

# DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 2 JULY 2020

## Questions from members of the public

No.	Member of the public	Question	Draft Answer
1.	David Tooley	Has the council received the Dorfman Review into Blakelands?	<p>The Council has not received the report but has received a further update from Mr Dorfman indicating that the report will be submitted by the end of July.</p> <p>We expect to be able to schedule a meeting of the Audit Committee to receive the report in August.</p>
2.	Lesley Sung	<p>The minutes of the Development Control Committee meeting of 4 June 2020 contains inaccuracies and important omissions. Our main objection to the application was about the reasons and justification for the increase in density at the Hindhead Knoll development site, which had been included in Plan:MK final version but had not been subject to appropriate public consultation.</p> <p>The Chair made a commitment to investigate the procedural errors and delve into the reasons around how the increase in density and numbers of dwelling at the site, had come about.</p> <p>Minutes should be a true record of proceedings, so why was this not published in the original minutes and I would ask that the minutes be amended to reflect the commitment made by the Chair?</p>	<p>Committee minutes are not intended to be an ad verbatim record of what was discussed at a meeting. Rather, a brief note of proceedings that in particular, records the decisions made.</p> <p>The issues raised in relation to the modifications to Plan:MK and the density increase were not material planning considerations in the case referred to.</p> <p>It is not our usual custom and practice to minute non material matters in any detail, but members of the committee may agree that the circumstances in this case are exceptional and warrant some non material details being recorded in the minutes. It is likely that an amended minute will be moved to this effect by a member of the committee.</p>

3.	Adam Chapman-Ballard	Is it MKC/DCC practice to support all social or affordable housing development applications, or those containing those units, regardless of their suitability for the local area they will be situated in - or what is the policy and approach to those type of units?	The weight that is attached to affordable housing within any given proposal, whether that be weight in favour or against, is guided by Policy HN2 (and potentially HN1 in terms of the mix of units) within Plan:Mk.
4.	Stuart Copeland	In Plan:Mk, a change to the density of the two sites at Hindhead Knoll was made without public consultation. The change was made in the Schedule of Additional Modifications - what other changes were made in that document that were not typographical or minor corrections	159 additional modifications were made to Plan:MK via the Examination in Public process. The Schedule of Proposed Additional Modifications (October 2018) included a reason why each of these changes were proposed.
5.	Tate Chapman-Ballard	If you're refusing these flats (20/00185/FUL – Bowback House) due to their impact on the local and nearby infrastructure, why does that kind of mentality not apply city wide including at walnut tree?	The recommended reason for refusal for Bowback House (20/00185/FUL) relates to the fact that the section 106 contributions do not offset the impacts of the development in this instance. Each application is considered on its own merits and therefore the recommendation for the application at Bowback House is site specific and does not set a precedent.