

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE

4.00pm 18 JUNE 2015

CONFERENCE ROOM 2, JUBILEE LIBRARY, JUBILEE STREET, BRIGHTON

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Morgan (Chair) Robins (Deputy Chair), Peltzer Dunn (Opposition Spokesperson), Druitt (Group Spokesperson), Greenbaum, Morris, Nemeth, O'Quinn, C Theobald and Yates

PART ONE

1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

A) Declaration of Substitutes

1.1 There were none.

B) Declarations of Interests

1.2 Councillor Druitt declaration a personal interest in respect of Item 6: Public Involvement in relation to the two petitions listed at (e) & (f): his own business ran bus services and if the area of land listed in the agenda were developed it could improve the business case for a bus route.

1.3 Councillor Druitt also declared a personal interest in respect of Item 9: Designation of Business/Neighbourhood Area and Neighbourhood Forum – Brighton Marina in respect of the same reason as listed at 1.2.

1.4 Councillor Druitt declared a final personal interest in respect of Item 12: Major Project Update as his business premises was located at Black Rock.

1.5 Councillor Peltzer Dunn declared a personal interest in respect of Item 6: Public Involvement in relation to the petition listed at (c) as he was a member of the bowls club.

C) Exclusion of Press and Public

1.6 In accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (“the Act”), the Committee considered whether the public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item of business on the grounds that it is likely in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during it, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information as defined in Section 100A (3) of the Act.

1.7 **RESOLVED** - That the public are not excluded from any item of business on the agenda.

2 CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & CULTURE COMMITTEE

2.1 RESOLVED:

- 1) That the Committee's terms of reference, as set out in Appendix A to this report, be noted; and,
- 2) That the establishment of an Urgency Sub-Committee the membership of such Urgency Sub-Committee shall consist of the Chair of the Committee, and two other Members nominated by the Group Leader or Leaders as appropriate to meet the requirements for the allocation of seats between political groups., to exercise its powers in relation to matters of urgency, on which it is necessary to make a decision before the next ordinary meeting of the Committee be approved.

3 MINUTES

3.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Chair be authorised to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2015 as correct record.

4 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 The Chair gave the following communications:

“There have been 4 further conferences confirmed for the Brighton Centre since the last meeting of this committee

The Visitor Services Team are working with Visit England on an Access for All campaign aiming to improve the visitor experience for disabled visitors to the city

Since the last committee the Royal Pavilion and Museums have secured £92.5k from the John Ellerman Foundation to focus on our film and media collections

Our libraries have run a whole series of engagement programmes such as Dementia Awareness Week and Autism Pride Day which was launched earlier today here in Jubilee Library

We have just submitted a Stage 2 Heritage Lottery fund bid for the Volks Railway and will hear the outcome in September

We are delighted that we have managed to work with our partners Freedom Leisure to continue to offer free swimming to under 16s in the city – with participation numbers increasing.

The Eco Tech show took place recently up at the American Express Stadium which I spoke at and I have also met with the city's Economic Partnership.

A petition with over 5,300 signatures by Our Brighton Hippodrome is not being presented today. It asks the council to support plans for theatre restoration and to use all available powers and its best endeavours to facilitate such plans.

I can confirm that we are now in positive discussions with Academy Music Group, the new owner of the Hippodrome, Hippodrome House and the access yard off Ship Street.

We have agreed to join a stakeholders group with Our Brighton Hippodrome, Brighton Hippodrome CIC, The Theatres Trust, Historic England and the Frank Matcham Society. The stakeholder group will work with Academy Music Group to find the best way forward to bring the Hippodrome back to life. The council will assist in that process by sharing relevant information for an independent viability assessment.”

5 CALL OVER

5.1 The Committee agreed to call all the reports listed on the agenda for decision.

6 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

6.1 The Chair noted there were a number of public items listed on the agenda.

(A) Petitions

(i) The Hippodrome

6.2 This petition was withdrawn from the agenda.

(ii) Traffic Assessment Saltdean and Surrounds

6.2 The Chair asked Cathy Gallagher to present her petition.

6.3 Ms Gallagher thanked the Chair and explained that the residents of Saltdean faced severe and growing road congestion with traffic cueing each day; it was estimated that 14,000 vehicles passed through Rottingdean High Street each day and Council Officers were currently assessing the traffic in the area. The potential for an additional 100 homes in the immediate area would make the issue worse, and the petition requested that all proposed developments over five units should be the subject of a traffic assessment. The traffic problems spilt over beyond the normal peak hours expected for congestion, and it was felt the Council were underestimating the extent of the problem. In summary the petition asked for enforcement to help relieve some of the busiest junctions.

6.4 In response to a query from Councillor Robins the petitioner explained that they opposed development on greenfield sites; whilst they were in favour of development on brownfield sites they felt this needed proper traffic assessments.

6.5 Councillor Greenbaum noted that she shared resident's concerns in relation to air quality.

6.6 The Chair provided the following response to the petition:

“I note your concerns about the impact of traffic on Saltdean arising from new development and your concern that its effects have not been considered cumulatively.

I can confirm that the city council *has* looked at the cumulative impact of new development proposed in the City Plan through the Strategic Transport Assessment (STA). It looks at the cumulative impact of new development on trunk roads and travel in the city and the effectiveness of mitigation measures. This Assessment was updated in June 2014 to look at the impact of the additional housing potential on urban fringe sites. In summary, the Assessment did not identify any fundamental constraints to urban fringe development that could not be mitigated.

In terms of considering the local impacts of development you can be assured that the impact of individual development sites will be assessed through further work on the urban fringe sites and through Part 2 of the City Plan - the site allocation Plan. Residents will be consulted on the content of Part 2 Plan early next year and then on detailed allocations.

If planning applications for development on urban fringe sites are received before the adoption of City Plan Part 2 then the traffic impact of proposals will be considered through a detailed traffic impact assessment. These will be required with planning applications. Residents will be consulted on all planning applications.

Once again, thank you for your petition, I note your concerns and will pass your petition to the relevant Team in Planning.”

6.7 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee note the petition.

(iii) King Alfred Indoor Bowling

6.8 The Chair noted the petition had been referred from Council on 19 March 2015.

6.9 Councillor Peltzer Dunn noted his sympathy with the petition and stated his view that the proposals for the new King Alfred were not realistic and would not meet the requirements of indoor bowls.

6.10 The Chair provided the following response to the petition:

“Thank you for your petition. The council does have ambitious plans for a new Kings Alfred Sport and Leisure Facility and it is very important that the current redevelopment scheme is successful, as the existing facility will only become less viable to keep open as the building further ages.

To give the best possible opportunity for a new redevelopment scheme to be viable, the council has proceeded with a detailed competitive dialogue process in which bidders are encouraged to provide the best possible sports centre on the current site or elsewhere in the Hove catchment area. That process was agreed by Policy & Resources Committee in July 2013 in accordance with the recommendations of the cross party Project Board,

who have had corporate oversight on the process before and since that decision was taken.

The bidders must meet a minimum specification for a sports centre, but are encouraged to provide a range of enhancements in line with the maximum specification as approved by the Policy & Resources Committee. In relation to indoor bowls, the minimum specification requires a 3 rink bowls hall, while the enhanced specification requires a 6 rink bowls hall, with a full range of associated club facilities (including bar, lounge, catering provision for 64 people, committee room and changing rooms). While a 3 rink bowls hall may not be considered ideal, it would certainly retain the ability for the public to play indoor bowls in a council, rather than private, facility in the city. Moreover the other 8 clubs that use the existing facility and play on 3 rinks would be able to continue unaffected.

In an ideal world, a bidder would provide a sports centre with all the enhanced requirements specified for swimming, sports hall, health & fitness and other areas, as well as indoor bowls, to achieve the best possible sports centre from the redevelopment. However we need to manage our expectations and be realistic. As with the request for a 50m pool, it will depend on whether a bidder is able to include such an enhancement, given design constraints and the need for an enabling development (of predominantly new housing on the site) to help fund the new centre. Indeed it was for this very reason that officers, the Project Board and Policy & Resources Committee carefully considered the parameters of the minimum specification.

While it is acknowledged that indoor bowls is a positive activity for those taking part, it does need to be recognised that (i) a 6 rink facility is a large area due to the wide open span of space needed, (ii) the usage is relatively low when compared with other provision e.g. swimming, and (iii) it is predominately used for only 6 months of a year.

A balance will be required by bidders when considering the potential uses to achieve a viable scheme. Realistically it is unlikely that all the enhancements can be provided, but this will be determined by the competitive dialogue process, the results of which will return to Committee. In any event it is not possible this late in the process to halt or change the process of procurement for a new sports centre of which the bowls element is a part.”

6.11 Councillor Nemeth stated that expertise in relation to the sport was with the local club, and he asked how many meetings had been held with the local club; Officers agreed to send a response to this query following the meeting.

6.12 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee note the petition.

(iv) Save Preston Park Cycle Track

6.13 The Chair noted the petition had been referred from Council on 19 March 2015.

6.14 Councillor C. Theobald stated that she had been to see the track herself; observed it in use and she hoped there would be funding available to keep it operational.

- 6.15 The Chair provided the following response to the petition and highlighted that a report would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee:

“Thank you for your petition. I know the Preston Park cycle track is a popular facility and it is great to see the growing interest in the sport.

Changes in Health and Safety guidance mean that the track no longer meets competition standards and British Cycling (the sport’s governing body) have advised that it can no longer be used for racing. The main issue is that the type and positioning of fencing around the track does not meet the required standards.

The track is still considered to be safe to use for coaching and training with mitigation measures in place, and continues to be used regularly both by clubs and individuals. The track itself is still considered to be in a reasonable condition but the stand will be demolished because it was no longer structurally sound.

The area in which the cycle track is located is a shared space. The track itself is laid around the cricket pitch used by St Peters Cricket Club which is also a very popular facility. The club are in advanced discussions with the council to take on the lease for the site and have carried out their own fund raising to help pay for improvements.

Officers are working with British Cycling to explore the issues and possible options.

The cost implications of carrying out the required improvements are expected to be significant. Initial estimates indicate that replacing the fencing with that of the required standard would cost in the order of £300,000. Refurbishment of the facility including relaying of the track itself is estimated to cost £880,000.

The council doesn’t have any capital resource allocated specifically for this work and on-going maintenance costs of any future investment also need to be factored in.

A number of funding opportunities are being explored by officers including s106 funding and funds ring-fenced to Preston Park from the parking scheme.

However these funds are not specifically allocated to the cycle track. The parking surplus is ring-fenced to improvements to the whole park. It has funded the recent refurbishment of the toilets by the Rotunda café, there is an agreement to fund improvements to the Chalet Toilets next year and a longer term management plan is being produced to inform expenditure priorities and maximise match funding opportunities.

A report will come to the next meeting of this committee detailing options for the cycle track. It will include a breakdown of the capital and revenue cost implications for each and outline potential funding sources. The report will also include the local context in terms of other park users and implications associated with any significant investment in the cycling facility.”

- 6.13 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee note the petition.

(v/vi) Protect Longhill Close Woodland

6.14 The Chair noted the petition had been referred from Council on 19 March 2015; there was also a Member Letter from Councillor Mears listed at agenda Item 7 (c) on the same topic and proposed that both items be taken together. The Chair invited Councillor Mears to speak to her letter.

6.15 Councillor Mears stated that residents had spoken on this matter at Council, and there were a number of sites within her Ward, Rottingdean Coastal, that could be affected by development on the urban fringe. Residents were concerned that the assessment would pave the way for development on sites. In relation to Brownfield sites Councillor Mears felt that the authority could do more to take advantage of funds available from Central Government given the housing constraints in the city. There were ongoing concerns that the price of properties in the city would not help to alleviate the housing need in the city. Councillor Mears stated that the issue needed to be discussed; residents were concerned about the impact on the woodland and wildlife in the area affected.

6.16 The Chair provided the following response to the petition and Member letter:

“I would first like to assure you that the City Plan Part One does not allocate any urban fringe sites for development. Instead it broadly identifies the urban fringe as having potential for 1000 dwellings based on the findings of the Urban Fringe Assessment. This work was required by the Planning Inspector for the City Plan who, at the Examination Hearing, did not consider the city council had been positive enough about housing development in the urban fringe.

The proposed changes to policies in the City Plan commit us to carrying out a more detailed assessment of urban fringe sites including site 43 – this will look more carefully at ecology, landscape impact and archaeology.

This further work will inform which sites will go forward into housing allocations in Part 2 of the City Plan. I can also assure you that local residents will be given the opportunity to comment on all site allocations proposed in the Plan.

We are expecting some planning applications to come in for urban fringe sites before the Part 2 of the Plan is adopted. Where this happens residents will be consulted and details of proposals will be considered through the planning application process

Once again, thank you for your petition, your detailed concerns are noted and the petition will be passed to the relevant Team in Planning.”

6.17 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that the submission from the residents and the Councillor Mears illustrated the problem with the overall approach the strategic planning in the city. It was also clear that some sites were more emotive for residents; he welcomed the response from the Chair and the assurance provided.

(B) Written Questions**(i) Caroline Lynch – Regulation 7 Direction, Article 4**

6.18 The Chair noted there was one question from Caroline Lynch, and invited Ms Lynch to come forward and put her question to the Committee. Ms Lynch thanked the Chair, and asked:

“In 2010 BHCC applied for a Regulation 7 Direction for the conservation areas of town to prevent the blight of estate agents boards, this was passed. In 2009 the Student Housing Strategy recommended similar action be investigated for the Article 4 wards for the well documented and well known significant blight of these boards cause in our area. Nothing has been done to progress this. I would like to ask today that the current Regulation 7 Direction be extended to cover all Article 4 wards and I have been directed by the Planning Committee to you to initiate this action.”

6.19 In response to Chair stated:

“There were very considerable difficulties experienced in bringing into effect the Regulation 7 Direction in the central conservation areas. The Secretary of State did not confirm the original order and directed that the area be significantly reduced to the streets most impacted by subdivision of properties and of greatest uniformity of townscape.

In the light of that experience the officer assessment was that the prospect of a favourable outcome of a regulation 7 Direction being approved over an extensive area of five wards was extremely remote.

A Regulation 7 direction would involve a very considerable amount of officer time commitment in developing the case and could not be committed without reasonable prospect of a positive outcome.

Since the time of the original student housing strategy there have been Regulation 7 directions accepted in similar circumstances elsewhere in the country. These precedents could be revisited as part of the review of the student housing strategy.”

6.20 By way of a supplementary question Ms Lynch asked if the review was already underway; the Chair deferred to Officers and it was explained review had not yet, but there were over 100 different recommendations. In relation to conservation areas there was a specific requirement for the local authority to create management plans, and this would be considered as part of the review. The Chair agreed that the Strategic Housing Partnership could contact Ms Lynch when they start the review so she would be able to feed into this.

6.21 There were no further items of public involvement.

7 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

7.1 The Member letter listed as Item 7(c) was considered with Item 6.

8 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING - DELEGATION OF DECISIONS

- 8.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Environment, Development & Housing in relation to Neighbourhood Planning – Delegation of Decisions. The report sought to obtain approval for all decisions and responses in respect of neighbourhood planning to be delegated to the Executive Director; excluding decisions to make a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). Currently all formal decisions in respect of neighbourhood planning had to be made by the Committee; apart from those relating to NDP which had to be made by Council.
- 8.2 In response to Councillor Druitt it was explained that the preferred position would be to not to ask for Officer delegation on the matter; however, due to the timetabling of meetings it was not always possible for decisions to come to Committee in a timely manner. There was also little discretion, in terms of the legislation, for Members to influence the outcome of applications – only where proposed areas overlapped.
- 8.3 In response to Councillor Nemeth it was explained that there was no sanction in the legislation for not meeting the required timescales, but there was a clear indication from Central Government that local authorities should comply with the legislative requirements. Councillor Nemeth supported the convening of an Urgency Sub-Committee in circumstances where it was not possible to bring the matter before Committee in time. Councillor Peltzer Dunn also agreed with this suggestion and argued it would provide a clear democratic mandate.
- 8.4 Councillor Yates stated his view that the thrust if the Localism Act had been to empower communities; he felt that this did not necessarily translate that all decisions had to be taken by elected Members; if the scope for Member discretion was limited he would be satisfied with the recommendation in the report.
- 8.5 In response to Councillor Robins it was clarified by Officers that no policy needed to be applied to these decisions; instead the legislation set out the criteria that had to be met; if this were done then the local authority had to approve the area becoming a neighbourhood forum.
- 8.6 In response to a further question from Councillor Druitt it was explained that the local authority had a duty to assist residents with their applications.
- 8.7 The Chair proposed the following amendment: where timetabling allowed applications would come before the Committee for decision; where this was not possible the Chair, Deputy Chair and Opposition would be consulted, and unless there was consensus amongst Members an Urgency Sub-Committee would be convened. The Chair put the amended recommendation to the vote, and it was **carried**.
- 8.8 The Chair then put the amended recommendation to the vote.
- 8.9 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee agrees to the following process for dealing with all decisions and responses required in respect of neighbourhood planning:

- i) Where timetabling allows applications to be determined within the legislative timescales these will be brought to the Economic Development & Culture Committee for decisions,
- ii) Where timetabling does not allow this the Executive Director for Environment, Development & Housing will consult with the Chair, Deputy Chair and Opposition Spokesperson will be consulted and:
 - a. If there is unanimous consensus amongst the views of Members the application will be determined,
 - b. If there is no unanimous consensus amongst Members an Urgency Sub-Committee will be convened to determine the application.

9 DESIGNATION OF BUSINESS/NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA AND NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM - BRIGHTON MARINA

- 9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Environment, Development & Housing relation to Designation of Business/Neighbourhood Area and Neighbourhood Forum – Brighton Marina. The report sought to determine two neighbourhood planning applications at the Marina following their deferral at the 15 January 2015 meeting of the Committee. The applications related to the designation of Brighton Marina as a Business Neighbourhood Area and a neighbourhood forum for the Brighton Marina neighbourhood area.
- 9.2 In response to Councillor Greenbaum it was explained that if the applications met the criteria in the legislation then the local authority had a duty to grant the application; any reasons for refusal would have to be clear to ensure the authority was not considered to be acting irrational.
- 9.3 In response to Councillor Druitt it was confirmed that the business/neighbourhood area differing primarily as it related to the business nature of an area that the plan sought to promote.
- 9.4 In response to Councillor Morris it was clarified that business and neighbourhood plans could not overlap geographically; the legislation enabled plans to be drafted so that both businesses and residents could input to to create a mutually agreed plan.
- 9.5 The Chair put the recommendations to the vote. Councillor Greenbaum asked that her vote against the recommendations be recorded.
- 9.6 **RESOLVED – That:**
 - 1) That the committee approves the designation of the Brighton Marina Business Neighbourhood Area as a business area neighbourhood area within the meaning of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as defined by the Area delineated in appendix A to this report.

- 2) That the committee approves the designation of the Brighton Marina Neighbourhood Forum as a neighbourhood forum within the meaning of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

10 LOCAL LIST OF HERITAGE ASSETS - ADOPTION

- 10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Environment, Development & Housing in relation to Local List of Heritage Assets – Adoption. The report outlined the results of the local list review with a view to adopt a fully updated local list of heritage assets and associated Planning Advice Note (PAN). The review followed a request for nominations and consultation on a draft local list of heritage assets. An updated and objective list would inform local development management decisions and help protect to city’s historic environment. It was confirmed that inclusion on the list gave buildings no additional protection in statute, but was important in identifying buildings that had local interest. Few of these buildings were located in conservation areas as they had their own delegations.
- 10.2 It was confirmed for Councillor Robins that the buildings were included under both land registry name and any colloquial name – the example of Portslade Police Station was referenced.
- 10.3 It was confirmed for Councillor Yates that there would be a project to include these buildings as part of the mapping information on the Council’s website.
- 10.4 In response to Councillor Nemeth it was clarified that was a process to ‘spot’ list buildings; this differed depending on whether the building was considered to be at risk or not.
- 10.5 In response to Councillor Druitt it was confirmed that the list removed buildings with a statutory listing to avoid confusion.
- 10.6 In response to Councillor O’Quinn it was clarified that if Members felt there were buildings at risk that should be included on the list these could be put forward to Officers for consideration; reference was made to the exterior of the Dubarry Building in Hove.
- 10.7 Councillor Morris welcomed the report and the work by Officers; he expressed concern that in the past some buildings and structures had been removed from the list where alterations had been made that undermined the architectural merit.
- 10.8 In response to Councillor Yates it was clarified that a building would only be recommended for national listing if it was considered to be at risk. English Heritage undertook regular reviews, and the authority would also notify them of any buildings considered to merit statutory listing; due to the backlog of buildings for review English Heritage largely prioritised on the basis of risk.
- 10.9 In response to Councillor Nemeth it was explained that there had been a two stage consultation with local amenity groups; this was also outlined in the appendices to the report.
- 10.10 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote:

10.11 RESOLVED:

- 1) That the recommended Local List of Heritage Assets (definitive list provided in Members' rooms and Customer Service Centres) and associated Planning Advice Note (PAN) (recommended text set out in Appendix 4) are adopted.
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Policy and Projects Manager, Planning & Building Control, to: make any minor typographic or grammatical corrections to the Local List and PAN; correct any factual or historical references where new evidence is available; and to remove any assets from the local list if nationally designated or demolished.

11 BRIGHTON & HOVE TRIATHLON 2016

- 11.1 The Committee considered a report of the Assistant Chief Executive in relation to Brighton & Hove Triathlon 2016. The report sought approval for landlord's consent to stage the Brighton & Hove Triathlon including a sport and fitness show on Saturday 17 and Sunday 18 September 2016.
- 11.2 The Chair stated that the Brighton Marathon had quickly turned into a very successful event, and this provided a template for appropriate road closures; the event involved additional elements, but would be assessed by the Safety Group. It was clarified that the organiser had to take out public indemnity insurance.
- 11.3 Following a question from Councillor Peltzer Dunn the Committee discussed the recommendation in the report to delegate the final arrangements to the Assistant Chief Executive. It was agreed that an update would be brought to the November meeting of the Committee along with the full events programme.
- 11.4 Councillor Robins welcomed the proposals and noted this would add to the tourist offer in the city.
- 11.5 Councillor C. Theobald welcomed the report and stated she would like more detail as this became available.
- 11.6 Councillor Druitt also welcomed the report, and agreed with the proposed way forward at 11.3.
- 11.7 In response to Councillor Nemeth it was clarified that the costs were neutral to the Council and met by the organiser.
- 11.8 In response to concerns raised by Councillor Greenbaum it was clarified that organisers had to comply with guidance for events, and work was constantly ongoing in relation to the sustainability elements of large events.
- 11.9 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote.

11.10 RESOLVED:

- 1) That the committee grants landlord's consent to stage the Brighton and Hove Triathlon in September 2016.
- 2) That the committee authorise officers to enter into formal agreements with event organisers to determine conditions, fees and levels of support as appropriate.
- 3) That the committee authorises the Assistant Chief Executive, after consultation with the Chair of the committee and opposition spokespersons, to make any alterations to the operational details of the event as necessary.

12 MAJOR PROJECTS UPDATE

12.1 The Committee considered a presentation and updated from the Head of City Regeneration in relation to the Major Projects Update.

12.2 The Chair noted there were projects boards for a number of the larger schemes that involved Members. Many had been in the planning stage for some time; with more moving towards implementation.

12.3 In response to Councillor Nemeth it was clarified the Executive Director had met with the Homes & Communities Agency on the issue of funding for larger sites, but it was hard for the authority to meet the criteria due the lack of land available for large developments. The HCA had offered to consider smaller sites, but there had not been enough time to undertake this work. Many of the larger sites mentioned in the presentation had housing elements, and this was key to bringing these brownfield sites back into use.

12.4 In response to further query from the Committee the following points were clarified:

- The final costings for the permanent traveller site were being detailed, but this was expected to be more than the grant. The final cost of the scheme would need approval from the Policy & Resources Committee.
- In relation to unfinished elements of the Open Market scheme; this could be followed up by Officers after the meeting if they were given details.
- The problems with the loan for the South-East Dance Studio as part of the Circus Street scheme had been rectified.
- The authority would push developers to achieve the maximum level of affordable housing on sites; as schemes were worked up they were the subject of viability costings; most schemes came up against viability issues as they had to work economically. The level of affordable housing also had to be considered against the other benefits of the scheme.

12.5 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee note the update.

13 ITEMS REFERRED FOR COUNCIL

13.1 There were no items referred to Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 6.09pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of