

## AGENDA ITEM NO. 8

### Council 13 June 2018 - Questions submitted by Members

Question No.	Question from:	Question:	Question to:	Service area:												
1.	Cllr Monique Bonney	What is percentage split in the transport modelling costs between each council and the developers party to the agreement(s) and total cost?	Cabinet Member for Planning	James Freeman												
<p><b>Response:</b> To date there is only agreement to the costs involved in producing a base transport model for the Swale Borough and these have been split as follows:</p> <table><tr><td>Kent County Council</td><td>£30,000</td><td>(16.5%)</td></tr><tr><td>Swale Borough Council</td><td>£30,000</td><td>(16.5%)</td></tr><tr><td>Quinn Estates</td><td>£118,700</td><td>(66.0%)</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>£178,700</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>The split agreed represents the area within the Borough that Quinn Estates would have needed to cover with regard to potential transportation impacts arising from any proposed development to the south east of Sittingbourne. The joint Borough and County Council contributions covers the transport modelling development costs for the remainder of the Borough.</p> <p>The costs attributable to Swale Borough Council were met from the agreed budget set aside for Local Plan development within the Council's revenue budget.</p>					Kent County Council	£30,000	(16.5%)	Swale Borough Council	£30,000	(16.5%)	Quinn Estates	£118,700	(66.0%)	Total	£178,700	
Kent County Council	£30,000	(16.5%)														
Swale Borough Council	£30,000	(16.5%)														
Quinn Estates	£118,700	(66.0%)														
Total	£178,700															
2.	Cllr Monique Bonney	Pease explain how members of the public who are not online respond to the Looking Ahead consultation; will there be paper copies available for residents to take home of both questionnaires and the supporting guidance, notes and forms?	Cabinet Member for Planning	James Freeman												

Question No.	Question from:	Question:	Question to:	Service area:
<b>Response:</b> It was undertaken in accordance with the Council's 'Statement of Community Consultation' (SCI) appropriately and proportionately reflecting the early stage reached with the Local Plan review. The communications from the Council on the 'Looking Ahead' consultation explained how non-online responses could be made by post, by hand or email. Hard copies of the documentation were also available at all Council offices and local libraries and a contact number given for reasonable requests for copies to be sent in the post or collected. There was also a facility for copies to be downloaded for printing and distribution.				
3.	Cllr Mike Baldock	At the last Full Council Cllr Lewin informed us that "it was common practice for developers to support transport modelling. There was a due process and the information it produced was public information. He understood that there had been more than one developer involved." Following an Fol request for details of other developers involved, the response came back that "There were no other developers involved." Can Mr Lewin explain which other companies he thought were involved, why his information differs from that of the Freedom of information response, and who advised him that other developers had been involved?	Cabinet Member for Planning	James Freeman
<b>Response:</b> At the time of the last Council meeting it was my understanding that discussions were taking place with prospective developers about the need for transport modelling to support the evidence base needed to assess the potential impact of proposed development scenarios. Whilst the base model has been developed with the assistance of one proposed developer, it is likely that any future scenario testing of options could include the involvement of other developers and these discussions will be ongoing as part of the Council's current Local Plan consultation and development work through 'Looking Ahead' and the 'Garden Settlements prospectus'.				
4.	Cllr Mike Baldock	To clarify certain apparent conflicts in previously given answers, can the Leader advise as to when he knew that Quinns were to be involved in drafting the Housing Infrastructure Bid, and at what point did he feel it was appropriate for them to be have drafted the initial bid?	Leader	Emma Wiggins
<b>Response:</b> I along with the relevant Cabinet Members met with officers to discuss the potential of submitting a Housing Infrastructure Bid, after the scheme was announced in July 2017. The need to involve relevant scheme promoters in any bids that would be				

Question No.	Question from:	Question:	Question to:	Service area:
developed was made clear. As I explained at Full Council on 21 <sup>st</sup> March the content of the Forward Fund Housing Infrastructure Bid was determined by Kent County Council, as the submitting authority, in partnership with Swale Borough Council. It would be considered best practice to involve scheme promoters relevant to securing the funding – whether that is one from the private sector, or in the case of our successful HIF bid for Queenborough and Rushenden, Homes England.				
5.	Cllr Roger Truelove	The Sittingbourne Town Centre Development Agreement was signed with Cathedral, Essential Lands and Altyon in September 2012. In January 2015 a variation was made to the Spirit of Sittingbourne LLP to replace Altyon with Quinn Estates. Quinn Estates had in fact been participating for a few months, with the deed of variation being endorsed at a meeting of the Cabinet in April 2014, although Quinn Estates were not named at the time. It is understood that Quinn Estates were brought into the picture by Essential Lands, rather than Cathedral. It is not clear whether any other local partner was considered in competition with Quinn Estates. Can you assure me that the preference for Quinn Estates was not influenced by any elected member of this Council or any officer involved at the time?	Leader	Emma Wiggins
<b>Response:</b> As detailed in the April 2014 Cabinet report the Development Agreement allows partners to be varied subject to the Council's approval. The Spirit of Sittingbourne Consortium put forward one proposal for Quinn Estates as a major Kent developer to become a partner and this was agreed through the appropriate delegations. I can confirm that this proposal was not influenced by any elected member or Officer involved at the time.				
6.	Cllr Roger Truelove	Members of various parties have recently visited the Foodbank in East Street in Sittingbourne, which acts as the operational centre for this important voluntary activity. Cllr John Wright and I both agreed to try to help them find a storage base for their supplies but I feel sure there are other ways in which this	Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing	Emma Wiggins

Question No.	Question from:	Question:	Question to:	Service area:
		Council could and should help them with their ever increasing demand. They are expecting more and more clients as the introduction of Universal Credit hits home. Do you agree that this Council should give more support to this organisation?		
<p><b>Reponse:</b> Yes, I agree that we should do everything we can to support the Foodbank operation. I have personally made enquiries and one of those was to another Foodbank operator.</p> <p>Currently the council collects food at the council offices to donate and arrange for the food bank to come and collect and hands out vouchers to customers of the housing service. The council will continue with these activities which are manageable in the resources it has.</p>				