

COUNCIL MEETING – 8 DECEMBER 2020

REPORT OF THE VIRTUAL ADDITIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

16 November 2020

Present: Councillors Griffiths (Chairman), Partridge-Underwood (Vice-Chairman), Allebone, Bell, Emerson, Francis, Graves, Harrington, Henley, L Lawman, Morrall, Scarborough, Ward and Weatherill.

Also present: Mrs L Elliott, Managing Director, Mr S Darcy (Director/Section 151 Officer), Mr A Piper, Miss K Denton, Mrs V Jessop and Mr E Symons (Assistant Directors), Mr B Gill (Monitoring Officer), Mrs V Phillipson, (Principal Property Manager), Mr M Swann, (Principal Planning Manager) Mrs C A Mundy (Senior Democratic Services Officer (Committees and Members)) – minute taker, Mrs F Hubbard (Senior Democratic Services Officer (Civic)) and Mrs E Robinson (Democratic Services Support Officer) – meeting producers.

1. APOLOGIES

An apology was received from Councillor Skittrall.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

RESOLVED to note that in accordance with the Localism Act 2011, the council's code of conduct and the council's constitution, the following declaration was made:

Councillor	Minute no.	Reason
Henley	Min 3 – High Street/Jacksons Lane Site	Personal – he has known one of the speakers for over 15 years.

3. HIGH STREET/JACKSONS LANE SITE

The annexed circulated report of the assistant director (corporate landlord) was received in relation to High Street/Jacksons Lane to consider entering a conditional contract with Keepmoat Homes to enable them to purchase the site for residential development.

Before the report was discussed the chairman addressed the meeting and explained that this report was being presented following the hard work and dedication of officers, who had inherited the project, and which had been ongoing for several years. This was one of the most politically significant and controversial projects undertaken by the borough council and was a key decision which would form part of the town's future and direction.

He gave some detail on how the project had progressed over the years. In 2006 the Economic and Environmental Committee approved a supplementary planning document for a mixed-use development on the High Street/Jacksons Lane site. Using compulsory purchase powers, land was gathered, though it was another six years before the procurement process started for a developer. In 2012 the first plans from Keepmoat Homes were shared. During the time of the project there had been a Global banking crisis and now a Global health pandemic.

In 2015 both the Queens Hall and Drill Hall sites were removed from the site. The Drill Hall is now being developed and the Queens Hall had been transferred earlier in 2020 to the Daylight Fellowship.

Planning permission was granted in 2018 and delegation was given to the Head of Planning regarding the section 106 agreement. Two years on a second scheme for the planning of the site had been brought forward, which was a separate issue and not for discussion tonight. No agreement had been reached on the sale of the land and this remained to be discussed tonight.

The Borough Council of Wellingborough would cease to exist after 31 March 2021, and it was felt that it would be beneficial for this matter to be determined whilst the council still had the decision-making ability to do so.

Exciting work was taking place on the public realm in the town centre, which will be the subject of consultation, the transformation of the multi storey car park was progressing well and Tresham college was open. Both were vital to the sustainability of the town as shopping habits continued to change and progress through the challenging times ahead.

The chairman urged members to make a firm recommendation to council, one way or the other, to enable action to be taken to move the decision forward in the lifetime of this council and whilst such decision was the council's to take.

Several speakers wished to address the meeting and council officers and Mr Morton and Mr Tully from Deloitte were also in attendance to advise on the matter in hand. The chairman expressed a desire, in the spirit of transparency, engagement and participation of the public to hold as much of the meeting in the public arena, however, if members wished to discuss anything in the confidential part of the report, he would move the meeting to private.

The Assistant Director (Corporate Landlord), Mr Piper, presented the report to committee, drawing attention to the purpose of the report and the focus of the debate which was the proposed recommendation to council to:

- (i) Enter a conditional contract, to protect the council's position, with Keepmoat Homes to enable them to purchase the site for residential development and make a new planning application;
- (ii) Delegate negotiations for the indicative surface car park scheme and to seek a capital bid for the construction thereof.

Mr Piper was aware of the concern over the loss of car parking and detailed the number of car parking spaces in the town, which equated to 2,442, including, 117 in Thomas Street, 419 High Street, 545 at Morrisons, 952 at the Swansgate, 138 at Castle Theatre, 68 at Aldi, 140 at Matalan and 63 at High Street Place.

Should the High Street/Jacksons Lane site be developed there would be a net loss of 200 car parking spaces, reducing to 2,200. Previous parking studies, undertaken before the pandemic, indicated that there were 1,304 occupied spaces with 1338 spaces available across the town centre. In 2016-18 there was an overall decrease in car parking spaces occupied – with the car parks that lost the most being at High Street and Morrisons – with the Swansgate also experiencing some decrease. The general feeling was that even if the High Street site was developed and the parking was reduced by 50%, there would still be more than adequate parking in the town centre.

The chairman thanked Mr Piper for presenting the report and asked the speakers to address the meeting.

The first speaker was Mrs Claire Ette, a resident, taxpayer and representative of the local community. She spoke for three minutes and expressed her objection to the sale of the land. She also spoke about the public meeting held in May 2018 and the depth of feeling, which resulted in the presentation of a 4,000 plus signature petition to council. A public consultation, with drop-in sessions for the public had been promised along with the final decision being made by a full council meeting. To date there had been no public consultation and she felt that this meeting had been hastily arranged, with the final decision to be made in four weeks.

If the site was developed there would be insufficient private parking for residents living in the properties to be built, this would result in them using the public parking spaces. Local people use the High Street car park to go to local businesses, the Doctors, Chemists, the United Reformed Church and other places of worship. The church, when open, frequently hosted large gatherings, such as funerals where access to car parking was essential, these people would not use the multi storey car park, it was too far to walk for the elderly. People would stop visiting Wellingborough if they could not park. She asked why the land needed to be sold and why the council had chosen not to listen to the residents of Wellingborough. She also noted that this meeting was not accessible for all people who were concerned about the future of the site and questioned whether this was a fair debate or discussion process, democratically. She considered that the site should remain as a legacy for the town.

The second speaker was Councillor Jon Ekins, ward councillor for the area, speaking on behalf of residents.

He informed the meeting that he had received numerous emails from Swanspool ward residents and other residents from around the town. Whilst

appreciating that the site needed some form of development, he did not consider that this was the correct scheme.

There was a need for car parking for those travelling from the North part of the town, this would increase with the completion of the Glenvale Park development. A failure to retain car parking in this area would result in more street parking, particularly in the St John Street and Hatton area of the town.

An undertaking that full consultation, with drop-in sessions, and the decision to be made at a full council meeting, had been given by the leader and he asked why this report was being presented to resources committee first, rather than it going directly to a council meeting.

He asked for clarity on whether a recent valuation of the land had been carried out and if so, how much had it been valued at? He also commented that it had been indicated to him that there may be other developers interested in the site for retail, commercial and residential – where car parking would be maintained. Could clarification be given as to whether anyone else had made such an offer or expressed an interest in the site.

One housing association was detailed in the report and he asked how many other housing associations had been approached and whether there was any other interest.

He referenced the request by Keepmoat to ask for historic costs to be discounted and asked why the council would agree to such request.

Noting the comments by Mr Piper regarding the car parking spaces that were available, he concurred with his comment that not all spaces were free or unlimited, some were for shoppers only and had restrictions. The High Street/Jacksons Lane car park was free and served those from the North of the town, including future residents of Glenvale Park, whilst the multi-storey car park, also free, served those to the South of the town and Stanton Cross.

He asked why car parking at High Street/Jacksons Lane would be taken away, for the council to then spend more council tax-payers money on the development of a 200-space site in the same location. He questioned if this was logical and the best use of tax-payers money.

In closing he urged members to ascertain if proper due consideration had been given to the value of the land, and that the price being offered for the land was best consideration, and to also check that every avenue had been explored with regard to retail, commercial and residential with car parking on the site. He believed there was a company who had expressed an interest in relocating to this site from elsewhere in the town centre which would free up space for residential development in a better location. He reiterated that these questions were being asked on behalf of residents who had approached him for help.

The third speaker was Mr Fred Harris. Mr Harris explained that he lived on the Redwell estate in the northern part of the town and he raised several points of

concern, including the fact that there was no regular bus service to the northern part of the town, thus resulting in those living in that area having to drive into the town centre, and therefore needing parking. The High Street/Jacksons Lane car park was the best place for parking for those from the villages and the northern part of the town. Once the Glenvale estate was completed those residents would need to park in the town centre. Failure to provide parking would result in residents travelling elsewhere to shop and this would affect businesses in Wellingborough. The car park was seldom empty and occupied by users of Salam Hall, the Doctors, Churches, employees of local businesses and shoppers. Other car parks were time limited and restrictive, the multi storey car park was unsuitable and inconvenient for users from the North of the town due to its geography and the one-way system which created severe congestion around the town. He also suggested that brownfield sites in the town could be used for more housing. He requested that the committee should decide not to proceed with the sale of land and the proposed development on this site.

The chairman clarified that this site was in fact a brownfield site.

The fourth speaker Mrs Cynthia Bailey addressed the meeting, she was a member of the United Reformed Church and a resident of Swanspool Ward. She asked what part the petition, signed by over 4,000 people, had in the decision-making process, and whether the concerns raised were being taken seriously or whether it had been a complete waste of time. A promise had been made that a consultation would be undertaken before a decision was made. Over 200 people had attended a public meeting and all were concerned over what was being proposed. She considered that the residents had been shoddily treated, this development was a huge significance for all, there was little parking in this area and the car park was needed for the elderly congregation who attended the URC, this was a large venue holding international and county events plus multi-faith celebrations and afro-Caribbean funerals with large congregations. The concern was that parking would move to the, already congested, local streets that had time limited parking. As a resident of Park Road, where there were many terraced houses with no parking, plus parking restrictions, she was very concerned. Also, visitors to homes in the area parked in the High Street. She emphasised the need for councillors to listen to residents who work and live in this area.

(Councillor Partridge-Underwood lost connectivity at 7.35pm but was able to view the live stream of the meeting.)

The chairman thanked all the speakers for addressing the meeting, he clarified that the intended consultation events and drop-in sessions had been unable to take place due to the health pandemic and several officers working from home.

He asked Stephen Norton from Keepmoat Homes if he would like to speak.

Mr Norton explained that planning consent had been granted for the site, but that there were now different challenges being faced in the current climate. Keepmoat wished to improve the product and outputs of their development,

whilst supporting the town centre economy. The purchase profile for the new development was to secure homes for first time buyers – there were changes to the housing mix moving from 4-bedroom family homes to two-and three-bedroom properties for first time buyers. This would enable there to be an increase in the number of affordable homes from 22 to 35 with a better mix on offer from 1-bedroom flats to 3-bedroom house on the site. Improvements had been made to the internal layout of the homes, to future proof and allow people to work from home, changing and improving rear gardens for better outside meeting space. Parking for the homes had been improved, making it more secure. These improvements and different styles of housing would enhance the street scene, with the omission of the need for stepped access, making it easier to navigate.

A pre-application had been submitted and comments made taken on board. This included the introduction of additional trees and shrubs into the public realm area, breaking up car parking, making improvements in line with the national homes space standards, improving connectivity through the estate and beyond and creating better topography, and giving more security to the rear of properties. It was considered that this was a better development to the one already consented and that development on this site would support the night-time economy of the town as there was a better selection with more affordable homes.

Councillor Griffiths thanked all the speakers for their input and opened the report for debate by the committee, he reminded members that if they wished to discuss anything in the confidential part of the report that the debate would need to be moved to private and that would result in the live event ending.

Members discussed the content of the report with many recalling the various options that had been suggested for the site previously including, a swimming pool, large supermarket, car dealership, re-siting of Tresham College, Hotel and multi-storey car park. Throughout the history of the development of the site it had been mooted that there would be some residential development on this site.

It had taken many years for the planning permission to be granted and there would be a further delay if a new application was proposed for the site. It was highly unlikely that this would be decided by the Borough Council of Wellingborough considering the timescales.

Members were disappointed that the promised public consultation and drop-in sessions had been unable to take place, although the work of the council had continued despite the pandemic, and it was understandable that the public were disappointed. It was appreciated that in the current circumstances, this was unable to happen. The matter would be decided by the full council meeting on 8 December 2020, where members of the public could have input.

Many councillors were not against the principle of the development on this site, which was never meant to be a long-term car park for the town. The land had been the subject of slum clearance with the intention to redevelop the area.

However, there was concern that this was not the right development for the site and that the current discussion was premature. Whilst the new planning application appeared to be a significant improvement on the one consented, there remained a lot of work to be done, with various concerns over highway issues with a road proposed to go all the way through the site, which was of concern.

Shopping habits had considerably changed since Covid-19 and it was unlikely the town centre would escape unscathed, there needed to be serious consideration on how to plan for the future of the town centre, and there was concern over how the site could or should be developed in the future. It was felt that this should be considered by the new unitary council, as the site had a lot of potential and there was a feeling that the sale of the land was being rushed.

The Planning Manager, Martyn Swann responded to various comments regarding the planning position only. He confirmed that the case officer had provided pre-application advice to the applicant within the 8-week timeframe as detailed in the appendix to the report. A subsequent meeting has been held for consultees to explain changes being sought and to understand from the developer the constraints of the development. It is believed that there is a scheme possible within the pre-planning application submission, but changes were required thereto with significant issues needed to be progressed.

A further pre-planning application has been requested and further work was needed to enable officers to recommend an application to planning committee for approval. Areas that needed to be addressed included the design, elevational treatment and the maximisation of section 106 contributions. Work will continue to take place with the developer throughout the pre-planning route.

Some members felt strongly that this site was no longer viable for retail/commercial use and that the days of a large supermarket coming to the town centre had passed. There was enough room on the site for the housing development and a greatly improved car park. It was considered that a decision on the site needed to take place sooner, rather than later, to ensure the decision was made by the borough council rather than the new unitary authority of North Northamptonshire.

The chairman asked Mr Piper if he would like to comment on any points raised at this stage.

Mr Piper referred to the issue of the car parking, whilst he appreciated there would be a net loss of car parking spaces, he felt that the new car park was of a much better quality, layout and much more secure. The current High Street/Jacksons Lane site area was a Brownfield site and was a poor-quality car park and had never been intended for use as a 'forever' car park. The new car park would be a much better offer for users.

A speaker had referenced the retail, commercial, residential mixed use originally proposed for the site. This had changed some time ago and only residential development of the site remained. Advice recently obtained, indicated that the market for this area was for housing development, it was unlikely that any developer would be interested in putting retail, commercial, leisure or hospitality development in this area.

The suggestion that a retailer from another site in the town was interested, was not correct. Contact had been made by an agent purporting to be acting on the retailer's behalf, though there was no evidence that this had been the case, and nothing further had come forward in recent years.

A valuation, completed very recently, was provided in the exempt papers to the report.

The chairman asked Mr Piper if he considered that a total of 2,200 spaces would be adequate parking in the future. Mr Piper clarified that with the push for cycleways, green routes and encouraging walking, there would be more than an adequate number of spaces. The town centre vision had reviewed car parking and with the improvements to the multi-storey car park, Castle Theatre and the proposal for the High Street site the offer was good.

Members continued to debate the report.

Further comments were made over the proposals for the site, particularly around highways and the junction of Jackson Lane and the improvements that would be required to the junction with High Street. There was also some concern over the style of the housing, as the High Street leading to Broad Green was a conservation area and it was considered that a more suitable style of housing would complement the area. The façade of the Drill Hall had been protected and this was to be redeveloped. It was felt that the enhancement to the design of houses would be beneficial.

Queries were raised over whether a viability study had been undertaken and, if not, it was important that such study be carried out before any decisions were made. A question was asked as to whether a conditional contract could be entered into without a viability statement from a third party. It was also considered imperative that the car park was built prior to any construction taking place on the site.

It was then mooted that it may be a good option to leave the site dormant until the unitary authority was in place, Councillors would be elected to the unitary council and would continue to fight for the best outcome for the people of Wellingborough. The unitary council may have more 'buying power' and it was considered that there was no need to rush to decide.

Reference was also made to the lack of provision for the elderly or disabled, with everything being focused on the under 35's; it was important for both the elderly and disabled or those suffering from mobility issues to be catered for in

a town centre location. The ability to park close to the town centre was also of most importance.

Councillor L Lawman proposed the following amendment to the proposed action as follows:

- 4.1 to add the words 'at a minimum price of X,Y,Z plus overage, once a revised planning application and section 106 agreement has been approved, without reference to the planning inspectorate' so it would read:
the disposal of the High Street/Jackson Lane site, subject to contract, to Keepmoat Homes for the purpose of residential development at a minimum price of X,Y,Z plus overage, once a revised planning application and section 106 agreement has been approved, without reference to the planning inspectorate;
- 4.2 to add the words 'such contract to be brought back to council for approval' to read:
to delegate to the assistant director (corporate landlord) the responsibility for agreeing the draft terms of the contract for disposal, such contract to be brought back to council for approval;
- 4.3 to add the words 'and such car park to be completed before the commencement of the scheme' to read:
that the approved indicative scheme in appendix 4 for a new surface car park of approximately 200 spaces be reviewed and a capital bid submitted for its construction, such car park to be completed before the commencement of the construction of the High Street/Jackson Lane site.

The chairman asked if officers wished to respond to the comments made and the amendment.

Mr Swann responded in relation to the viability issue. He explained that as a local planning authority, greater use of financial viability opportunities had been undertaken over the years. Officers had become more experienced in dealing with financial viability issues and using the services of independent financial viability specialists to review the assumptions made. This has had positive impacts in terms of outcomes secured around affordable housing and section 106 contributions. Land value forms part of such assessments and it is important that section 106 contributions and affordable housing provision are not compromised by the price paid.

Mr Piper confirmed that a viability discussion would be needed, and the developers were aware of this too. The council would need to get a decent price for the land along with a section 106 contribution. A parking survey would be required as part of the planning application.

Officers would try to ensure that the car park was built prior to the site being developed. Developers always required compound space, but this would need to be considered before the balance of the site was lost.

Traffic surveys would be undertaken, and design issues would be the subject of discussions between the developer and their planning advisers.

Advice had been sought on a conditional contract and it had been confirmed that this would offer protection for the council; currently no contract was in place. Whilst the developers would not be on site by the time the borough council ceased to exist, it was expected that a contract could be in place before then.

The chairman asked if the Keepmoat scheme would be phased. Mr Swann responded that this was not clear at present, but that it could be.

A further member felt that the decision about the future of the site need to be based on strategy. The developer intended to use the site for housing with no strategy for retail, leisure or other use. He felt the market needed to be tested to ensure value for money and that legally the site was being disposed of in the correct way. This would avoid any challenge by the public. It was suggested that the decision should not be rushed and should be left for the unitary authority to decide so this would work with future strategies for North Northamptonshire.

Mr Piper confirmed that the market had been tested and the proper procurement process had been carried out, albeit several years ago. It could be re-tested, but officers were comfortable that a valid process had been undertaken.

The strategy for the town centre indicated that the site was appropriate for housing development. This development was expected to bring several hundred people into the town centre to live and use its amenities.

Councillor Harrington addressed the meeting and agreed with the proviso that the new car park be completed prior to any housing development on the site. He seconded Councillor L Lawman's previous amendment.

Officers expressed some concern over the wording of the amendment. They felt that for a developer to commit to the expense of obtaining planning consent, prior to there being a contract in place, was a lot to ask and there was concern that a developer would not agree to this.

Members and officers further discussed the proposed amendment.

Mr Piper suggested that the wording would need to allow the planning matter to be decided after the conditional contract was exchanged. It was felt some further discussion was required on proposal 4.1.

It was, however, felt that the other amendments at 4.2 and 4.3 were acceptable.

The chairman put the amendments to 4.2 and 4.3 to the vote and this was declared carried.

The debate regarding proposal 4.1 continued with officers making suggestions and members rejecting these.

It was considered that there needed to be some further discussion around the confidential appendix to the report.

The chairman therefore proposed that the meeting be moved into confidential to enable a discussion to take place, on being put to the vote this was agreed.

RESOLVED that the public and press be excluded from the meeting during consideration of this item in accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information of the description shown in Part1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

The chairman closed the open part of the meeting at 8.50pm and there was a 10-minute adjournment to enable officers to set up the confidential meeting.

The meeting reconvened in private with the following present:

Councillors Griffiths (Chairman), Partridge-Underwood (Vice-Chairman), Allebone, Bell, Emerson, Francis, Graves, Harrington, Henley, L Lawman, Morrall, Scarborough, Ward and Weatherill.

Also present: Mrs L Elliott, Managing Director, Mr S Darcy (Director/Section 151 Officer), Mr A Piper, Miss K Denton, Mrs V Jessop and Mr E Symons (Assistant Directors), Mr B Gill (Monitoring Officer), Mrs V Phillipson, (Principal Property Manager), Mrs C A Mundy (Senior Democratic Services Officer (Committees and Members)) – minute taker, Mrs F Hubbard (Senior Democratic Services Officer (Civic)) and Mrs E Robinson (Democratic Services Support Officer) – meeting producers. Mr Tully and Mr Morton from Deloitte were also present.

A lengthy debate ensued regarding the proposed amendment.

Officers confirmed that advice had been received regarding the importance of a contract being in place for the benefit of the council; without this there was a possibility that the developer would do nothing further to progress the second planning permission as they had already expended considerable resource at risk with no contract in place.

Discussions also took place around the negotiations at 5.1 of the exempt report from Deloitte, (appendix 5) and the price and payment terms.

Various suggestions were made in relation to the price and the amount that should be paid for the site. It was advised that a detailed price should not be included within the recommendation, as this was still the subject of negotiation.

Legal advice was provided by Mr Gill, Monitoring Officer and the following wording was suggested to the amendment:

4.1 that subject to contract, the council agrees to sell High Street/Jackson Lane site to Keepmoat homes, subject to meeting all the following conditions:

- (i) the site is sold for development of residential housing and public car parking;
- (ii) the agreed price is not to be less than the price detailed at 5.1 of the Deloitte report, exempt appendix 5, to the report;
- (iii) An overage is paid;
- (iv) A revised planning application, including a section 106 agreement, being approved by this council (or its successors) at the earliest possible date.

Members discussed this further but considered that a date needed to be added at point (iv), it was initially suggested that this be 31 December 2021 but following consideration agreed that this be 31 September 2021.

Further discussion in relation to the price took place. Members were advised that should the price be too high the site may no longer be of interest to any developer. Consideration also had to be given to the negotiation of the section 106 contributions and what could be delivered from such monies.

Members asked the experts if they thought there was a possibility of development, other than housing, going onto this site. The advice was that this was highly unlikely and probably would be even less likely following the pandemic.

Members were also advised that due to the time constraints any planning application would be decided by the new unitary council, though the groundwork over the next few months would continue to be carried out by officers of the borough council.

Concern was expressed over the proposed amendment by a number of councillors who felt they would be unable to vote in favour of such amendment.

Councillor Partridge-Underwood asked for clarification from the monitoring officer as to whether he would be able to vote as he had lost connectivity, during the open part of the meeting, though he had managed to watch the live stream of the meeting. The monitoring officer clarified that if the councillor felt fully informed about the subject matter, it was possible for him to vote, however, if he had any doubt, he would advise him not to participate in the voting.

The chairman put the amendment to 4.1 of the report, which was proposed by Councillor L Lawman and seconded by Councillor Harrington, to the vote as follows:

- 4.1 subject to contract, the council agrees to sell High Street/Jackson's Lane site to Keepmoat Homes, subject to meeting all the following conditions:
- (i) the site is sold for development of residential housing and public car parking;
 - (ii) the agreed price is not to be less than the price detailed at 5.1 of the Deloitte report, exempt appendix 5, to the report;
 - (iii) An overage is paid;
 - (iv) A revised planning application, including a section 106 agreement, being approved by this council (or its successors) no later than 30 September 2021

The amendment was declared carried with seven votes in favour, five votes against and one abstention.

(At the request of Councilor Henley it was noted that Councilors Emerson, Francis, Henley, Scarborough and Weatherill voted against the above).

This amendment along with the amendments agreed during the open meeting became the substantive motion, as shown below.

It be recommended that approval be given to:

- (a) subject to contract, the council agreeing to sell High Street/Jackson's Lane site to Keepmoat Homes, subject to meeting all the following conditions:
 - (i) the site is sold for development of residential housing and public car parking;
 - (ii) the agreed price is not to be less than the price detailed at 5.1 of the Deloitte report, exempt appendix 5, to the report;
 - (iii) An overage is paid;
 - (iv) A revised planning application, including a section 106 agreement, being approved by this council (or its successors) no later than 30 September 2021
- (b) delegate to the assistant director (corporate landlord) the responsibility to agree the terms of the contract for disposal, such contract to be brought back to council (or its successors) for approval;
- (c) a capital scheme being submitted for the construction of the approved indicative scheme, as detailed in appendix 4 to the report, for a new surface car park of approximately 200 spaces, such car parking scheme to be completed before the commencement of construction of the High Street/Jacksons Lane site.

This was put to the vote and declared carried.

R1 RECOMMEND that:

- (a) subject to contract, the council agrees to sell High Street/Jackson's Lane site to Keepmoat Homes, subject to meeting all the following conditions:
 - (i) the site is sold for development of residential housing and public car parking;
 - (ii) the agreed price is not to be less than the price detailed at 5.1 of the Deloitte report, exempt appendix 5, to the report;
 - (iii) An overage is paid;
 - (iv) A revised planning application, including a section 106 agreement, being approved by this council (or its successors) no later than 30 September 2021
- (b) the responsibility to agree the terms of the contract for disposal, be delegated to the assistant director (corporate landlord) such contract to be brought back to council (or its successors) for approval;
- (c) A capital scheme be submitted for the construction of the approved indicative scheme, as detailed in appendix 4 to the report, for a new surface car park of approximately 200 spaces, such car parking scheme to be completed before the commencement of construction of the High Street/Jacksons Lane site.

4. ANY OTHER ITEM THAT THE CHARIMAN DECIDES IS URGENT

The chairman had no further business and thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.

Chairman

The meeting concluded at 9.57pm.