

Local Development Framework Project Management Board
Workshop 28
9th July 2013, Brympton Way, Yeovil

Members Present: **Officers Present:**

Ric Pallister
Tim Carroll
Sue Steele

Rina Singh
Martin Woods
Andy Foyne
Dave Norris
Jo Manley
Keith Lane
Helen Rutter
Helen Harris

1. Notes of last meeting and matters arising

Final Duty to Co-operate agreement has been received from Dorset County Council and Somerset County Council has now been received. DCC still maintain a disagreement with their own Districts over content but the Duty To Co-operate requirement for engagement with SSDC has been fulfilled.

The response to the Hardisty Jones submission concerning prospective economic activity rate changes over time and a consequent requirement to increase population for the same workforce and therefore requirement for more dwellings for South Somerset can be viewed as having been endorsed in light of it nor being brought up in the Inspector's Preliminary Findings letter.

2. Inspectors preliminary findings

AF ran through the implications and timetable schedule presented in relation to the Inspectors Preliminary Findings letter and outlined the initial responses to each of the main issues, namely;

There was a full debate on all the main points raised by the Inspector and the potential implications. The Members on the Board expressed concern at the way in which the Response to the Inspector's points were couched. It was felt incorrect and inappropriate to express disagreement with the points raised by the Inspector who by the nature of the process is final judge of the matters at hand. It was therefore considered and agreed that these references should be removed and not used in any formal correspondence with the Inspector

The PMB expressly considered at length the pros and cons of withdrawing the Plan over suspension in general terms and in context of information provided re recent examples of Local Plan Examinations which had been suspended. They determined to pursue suspension should the Inspector endorse this. This would require a response from the Council to the Inspector acknowledging the Preliminary Findings together with a schedule of work and outline timetable to address the areas of concern and, on that basis, seek his approval of a suspension option.

PMB agreed:

- The need for a review of the Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and that the Sustainability Appraisal should be re-done by an

outside consultancy to ensure a fresh look is achieved unaffected by earlier controversies. SA review would require reconsultation.

- The need to redo the SA for the Direction of Growth for Ilminster and re-consult.
- To undertake the work identified as needed as outlined in the schedule on the employment land provision for Market Towns and Rural Centres.
- Clarify position in terms of interim provision of housing growth in Market Towns and Rural Centres and particularly in terms of the relationship between each individual settlement prior to adoption of a site allocations DPD.
- Advertise and re consult as a main modification on Proposed Modification made for Wincanton with a view to reviewing the requirement for more housing should the provision for the settlement be developed such that there was no provision towards the end of the plan period.
- References to the non-statutory documents within policies to be removed to the supporting text of the policy and advertised as minor modifications.
- To pursue suspension given its benefits over withdrawal
- Need for a more detailed project plan of the suspension work than that presented with the schedule

It was acknowledged that, if the Inspector was minded to agree to a suspension of proceedings, it would then require a formal decision by Full Council to pursue the “suspension” option and undertake all the subsequent work in order to pursue an early decision and move expeditiously towards final adoption a letter from the Portfolio Holder would need to go early to the Inspector and be subject to subsequent appropriate member endorsement.

3. Publication of Inspector’s preliminary findings and initial Council response and informing Members (draft members email attached)

The Board considered a draft of an information sheet for members. **PMB Agreed** to leave to Portfolio Holder to develop this.

4. Press release and media engagement (draft press release attached)

The Board considered a draft of a Press Release. PMB agreed to leave to Portfolio Holder to develop this subject to agreement of Board chairman.

5. Next stages and next meeting

Would be dependant on the more detailed Project Plan

6. Implications for East Coker Neighbourhood Plan (NP)

Whilst clearly there was more uncertainty about the urban extension it was considered that the Plan could continue and it would be left to District Executive to consider in detail the designation of east Coker for a NP

7. Any Other Business

None