

## **PMB Notes of meeting 30/04/12**

### **Workshop 15: Consultation Strategy and Timescale to Submission**

Present: Cllr Ric Pallister, Cllr Tim Carroll, Cllr Sue Steele,

Officers: Andy Foyne, Martin Woods, Rina Singh, Dave Norris, Helen Rutter, Kim Close,

Policy Officers present: Jo Wilkins, Nigel Collins

1. Minutes of Workshop 14 and matters arising  
Notes agreed.

Matters Arising: All actions completed.

Cllr TC noted that it was agreed at Full Council that the completed text of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 be circulated to all members prior to signing off by PMB. This is included in the Project Plan discussed under item 3.

2. Proposed Submission South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028, Consultation Strategy

The proposed consultation strategy was discussed. Agreed that the approach should be clear and simple including next steps and inclusion of thumbnails showing the direction of growth for Yeovil and the Primary and Local Market Towns.

#### **PMB agreed:**

That the overall approach set out in the consultation strategy was acceptable with following items of detail/amendment:

A half page advert in the Western Gazette

Summary leaflet to be sent out with South Somerset News (being delivered week of 26<sup>th</sup> June) and A4 insert in Chard and Ilminster News

Notices/advert to be placed in Langport Leveller and The Visitor (in addition to Blackmore Vale Magazine, Chard and Ilminster News, Western Gazette and Fosse Way Magazine)

To have a static unmanned exhibition in reception at Brympton Way for the consultation period rather than individual events in particular locations

Rather than a process fact sheet produce a set of FAQ's to be placed on the web and circulated to Town and Parish Councils and made available at exhibition

Final consultation material to be endorsed by PMB

**ACTION:** Jo W to liaise with Martin Hacker and Bruce Soord to action the above and prepare relevant material.

3. Timetable to Submission (project plan and note of call to PINS)

AF explained that Stephen Carnaby of the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) has confirmed that all copies of representation received will go to the Inspector in full in both paper and electronic format. It will be at the Inspector's discretion as to whether a pre hearing meeting takes place (usually the case where there are major issues to discuss) – likely to be the case for South Somerset.

The inspectorate need to be informed 1 month before publication of Proposed

Submission document and then again on publication at which point they will forward a draft Service Level Agreement to agree with SSDC over the next stages. They will expect SSDC to give them a clear view as to when an Examination will be appropriate based on local knowledge of the process and issues.

AF presented the project plan he explained that the team had expressed concern regarding proposed timescales particularly in relation to dealing with comments on Proposed Submission Consultation and timescale allowed for reading and inputting representations (whilst respondents will be encouraged to make their representation online experience has shown that many make them in paper format).

Noted that there is 3 weeks to get the Proposed Submission consultation version of the local plan prepared with a further 2 weeks for Member and Corporate Officer consultation and 1 week for amendment prior to PMB sign off.

**PMB agreed** that Members are to be sent a hyper link to the final text and are to given only 10 days in which to forward their comments in relation to what was agreed at Full Council on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2012. Paper copies of the document are to be placed in the Members room. Jo Gale to be notified so that she can direct members to the document.

**ACTION** AF to ensure final text made available to members as agreed.

Planning Policy Team will amend the text as necessary and final text will be reported to PMB along with:

Sustainability Appraisal – KL dealing;

Appropriate Assessment – N Cardnell had liaised with Royal Haskoning and report now drafted.

Equality Analysis – has already been seen by PMB and further stage 2 assessments will be bought back for PMB to consider if required by any new policy

Saved policies – a list of all policies being replaced and by what and those that continue to be saved will be included in final proposed submission plan (which Members will see as noted above).

Likely that 2 half day meetings of PMB will be required to cover everything and sign off.

Inset maps and proposals map are being produced/finalised and the final text will be put onto INovem – resources are available to do this.

Proposed consultation period to run for a 6 week period from 22<sup>nd</sup> June to 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2012 this means the consultation period will run into the school holidays. **PMB agreed** that a couple of weeks overlap is acceptable given that the majority of the consultation period is outside the holidays.

Any major changes arising from representations will require further consultation.

The Inspector will be sent a copy of the submitted document, all representations in electronic and paper format, the consultation report and schedule of proposed minor changes.

AF reminded PMB of 3 issues that may require major review of the plan:

Publication of revised household data from the census will require analysis this may or may not have significant implications for the contents of the plan.

Receipt of any representations that raise major issues.  
Post submission receipt of BRES data.

Examination timetable will be at the discretion of the Inspector. The Inspector will decide if the plan is sound or not and may suggest amendments which the District Council can decide whether to accept or not although there must be sound planning reasons for not accepting any amendments.

Cllr RP is on leave from 10<sup>th</sup> –30<sup>th</sup> September 2012. **ACTION:** AF to add this to leave calendar.

**PMB agreed** to endorse the Project Plan as an indicative timetable to pursue and funding as indicated from Local Plan Reserve.

#### 4. Review of Recommendation 41 to Full Council

N Collins presented draft report to Full Council and highlighted a couple typing errors.

Key issues are:

- Although there is an ability to encourage and promote the re opening of potential rail freight hubs and potential passenger stations there is no evidence to support protection of the land – could result in blight.
- To produce a business case is likely to cost £50,000 - £100,000 per station site.
- Consider that it would be inappropriate to spend money on a business case when there is no guarantee.
- A compromise was presented that included protection of the land until such time as a business case was presented. Investing in a business case would not guarantee reopening.
- Recognition that Network Rail is likely to invest in the existing network rather than open new stations.

**PMB agreed** that the compromise approach was not acceptable and should be deleted from the final report. Report needs to refer to paragraph 41 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Point 4 of the conclusion requires amendment or deletion. Support for rail stations was agreed but protection was not.

**ACTION:** N Collins to amend contents of the draft report as agreed.

#### 5. AOB

- PAS toolkit on the NPPF is now available and has been assessed. The review already carried out by the Planning Policy Team is more comprehensive. Only key issue is that the Minister is going to insist that there is policy in local plans in favour of sustainable development. PAS have produced a model policy. **PMB agreed** that such a policy should be inserted and there was no conflict with Full Council decision. **ACTION:** AF to arrange for such policy to be included in the local plan.
- Concern was raised at Full Council regarding the ability of Yeovil urban area to accommodate the potential level of windfall development identified. **PMB agreed** that the urban extension has enough capacity to accommodate up to 2,500 dwellings which gives sufficient flexibility should Yeovil's urban capacity

be an over estimate. This position has been clearly set out to Members and Full Council in the conclusion of Item 7 Annex 1, Appendix B.

- AF informed PMB that he and Jo M were meeting Cllr Gage on 30.04.12 (pm) to discuss the employment figures.
- Cllr RP raised concern regarding the requirement to have a 5 year land supply of Traveller sites as required by the new national planning policy (2012). AF clarified that if there is no 5 year supply to meet identified need this will have to be met through a site allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). Timing of / need for this will addressed when the Council consider the revised Local development Scheme (LDS).