

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SOUTH HAMS DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD  
AT FOLLATON HOUSE, TOTNES ON THURSDAY 25 MARCH 2010**

**MEMBERS**

\* Cllr M Stone – Chairman

\* Cllr J H Baverstock – Vice-Chairman

* Cllr K J Baldry	* Cllr P W Hitchins
* Cllr A D Barber	* Cllr M J Howarth
* Cllr N A Barnes	* Cllr C W Jones
* Cllr H D Bastone	* Cllr L P Jones
∅ Cllr J I G Blackler	* Cllr R M Lawrence
* Cllr J Brazil	∅ Cllr I Longrigg
* Cllr B F Cane	* Cllr D W May
* Cllr B E Carson	* Cllr D M O’Callaghan
* Cllr R J Carter	* Cllr C M Pannell
* Cllr P H Cook	* Cllr J T Pennington
* Cllr S E Cooper	∅ Cllr S L Rankin
* Cllr P Coulson	* Cllr R Rowe
* Cllr R F Croad	* Cllr M F Saltern
* Cllr G J Fielden	* Cllr J W Squire
* Cllr R D Gilbert	* Cllr R C Steer
* Cllr M Hannaford	* Cllr R J Tucker
∅ Cllr F J Hawke	* Cllr R J Vint
* Cllr J D Hawkins	* Cllr A Ward
* Cllr M J Hicks	* Cllr J A Westacott MBE

\* Denotes attendance

∅ Denotes apology for absence

Officers in attendance and participating:

For all items: Strategic Management Team, Monitoring Officer and Member Support Services Manager; and

Item 10 (Minute 89/09 below refers): Head of Community Regeneration and Forward Planning Manager;

Item 11 (Minute 90/09 below refers): Head of Environment Services; and

Item 13 (Minute 92/09 below refers): Risk and Health and Safety Advisor.

**83/09 WELCOME**

On behalf of the Council, the Chairman wished to welcome Cllr Tony Barber to his first Council meeting since his recent election to the Council.

**84/09 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 4 February 2010 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

85/09

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were invited to declare any interests in the items of business to be considered during the course of the meeting. These were recorded as follows:-

Cllr J T Pennington declared a prejudicial interest in Item 9(c): 'Notice of Motions (Minute 88/09(c) below refers) by virtue of his membership of both the Development Management Committee for Devon County Council and the Development Control Committee for South Hams District Council and left the meeting during consideration of this item.

On behalf of each Member of the Development Control Committee, Cllr Fielden wished to declare a personal interest in Item 9(c): 'Notice of Motions (Minute 88/09(c) below refers) by virtue of the Committee being due to consider the matter in due course. (NOTE: a number of Committee Members abstained from the vote on this item. Cllr P Coulson left the meeting during the debate and was therefore not present when the vote was taken).

Whilst questioning the merits of the motion when considering that the Council was already a statutory consultee, Cllr R F Croad declared a prejudicial interest in Item 9(c): 'Notice of Motions (Minute 88/09(c) below refers) and left the meeting during consideration of the item.

Cllrs J A Westacott MBE and A Ward both declared a personal interest in Item 12: 'Petition Received from the South Hams Against Mobile Emissions Group' (Minute 91/09 below refers) by virtue of them each being a Member of the Group but remained in the meeting and took part in the vote on this item. Cllr D M O'Callaghan also declared a personal interest in this item by virtue of having previously led a campaign against a similar mobile phone mast in Kingsbridge and also remained in the meeting and took part in the vote on this item.

Cllr R D Gilbert declared a prejudicial interest in Item 10: 'South Hams Local Development Framework: Site Allocations for Kingsbridge and Salcombe' (Minute 89/09 below refers) specifically in respect of proposal K4 for Kingsbridge and advised that if this proposal was specifically discussed, he would leave the Chamber.

86/09

**CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Council proceeded to note a list of Civic Engagements recently attended by the Chairman, during which particular reference was made to:-

- his pride and honour at being presented to Her Majesty the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh;
- his recent visit to the Korniloff Residential Home; and
- his attendance at the Fashion Show which had raised monies towards his chosen charity of 'Help the Heroes'.

In addition, the Chairman also highlighted the upcoming charity Pro-Am Golf Tournament at Bigbury Golf Club and extended an invitation for any interested Members to attend this event.

87/09

## QUESTIONS

It was noted that six questions had been received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 8.

### **From Cllr Brazil to Cllr Hicks, lead Executive Member for Financial Affairs**

- (a) *“How many outbreaks of food poisoning related to retail outlets have been confirmed in the South Hams over the past year?”*
- (b) *“Who took the decision to move ahead with the ‘Scores on the Doors’ food standards agency scheme?”*
- (c) *“Will this scheme be of any extra cost to the Council or our retail outlets in the South Hams?”*

With the agreement of the Chairman, Cllr Hicks responded to each of the three questions in the same answer (as detailed below).

In his introduction, Cllr Hicks stated that the subject of food hygiene inspections was quite complicated and it was therefore deemed helpful to provide some detailed background.

Nationally, the overview of the process was in the hands of the Food Standards Agency (FSA).

Local councils had a statutory obligation to ensure adherence to the Code through the medium of regular inspections by properly qualified staff and the frequency of inspection was decided on, using a number of categories based on an assessment of risk to public health.

Cllr Hicks stressed that there was an important level of risk assessment within the process and this was tempered by qualified and experienced professionals and was not solely a tick boxing exercise.

In terms of the question, there had been no outbreaks of food poisoning related to retail outlets confirmed in the past year. This may come as a surprise since we had all met people who had complained of one stomach upset or another. However, the difficulties of linking together and proving a connection between an event and a specific establishment should be obvious except in the most serious and probably replicated occurrences. Members may be aware that the NHS as a whole had an obligation to report cases, where food poisoning may be the cause, to the local council and in this council year there had been 250 such statutory notifications. Since it was believed that in the order of ten times as many occurrences took place as were reported, we could be looking at the tip of an iceberg.

The cost of implementing the 'Scores on the Doors' initiative was being met by the FSA, and South Hams District Council (SHDC) had an opportunity to bid for a piece of a total national pot. This we did as part of a Devonwide decision to adopt the idea. Our costs would be within the money allowed by this process. It was considered that, since the Council was not involved in additional expenditure, the decision was an operational one and it was made quite properly by the Head of Service who kept Cllr Hicks informed at all times.

When it did go live, the normal inspection process carried on at the moment would feed a rating process, maybe "stars" or something similar, where the highest rating would be "Fully Compliant" and this would be reflected in the Score on the Door of 5. There may well be some cost of the system to those operators who did not reach the top rating, but it would be in their best interests and those of the eating public for them to be persuaded to minimise any risk to public health.

For the record, there were 1366 food retail premises in the South Hams area and SHDC environmental health inspectors had made 804 inspections so far this year. SHDC had served 98 formal notices requiring improvements and there had been no prosecutions for non-compliance.

Whilst commending the food outlets in the South Hams on their high standards, Cllr Brazil proceeded to ask one supplementary question regarding what guarantees were in place to ensure that such establishments did not incur additional costs. In reply, Cllr Hicks highlighted that it was in the interests of such businesses to be fully compliant with the code of practice. Furthermore, it was likely that premises which did not obtain a score of 5 would be able to be re-assessed soon after and any additional expenditure incurred to improve upon this performance would ultimately be in the public interest.

**From Cllr Brazil to Cllr Howarth, lead Executive Member for Value for Money**

- (d) *'How many planning training sessions have there been over the past 2 municipal years, not including the training sessions last Thursday (18<sup>th</sup> March)'?*
- (e) *'How many Councillors did not attend'?*
- (f) *'How many Councillors have been disqualified from the planning process as a result of not attending the planning training sessions'?*

With the agreement of the Chairman, Cllr Howarth also responded to each of the three questions in the same answer (as detailed below).

Cllr Howarth advised that whilst there were no training sessions held in the 2008/09 Municipal Year, there had been four sessions held prior to 18 March 2010 for the 2009/10 Municipal Year. A fifth session (with further repeat sessions) was held on 18 March 2010. The five sessions covered the following themes:- Historic Built Environment, Avoiding Pre-determination and Material Considerations, The LDF System, Matters in relation to Gypsy and Traveller sites and Enforcement.

Following the sessions held on Thursday, 29 Members had now met the 80% training requirement (i.e. had attended four of the five training sessions held during 2009/10), as outlined in the Council Constitution.

As it currently stood, no Members had been disqualified from participating in the planning process. A further series of sessions were to be held on the morning of 21 April 2010, where after it was hoped and anticipated that all the remaining Members would be able to meet the 80% training requirement.

Cllr Brazil asked one supplementary question regarding whether Cllr Howarth felt it was appropriate that Members who had not met the 80% requirement should be disqualified from the planning process. In response, Cllr Howarth felt that such training was vital, but did accept that the existing requirement to attend four out of five sessions may be excessive and should be reviewed.

88/09

## NOTICE OF MOTIONS

It was noted that three motions had been received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10.1.

### (a) By Cllrs Pennington and Squire

*'In view of the fact that a number of Brownfield sites have been identified as possible potential site options for housing development during the Local Development Framework and DPD public consultation period which ran from 17 December 2009 to 10 February 2010, this Council agrees to a short delay in the finalisation of the currently proposed Local Development Framework programme and process to enable further in depth investigation and analysis into the feasibility of developing those Brownfield sites for housing development which accords with Government and planning policy for housing development in advance of development of Greenfield sites and especially in designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Areas of Great Landscape Value and also in the democratic interest of public consultation and concern.'*

Having been **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED**, the proposer of the motion made particular reference to:-

- his wish to seek a short delay to allow for greater analysis of Brownfield sites;

- his disquiet at the role played by the Prince's Foundation. In particular, the proposer highlighted the failure of the organisation to reply to any of his correspondence and his doubts that the Foundation actually visited all of the sites proposed in the South Hams;
- whether employing the Prince's Foundation to undertake this exercise (which cost approximately £110,000) had represented good value for money;
- the pressures arising from the Local Government Review having now subsided; and
- some neighbouring local authorities having already taken the decision to delay work on the Local Development Framework pending the General Election.

In stating his full support for this motion, the seconder echoed a number of comments expressed by the proposer. In emphasising the importance of listening to local residents, the seconder felt that a short delay would enable town and parish councils to be properly consulted with the officers and the Prince's Foundation.

In discussion, the following points were raised:-

- (i) In disagreement with the motion, the Leader of Council stated that he was totally opposed to any delay. Each town and parish council had been given plentiful opportunity to attend the two rounds of Cluster meetings at which presentations had been held. Members had also been given every opportunity in recent months to view any proposed sites of interest. Regardless of the result of the General Election, the existing housing requirements had been ratified and would still apply. It was the view of the Leader that any delay would be undesirable as the need to deliver sites for development was of paramount importance.

A number of Members echoed their support for these comments and reiterated the need to deliver affordable housing for young people as soon as was practically possible.

- (ii) An amendment to the motion was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED**. The amendment sought to delete the word '*short* delay' and replace it with the term '*six week* delay.'

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12.7, both the proposer and seconder of the original motion were content to accept this amendment as an alteration and it therefore became the substantive motion.

In discussion on the substantive motion, the following points were raised:-

- It was felt that a six week delay would enable adequate time for all Members to view the sites;
- A Member believed that the Prince's Foundation process had worked well in Totnes and therefore felt that other areas should have been given the same opportunities;

- In emphasising the importance of getting each Document right, some Members questioned why the Council was rushing through this exercise. Moreover, there was a public perception that adequate consultation had not been undertaken and there was a real concern that developers would simply build on the Greenfield sites and leave the more problematic Brownfield sites to a later date;
- Agreement to a delay would allow for the outcome of the General Election to be known;
- one Member wished for a delay to enable alternative delivery models to be considered for affordable housing;
- It was clarified that approval of this motion would result in the potential for the debate to be re-opened on every site in the district which was contained within the Site Allocation DPDs.

When put to the vote, this motion was declared **LOST**.

**(b) By Cllrs Brazil and O'Callaghan**

*'This Council believes that Second Homes should be liable to pay double Council Tax.'*

Having been **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED**, the proposer of the motion made particular reference to:-

- the additional income (estimated at £7 million) which would be generated in the South Hams and re-invested into rural services, local communities and affordable housing;
- such an increase acting as a disincentive, which would help to control the housing market. Whilst accepting that tourists bring much needed revenue to the South Hams, such an increase would also ensure that second homes were less likely to remain empty; and
- the proposal having no financial impact on local residents.

The seconder of the motion highlighted that affordable housing was the number one priority of the Council and emphasised the massive discrepancy between average house prices and local incomes.

In discussion, the following points were raised:-

- (i) An amendment to the motion was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED**, which read as follows:-

*'This Council believes that the Government should be required to increase Second Homes Council Tax.'*

In support of the amendment, reference was made to:-

- any decision to increase Second Homes Council Tax not being within the remit of the Council. It would therefore be necessary to lobby central government to seek such an increase;
- the desire for any increased revenue to be spent on affordable housing in the South Hams instead of being passed to Devon County Council;

- the potential for second homeowners to change the designation of their properties. If the rate was increased significantly, some Members advised that homeowners would simply switch the designation of their properties to business usage. As a guide, it was noted that since the decision to increase the level from 50% to 90% on 1 April 2004, there had been a 9% shift in terms of a reduction in the number of homeowners who were actually paying second homes council tax, in comparison to an actual increase in numbers of second homes owned. It was felt that such a trend would only be exacerbated in the event of a significant rate increase;
- the potential to address the second homes issue through the planning process.

When put to the vote, this amendment was declared **CARRIED**.

It was then:

### **RESOLVED**

This Council believes that the Government should be required to increase Second Homes Council Tax.

#### **(c) By Cllrs Lawrence and Barber**

*'That this Council notes with concern the current proposal for an incinerator and associated landfill at Lee Mill and directs its officers to investigate with urgency the following issues and report back to the April Development Control Committee.*

*The issues are:-*

- 1) Impact of traffic on the community of Lee Mill, on roads surrounding the development and the A38 trunk road;*
- 2) Risks of air pollution, particularly on the health of residents in the nearby town of Ivybridge;*
- 3) Risks of water pollution into the water table and the river Yealm;*
- 4) Visual impact;*
- 5) Effects on the wildlife at present in and near the site;*
- 6) The need for an incinerator in this location, remote from potential users of the excess heat generated;*
- 7) The suitability of this form of waste disposal'.*

Before any motion was proposed, the Chairman invited the Monitoring Officer to advise Members and she supplied the following advice:-

'Members who wish to speak on this motion should bear this advice in mind:

- If you are a Member of the Development Control Committee, you will need to make it clear today that you intend to keep an open mind pending consideration of the County Council's request for this Council's view on the planning application at the forthcoming meeting of the DC Committee, when you will have the benefit of officers' written advice and will be in a position to take into account all relevant evidence and representations; and
- If you are not a Member of the DC Committee, you are entitled to express your views but should consider whether doing so would restrict your ability to speak on the matter in this or any other forum in the future, or whether you might be regarded at that stage as having predetermined it.'

Whilst proposing his motion, the proposer informed Council that he wished to delete the words '*with concern*' in the first line and the word '*April*' on the fourth line of the motion as they appeared on the agenda. The motion was subsequently **SECONDED**.

The proposer of the motion proceeded to make particular reference to the:-

- extent of the concerns raised at a recent public meeting in Ivybridge. Moreover, it was apparent that there was a lack of knowledge and consequent fear about the impact of the incinerator;
- request that residents would find it helpful to have access to expert evidence, via presentation of the application to the Development Control Committee, prior to them submitting representations to the County Council;
- success of recycling in the South Hams. The proposer questioned whether the size of the proposals, at twenty times the level of landfill demand in the district, was the solution to the waste problem;
- concern of some experts at the proposed model of waste disposal;
- proposals using the wrong technology and being located in the wrong place;
- potential traffic implications of over 150 heavy lorry journeys each day using the road in Lee Mill;
- threat to the River Yealm;
- visual impact. The proposer felt that the proposals would resemble an alien feature in a rural landscape;
- cross party opposition to the incinerator in the South West Devon constituency.

The seconder also highlighted the wishes of residents in seeking reassurances with regard to the proposals and his hope that all issues would be taken on board during the planning process.

In stating that the proposed site was not appropriate, a Member stated his strong concerns with the application and his hope that the Development Control Committee would take these matters into account.

It was then:

### **RESOLVED**

That this Council notes the current proposal for an incinerator and associated landfill at Lee Mill and directs its officers to investigate with urgency the following issues and report back to the Development Control Committee.

The issues are:-

- 1) Impact of traffic on the community of Lee Mill, on roads surrounding the development and the A38 trunk road;
- 2) Risks of air pollution, particularly on the health of residents in the nearby town of Ivybridge;
- 3) Risks of water pollution into the water table and the river Yealm;
- 4) Visual impact;
- 5) Effects on the wildlife at present in and near the site;
- 6) The need for an incinerator in this location, remote from potential users of the excess heat generated;
- 7) The suitability of this form of waste disposal'.

(NOTE: In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15.6, Cllrs K J Baldry, R M Lawrence and M F Saltern each requested that their vote in support of the motion be formally recorded).

89/09

### **SOUTH HAMS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: SITE ALLOCATIONS FOR KINGSBRIDGE AND SALCOMBE**

A report was considered which sought resolution of those matters where the final content of the Site Allocation Development Plan Documents (DPDs) had not been resolved under the delegation arrangements agreed by Council at its meeting on 17 December 2009 (Minute 65/09 refers).

In his introduction, the Leader advised that it was his intention for consideration to be given to the two areas separately, with proposals moved, seconded and voted on individually.

In general discussion, reference was made to:-

- (a) the recent site visits. A number of Members expressed their regret at the short notice for the site visits. Some Members stated that since they had not been able to attend the site visits, they were therefore unable to reach a judgement on these proposals and a decision should be deferred to a future meeting. In disagreement, other Members welcomed the opportunity to visit the sites with officers and it was also emphasised that every Member had been able to view all of these sites independently for a number of months before this meeting;

- (b) the hard work and efforts of officers, local Members, the town councils and the wider community to produce these proposals;
- (c) the letters received during the consultation process. A Member felt that each of these letters should have been more publicly accessible. Furthermore, the Member stated that the general public were particularly interested in this issue and the lack of public engagement during the Prince's Foundation process was disappointing. The Leader of Council stated his disappointment that Members had initially been satisfied with the Prince's Foundation process, but some had since changed their minds in light of some public concern;
- (d) reconsidering these proposals. A Member commended his colleagues for providing the Council with the opportunity for these proposals to be reconsidered in the public domain;

In discussion on the Kingsbridge proposals, the following points were raised:-

- (e) Whilst having a few reservations on points of detail, some local Members felt that the proposals constituted the most appropriate solution for the Kingsbridge area;
- (f) In acknowledging the landowner issues, Members still felt it unfortunate that it was necessary to allocate Greenfield (and not Brownfield) sites to meet the needs up to 2016. The strong view was expressed by Members that they did not wish to wait until 2016 to deliver Brownfield sites. In acknowledging the point, the Leader stated that rigorous tests had been undertaken on the Brownfield sites and they were not available in the short term. In light of the multiple ownership issue, a Member stated his surprise that site K3 had been included in the proposals, which he felt were a non-starter;
- (g) A Member regretted that some of the issues presented in the Kingsbridge and Salcombe Area Partnership report in 2003 had not been addressed. The Member felt that if progress had been made on this report, potentially some Brownfield sites could have been delivered earlier;
- (h) It was stated that the proposals now presented for approval had been radically changed from the initial Prince's Foundation proposals;
- (i) Specifically on Site K1, it was requested that officers reinstate the adjacent sports pitch provision to 0.7 hectares;
- (j) A local Member expressed her particular concerns regarding the development gap closing between West Alvington and Kingsbridge, the scale of development proposed at Site K1, the suitability of Site K6 and the general principle of developing on Greenfield sites

In specific discussion on the Salcombe proposals, reference was made to:-

(k) the proposals to 2016 having already been largely completed;

(l) the following points being raised in support of proposed Site 3:

- It was felt that this site was the most sustainable in planning terms and had the support of the Forward Planning officers;
- The trend for migration out of the town would be at least partly reversed by developing some affordable housing at the bottom of the town;
- The site was in close proximity to the industrial area in Island Street;
- There would be benefits to the retail outlets (e.g. the post office) in the town by developing at the bottom of the town;
- The relatively high density required would be out of keeping with the existing low density housing in the area of the alternative proposal;
- Some Members felt that the visual impact arising from the alternative option would be more severe;
- This site would enable a compact development and was likely to result in a greater proportion of affordable housing due to the greater market value of housing in this area.

(m) the following points being raised in support of the alternative option to support development at Sites 1 and 5:

- This option having a lesser impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- Employment units on Site 3 would be for very small businesses only;
- The primary school was located in close proximity to these sites, in addition to amenities such as recreational areas and the Rugby Club;
- A number of Members did not feel that the argument about narrowing the gap between Salcombe and Malborough was an issue;
- The overwhelming majority of local residents and the town council supported this alternative;
- Some Members were of the view that unfortunately the town centre did not now have much to offer local residents and the vibrant hub of the town was now located at the top of Salcombe;
- The superior vehicular access to this area;
- These sites had willing landowners, where the ownership issues for Site 3 were more uncertain;

At this point, a motion to publish the Salcombe proposals as illustrated at Appendix A of the report presented to Council (including Site 3), which had been **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED**, was put to the vote and was declared **LOST**.

The following motion was then **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:-

*'That in respect of the Site Allocations DPD for Salcombe, the Council supports the progression of the alternative sites at the entrance to the town at the top of the hill and retention of sites 7 and 9 for employment use. To enable publication, the final content of the DPD for Salcombe be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning and Economy, in consultation with the Leader of Council, the local Ward Members and Cllr Ward.'*

It was then:

### **RESOLVED**

- (a) That the content of the Site Allocations Development Plan Documents related to Kingsbridge be published (as illustrated at Appendix A of the report presented to Council); and
- (b) That in respect of the Site Allocations DPD for Salcombe, the Council supports the progression of the alternative sites at the entrance to the town at the top of the hill and retention of sites 7 and 9 for employment use. To enable publication, the final content of the DPD for Salcombe be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning and Economy, in consultation with the Leader of Council, the local Ward Members and Cllr Ward.

90/09

### **REVIEW OF CAR PARK CHARGES AND CONDITIONS**

The Council considered a report which outlined the representations made in respect of the South Hams (Permit and Boat Storage) Readvertised (Amendment) Order 2010 and sought approval to a Revised Scheme for 2010.

In discussion, the following points were raised:-

- (a) The Lead Executive Member for a Clean Environment clarified that the report only sought to review the proposed changes to the restrictions. It was therefore not an opportunity to review the car park charges, which had been approved by Council at its meeting on 4 February 2010 (minute 80/09 refers);
- (b) The view was expressed that town and parish councils should be included as consultees when such matters were advertised;
- (c) A Member highlighted that despite a number of concerns being raised by his colleagues at the previous Council meeting, there had been no objections or comments submitted on the increased Pay and Display charges.

It was then:

**RESOLVED**

1. That the representations made in respect of the 2010 Order be noted and the revised scheme be confirmed; and
2. That officers be instructed to confirm the Order accordingly and publicise the confirmation in accordance with statutory requirements, with the Order to come into effect on 25 March 2010.

91/09

**PETITION RECEIVED FROM THE SOUTH HAMS AGAINST MOBILE EMISSIONS GROUP**

Members considered a report which presented a petition received by the Council from the South Hams Against Mobile Emissions (SHAME) Group against the T Mobile phone mast in Babbage Road, Totnes.

It was then:

**RESOLVED**

That the contents of the petition be noted and support be expressed for the subsequent officer response.

92/09

**RISK MANAGEMENT – ANNUAL REPORT**

Consideration was given to a report which provided information on the risk management activities which had been undertaken since April 2009.

It was then:

**RESOLVED**

That the progress made on risk management be noted and supported accordingly.

93/09

**APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL BODIES**

A report was presented which sought to appoint Cllr Tony Barber to the Prosperity Policy Development Group for the remainder of the 2009/10 Municipal Year.

It was then:

**RESOLVED**

That, with immediate effect for the remainder of the 2009/10 Municipal Year, Cllr A D Barber be appointed to serve on the Prosperity Policy Development Group.

94/09

**REPORTS OF BODIES****RESOLVED**

That the minutes and recommendations of the undermentioned bodies be received and approved subject to any amendments listed below:-

- |     |                               |                  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|
| (a) | Personnel Panel               | 26 January 2010  |
| (b) | Development Control Committee | 10 February 2010 |
| (c) | Scrutiny                      | 11 February 2010 |

**SC.54/09: Forward Planning**

A Member raised a question on the findings of a recent Shelter report which had ranked the Council as the lowest in Devon and Cornwall for delivering affordable housing. In reply, the lead Executive Member for Housing highlighted the limitations of the statistics used in the report (e.g. that the figures were out of date). Nonetheless, the Executive Member did welcome the fact that the report had raised the profile of the affordable housing shortfall in the South Hams.

With regard to concern expressed regarding development taking place beyond the Development Boundary, the Leader of Council informed that these were due to be reviewed in accordance with the work on the South Hams Local Development Framework.

- |     |                               |                  |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|
| (d) | Council Tax Setting Panel     | 23 February 2010 |
| (e) | Environment PDG               | 25 February 2010 |
| (f) | Executive                     | 4 March 2010     |
| (g) | Standards Committee           | 9 March 2010     |
| (h) | Development Control Committee | 10 March 2010    |

(Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 5.15 pm).

---

Chairman