the process the number had already been reduced substantially from 27 to 20 and following the Cabinet's interim approval of that number last September that had progressed to pre-application discussions in January 2019 and the recent submission of the planning application. The Officers' comments with regard to the permitted development rights were noted but he felt that the key point was that the complex of buildings remained exactly the same in terms of site, buildings and constraints, so a proposal for 20 was realistic and still would reduce the overall amount of built floor space on the site within the AONB. He was aware supporting this in the Masterplan would in no way guarantee permission for 20 in a planning application and that would be dealt with at the appropriate time.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Bartley, of Wye with Hinxhill Parish Council spoke on this item. He asked the Cabinet if Council Officers were clear on what kind of document they were recommending for adoption tonight. In his view Paragraphs 70 and 71 of the report suggested they did not. It was a document that had moved from a Supplementary Planning Document to a Design Brief. He said that adopted policy stated that the Masterplan should be a Supplementary Planning Document, and therefore be compliant with Regulation 8, and conform to other policy documents. The Parish Council knew that Telereal had challenged this policy requirement on the 25th April 2016. Then, at some point, Officers had pronounced that 'it had been decided' that the Masterplan would just be 'informal guidance'. He wondered where was the justification for this significant change to adopted policy, since planning law required that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan, in this case the Local Plan and Wye Neighbourhood Plan? Despite the receipt of some 2,000 comments, he said that the Masterplan map in Appendix 1 to the report had remained unchanged in over two years, bar one minor change to help the bin lorries. He asked where was the evidence that Officers had reassessed the entire Masterplan against the

new Local Plan and revised NPPF policies? In the absence of this reassessment he asked how the Cabinet could know if the scale of the development proposed by the Masterplan was proportionate to the size of Wye and whether, the proposal would conserve and enhance the AONB's natural beauty? Specifically he asked how Policy HOU2 would apply in relation to heritage assets and the proposed care home flats, and HOU3a and HOU5 elsewhere on Wye3? He also asked why this Masterplan ignored Withersdane? These were a few of what he considered to be the many fundamental flaws in the process. With regard to traffic, he said that the TPP Assessment used an imputed fall back allowance. All the Cabinet had in front of it were assertions, and these pre-dated the change in the lawful use of the ADAS site and it's, as yet unknown, fall-back position. He asked where was the evidence of assessment of the MLM analysis? The ADAS site had profound implications for traffic. The lawful use issue would reverberate and impact on every number within the traffic model, on which the Masterplan relied. Therefore, before any consideration of which traffic assessment was right, he considered it was fundamental that the new lawful position of the ADAS site was clarified, and correctly reconsidered within any modelling, and reviewed by KCC Highways. Advice had been sought from Counsel, who confirmed the Parish Council's view that the ADAS permitted development granted in January 2016 was not lawful. Therefore, he considered that the fall back, the workshops and indeed the entire Masterplan consultation process was based on a false presumption of residential development, and therefore an inflated land use value. He said that there was no evidence in the report that Officers had assessed the hasty proposal for 15 Units on the ADAS site against the usual policy requirements, therefore this recommendation was flawed and open to challenge. Mr Bartley said that given the complexity of the issues and the impasse that had been reached on this site, a positive suggestion would be a Neighbourhood Development Order which could resolve WYE3 equitably. In conclusion he said that Telereal had stated publicly in 2015 that 'The Imperial Masterplan was in the bin'. He now invited the Cabinet to bin Telereal's WYE3 Masterplan, and not accept the recommendations, or adopt what he called a "flawed, quasi-policy document".

The Portfolio Holder said that he wanted to assure all present that the amount of work that had been put in by Planning Officers to arrive at their conclusion had not been reported in its totality and the report was only the 'tip of the iceberg' in terms of that work. In terms of the previous report that came to the Cabinet in September 2018, new information had come to light and the report had been reviewed and found to be wanting. That new information had brought about the changes to the numbers and the historical use of the ADAS buildings. Much of the consideration was judgment based, but based on real experience and analysis of this important site within the AONB. He understood that there were strong opinions on this matter, but on balance he considered the report in front of Cabinet was sound and he urged colleagues to support the Officer's recommendations.

The Spatial Planning Manager said that this matter had to a large degree already been covered by the Cabinet back in September 2018. A number of the issues raised then by the Parish Council were matters that since that point had now been addressed, for example the MLM traffic assessment and concerns about Officers checking for the presence of any outstanding representations on the draft Masterplan. This had therefore come back to the Cabinet at this meeting mainly because of the ADAS site. Significant new evidence had come forward in respect of whether the prior approval process was the appropriate one to determine whether that building could be converted to flats or not, and this report demonstrated that there had been a very thorough exercise undertaken,

with the benefit of Counsel's opinion, to confirm Officers' views that were reported to the Cabinet in September 2018 were in fact incorrect and that advice to Members had now been corrected. In the absence of that previous fall-back position, Officers had reconsidered what they viewed as the appropriate numbers for the ADAS site in the Masterplan. On balance a small reduction in the amount of development on the ADAS site was viewed as appropriate and should be made to the Masterplan.

Resolved:

That the draft masterplan for the WNP11 area be adopted as informal guidance for development management purposes subject to the following:-

- (i) the wording and any associated diagrams or maps be changed to reflect that residential redevelopment of the former ADAS site should not exceed the existing footprint of previously developed land and be up to a maximum of 15 residential units; the amendments to be to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning and Development, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning & Development.**
- (ii) wording be changed to the appropriate Planning and Design Principles section to include further general principles sections on grey water recycling measures in accordance with paragraph 63 of the September 2018 Cabinet report; the amendments to be to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning and Development, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning & Development.**
- (iii) the inclusion of those amendments to the draft masterplan listed in the attached schedule of proposed changes, appended to the report; and,**
- (iv) any other consequential minor amendments considered necessary by the Head of Planning and Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning & Development.**

178 Local Authority Lottery Scheme

The Portfolio Holder introduced the report which sought Members approval to undertake the necessary legal and project management tasks to develop and deliver a Local Authority lottery scheme for the benefit of the local voluntary sector and the residents of the Borough.

Two Members expressed concerns about the proposal in terms of its potential effect on those who may be susceptible to gambling addictions and whether such a lottery was sustainable given previous experience of an Ashford Borough Council run lottery scheme in the 1980s where initial interest very quickly lost momentum. They therefore wondered if a Council run lottery was an appropriate thing to be lending support to and whether there were better and more moral ways to raise funds for charitable causes. Both the Portfolio Holder and the Leader said they had some sympathy with those comments, but these matters had already been considered and this would not be a lottery of instant gratification such as scratchcards, game machines or online

gaming/betting. Dover District Council had been running such a scheme since February and had been very successful, as had a number of other Local Authorities, in raising money for the local voluntary sector and local not for profit clubs.

Resolved:

- That (i) a set up budget of circa £11,000 be agreed to be allocated that will enable a Local Authority lottery scheme to be launched.**
- (ii) the Head of Culture and the Head of Legal and Democracy be authorised, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Culture, Tourism and Leisure, to agree and settle all necessary licences, legal requirements and documents and to contract with an External Lottery Manager to deliver an appropriate Local Authority lottery scheme for the Ashford Borough.**

179 Housing – Current Delivery, Finance and Onward Strategy

The Portfolio Holder introduced the report which, amongst other elements, included the Council's new Affordable Housing Delivery Plan 2019-2023 for endorsement. This set out how the right homes would be delivered in the right places and the strategic context in which the delivery programme sat, enabling work with Registered Providers and acquisitions (land and on-street purchases). He wanted to thank the Officers involved for producing such a detailed document. It was admittedly ambitious, but it would put Ashford at the forefront of delivering affordable social housing in Kent. The document was also holistic in the way it looked to deliver affordable housing in the Borough along the lines of the Council's wider corporate agenda – carbon neutrality by 2030, space standards, decent homes for all and attempting to remove the stigma regarding social housing. The document was also flexible in that it would allow for a change of direction if and when needed, in response to changing circumstances in future years.

The report was opened up to Members and the following responses were given to questions/comments: -

- The commitment to carbon neutrality was something that was being closely examined by Housing and its contractors/partners in terms of embracing new heating methods and technologies. It was important to constantly challenge themselves to deliver the facilities to meet the targets that had been set. In terms of existing stock they were working with Engie to examine their expertise in energy provision and potential retro-fitting. This had of course not yet been costed, but a provision had been included within the business plan and this would be kept under review going forward.
- The Chief Executive and the Portfolio Holder for Finance and IT agreed to examine possibilities for the Council to be more flexible with the dates it took direct debit payments, particularly for those claiming Universal Credit.
- The plan had been closely analysed in financial terms and had been found to be sound. The level of debt for the current proposed programme could be repaid

within 20-23 years and was affordable and manageable within the life of the current business plan. Clearly though it would have to be kept under review on a year on year basis.

- There was some risk to the Council if there was a significant and sustained increase in Right to Buys due to legislative changes, but this was not anticipated and the business plan did have flexibility to deal with changing circumstances.
- In terms of disabled adaptations, the business plan did maintain the budget for these in the Council stock, including the support for the In-House Occupational Therapist post who worked on adaptations and Disabled Facilities Grants. In addition, the significant amount of work undertaken within the HRA to meet the needs of disabled people would continue.

Resolved:

- That**
- (i) the progress in delivering the affordable housing programme in the HRA be noted.**
 - (ii) the impact of the Housing Department on the corporate agenda, as detailed in paragraph 4 of the report be noted.**
 - (iii) the priorities set out in paragraphs 5 & 6 of the report be agreed.**
 - (iv) the updated HRA Business Plan and financial projections as set out in the report and in Appendix A to the report be agreed.**
 - (v) it be noted that Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) will review the HRA Business Plan financial projections as part of the budget scrutiny process.**
 - (vi) it be agreed that given the positive impact of street purchases on the overall programme, the existing delegation to the Head of Housing (no.14.9) be amended as set out in paragraph 35 of the report.**
 - (vii) authority be delegated to the Head of Housing, in consultation with the Head of Finance and IT and the Portfolio Holder for Housing, to bid for and/or purchase land suitable for housing development, up to a value of £5m., subject to the availability of sufficient funding (as explained in paragraph 65 of the report).**
 - (viii) the Council's plans for future housing delivery as set out in Exempt Appendix B to the report, which represents the full delivery programme be agreed, and authority be delegated to the Head of Housing, in consultation with the Head of Finance and IT and the Portfolio Holders for Housing and Finance and IT, to vary the programme as necessary**
 - (ix) the detailed delivery plan entitled "Building on Solid Foundations" at Appendix D of the report be endorsed.**

180 Joint Transportation Board Minutes – 10th September 2019

One of the Ward Members for Aylesford and East Stour referred to the Aylesford Place and Newtown Road Underpass repairs. The report from KCC Officers at the Joint Transportation Board meeting had been extremely disappointing, and indeed a month on since that meeting nothing had been done. It had now been made clear that the CCTV cameras there were not being monitored. KCC had made a pledge that they were going to get estimates to do the work but nothing had been done and they were now approaching the time of the year where there would be darker evenings and the underpass would become even more dangerous for those using it, including children going to and from the North School. He therefore asked if KCC could be encouraged to act sooner rather than later.

The Deputy Leader, who was also Vice-Chairman of the Joint Transportation Board, said he would raise this with KCC Officers. The Head of Community Safety and Wellbeing advised that she would also contact KCC Officers for an update on this. She advised that the cameras in this location had not been operational for a number of years and quotes for replacements were being pursued.

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Joint Transportation Board held on the 10th September 2019 be received and noted.

181 Economic Regeneration and Investment Board Notes – 11th September 2019

Resolved:

That the Notes of the Meeting of the Economic Regeneration and Investment Board held on the 11th September 2019 be received and noted.

182 Schedule of Key Decisions to be Taken

Resolved:

That the latest Schedule of Key Decisions as set out within the report be received and noted.

183 Exclusion of the Public

Resolved:

That pursuant to Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item, as it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the public were present there would

be disclosure of exempt information hereinafter specified by reference to Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A of the Act, where in the circumstances the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

184 Corporate Property and Projects – Service Changes

The Portfolio Holder introduced the confidential report which asked Cabinet to consider proposals to change the Corporate Property and Projects Service, the impact these would have on the delivery of service priorities and the consultation process followed.

Resolved:

- That (i) **the recommendations of the Joint Consultative Committee of 27th September 2019, which note the outcomes of the consultation and proposals for the Corporate Property and Projects Service, be endorsed.**
- (ii) **the implementation of the service changes of the Corporate Property and Projects Service be approved as outlined in the Joint Consultative Committee report of 27th September 2019.**

Recommended:

That the potential costs of £46,427 resulting from early release of pension on the grounds of redundancy be approved.

Queries concerning these Minutes? Please contact Member Services:
Telephone: 01233 330349 Email: membersservices@ashford.gov.uk
Agendas, Reports and Minutes are available on: <http://ashford.moderngov.co.uk>