

Notes of meeting 13/9/11

Workshop 6: Growth requirement and General Review

Present: Cllr Sue Steele, Cllr Peter Seib, Cllr Tim Carroll,

MAG Officers present: Andy Foyne, Jean Marshall, Martin Woods, Dave Norris, Helen Rutter, Andrew Gillespie, Kim Close, Rina Singh, Steve Joel, Charlotte Jones (from 11am)

1. Minutes of Workshop 4

AF updated situation re 2 x Growth Workshops (Bakers) and email from PINS both covered by separate papers. No other matters arising

Minutes of Workshop 5

No matters arising

2. PINS Soundness

2 issues requested to ask critical friend

- Yeovil, what happens if we change location for growth
- Langport – proposed change in status to market town

Critical friend project now withdrawn but PINS (S Carnaby) still able to respond.
Yeovil – would have to reconsult if go for a multi site option
Langport – no need to reconsult as can explain proposed change as part of submission document

Took opportunity to ask other questions.

Scale of growth – provided not a quantum change from 16,000 likely to be ok and no need to reconsult. RSS – still have to take proposed modification figures into consideration though by the time the examination comes around, RSS likely to have gone (under localism Bill) if there is delay in enacting Bill, it would be legitimate to argue on own evidence base alternative figures.

Plan A = work on basis of RSS going by the time of the examination

Plan B = if not gone will use own evidence base

Additional Yeovil modelling. Have already gone out to further consultation on first round of additional Parsons Brinkerhoff modelling but asked if need to go back to consultation bearing in mind further work being done is a technical response to issues raised. PINS advised should do so if there is time but as the additional work is evidence and adjusting for technical reasons we wouldn't normally consult on evidence. The public will still have the opportunity to make representations on all of the Parsons B work before the examination. If we do chose to go for further consultation there will be at least a months delay if not 2.

PB stuff to date is currently on the SCC website and the questions raised are also on there (with link). Need to ensure additional work is also published and that SCC respond to additional technical queries.

MW – must ensure all data is visible. Final draft core strategy must clearly indicate we have used PB evidence and to demonstrate to Inspector we have had regard to it.

Action: AF to confirm with S Walford will take same approach as previously.

Action: PB report to be notified to all Members. Explain that workshop was asked for by Area South but if anyone wants to attend they are welcome to do so. JHM to arrange

Action: AF to ensure Inovem can accept SW comments onto the Website

3. Housing Requirement (Baker's Workshops)

Two main issues causing concerns

- Economic Potential – this was generally accepted that sectoral analysis is preferential than using national figures
- Migration and population – top end potential remains the same but lower end slightly dropped. Bakers used latest figures, rest is conjecture. May 2012 will go the 2010 household projections and Inspector will be duty bound to look at those figures. SSDc will also have to consider these therefore the process itself allows for the latest data to be considered.

AF response to Marcus Fysh questions with response waited on some points from John Baker. This will then be circulated to all Members. Queries raised about Taunton Deane and SDC reducing their figures – we have used own evidence and not followed their pattern. TDBC figures also covered part of Sedgemoor's area (Bridgwater) as part of the then Principal Urban Area (PUA) so not directly comparable. TDBC now promoting 17,000 over 20 year period 2008 – 2028 (was 21,800 including part of Sedgemoor) Job growth projection in TDBC 11,900 and growth rate 2.8% pa.

JB asked to convert his projections to GVA – not easy to do. Q6 on 15/8/11 13,000 dwellings in TDBC appears to relate to Taunton alone and not to District – cannot therefore compare.

Bakers report considered robust and no evidence thus far to change. P Seib – not a question of will we reach 16,000, but rather when we reach it.

AF – this is an economic lead growth programme, cannot overprovide as the market will dictate speed of growth but could underprovide and if we did this would result in employers not being able to house workforce, house price rises etc and employers will then look elsewhere. In 2010 had over 1000 houses built, highest since 1991 at height of a recession. Have had good growth rate since WW2, will be peaks and troughs but it is only a question of when we get to 16,000, we are aiming to 2026 (17,200 for 2028) but could be earlier or later, let market sort it out.

RSS figure of 16,600 was based on projections of economic growth done by Bakers on behalf of SCC and Districts.

Economy also grown, not sure if in past economic growth has been in same place as housing growth.

Recommendation: Stick with 16,000 to 2026 (17,200 to 2028)

HR: are we sure we can constrain growth in rural areas under policy SS2?

AF: have doubled the provision in rural areas to 2400. SS2 works nicely. Infill is an issue. Of 1200 new dwellings in rural areas over 50% are "infill" sites. Policy is radical, question is how you make it sustainable. Affordable housing is ok and if its mixed market and affordable its ok but if it is just large executive housing it wouldn't

be. We will need to engage with the community to explain that. It will be interesting to see how the Inspectorate view it too.

Difficulty will be in getting community onside. Policy SS2 needs to have community fully behind policy. Policy can be reviewed under monitoring. Lots of people also want to downsize and remain in their villages and others need starter homes but they are not necessarily affordable housing, It is a question of saying no to the wrong sort of housing. Further wording re SS2 promised at earlier PMB?MAG meeting will address this issue.

4. IDP

Only arrived on Friday 9th but still not complete. Need therefore to have further PMB. IDP and Parsons Brinkerhoff work will be the agenda items

Agreed – 29th September pm

There have been problems in getting some stakeholder engagement so may have to do a name and shame. W Water in particular so has implications for Somerton and Langport.

Workshop 7: General Review and Matrix

1. Feedback on Area Workshops

Details of Area workshops noted. Most of the issues arising from the Area Workshops are covered by other papers except for Henstridge. This is currently a saved policy but could indicate it as a retained policy. HR – has been difficult to get appropriate growth in the area so we do need a mechanism and policy would be good to retain.

Agreed – no new policy but retain existing saved policy

(Meeting closed with Workshop 7 continuing on 14th September 2011.)