

Local Plan Suspension Programme Project Management Board

Notes of Meeting held on 14th October 2013

Present:

Alastair Peattie – Enfusion
CllrTim Carroll
Cllr Ric Pallister (Chairman)
Cllr Sue Steele
CllrAngie Singleton
Rina Singh
Martin Woods
Kim Close
David Norris
Keith Lane

Ric introduced Alastair Peattie(AP) from Enfusion.

1. Project Plan Task 16 Progress Report from Enfusion. - **Progress on time Noted**
2. Project Plan Task 15 Compliance Report from Enfusion.- **Conclusions noted Report to be added to the Evidence Base.**
3. **Project Plan Task 14 Yeovil Sustainable Urban Extension Sustainability Appraisal.**

AP gave a presentation of his main findings from the report

The six areas (A-F) were thoroughly re - considered as being reasonable alternatives for growth of Yeovil from previous analysis of documents and the newly completed Landscape Addendum.

Analysis of constraints/technical studies meant two areas were rejected – Area E and Area F for reasons arising from Landscape addendum. Areas A,B,C, and D were considered further as they presented reasonable options for development. The issue of the flight zone not being clearly identified and documented as a constraint was raised RP highlighted the fact that the sections that had been discounted prior to the identification of the six areas (A-F) needed to be clearly documented; eg, the area to the north and west of Mudford Road. KL explained that minimum site size and landscape issues were covered on page 16. It was agreed those sites that had been discounted should be listed and para 3.17 should cover 360 degrees by adding further explanation as to why some areas were not considered to be 'reasonable alternatives'. In particular ' F'

It was agreed there would be a fuller explanation of areas omitted and the reasons (KL/ AP)

The Board discussed the table 3.3, page 23 – Discussion took place regarding flood zones and the viability of Area C. It was explained that representations on this area had been received from West Dorset DC and would be reported later on in the process. The acute severance aspect of this area from the town due to the River Yeo and the Bristol/Weymouth railway line was highlighted. AP explained that this issue had been identified and addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal. It was stated that Area B was the only option with the spatial potential for a secondary school. It was explained that using CIL you can use funds collected for alternative sites, a school does not have to be located on the development, but if an additional Secondary School for Yeovil was required by the Education Authority then this area(B) was probably the only one with sufficient land out of all the six areas (A-F).

Page 24 Traffic – Reference was made to the gradient of Hendford Hill which had been raised in the Inquiry. AP confirmed that this aspect has been considered in the relevant part of the SA.

Page 25 Landscape – the issue of growth beyond the plan period (2006-2028) and the ability of the individual sites' to accommodate such growth was raised in the context of whether this aspect had been included in the SA. AP confirmed this was part of the next stage assessment methodology which would be considered later on the agenda.

Page 25 Historic Environment – Reference was made to the recent significant archaeological finds at the hill top site adjacent to Area D . Officers explained that although these were currently being investigated by the County Historic Environment team, the site itself currently was not designated and therefore was not a designated constraint within the SA.

Page 25 Climate Change – there was little to differentiate between sites.

Page 26 Pollution – A key difference between areas was agricultural land quality This will help to inform the process further on.

Page 25 Flooding – Area C has significant issues – minor negative effect.

Page 25 Biodiversity – could affect all – no significant difference.

AP stated that the SA must be used to show how the information has contributed and informed the final decision in terms of site selection.

The fact that 1565 dwellings and not the previous 2500 was raised as the Inspector did not specifically the issue of beyond-plan period growth. Officers explained that there had been extensive internal and external discussions with Enfusion on this aspect. Enfusion's view was that it is important that the base assessment figure on identified housing need should be utilised in order to create a level playing field and therefore the 1565 figure should be used. Using the higher (original) figure

comprising the base requirement plus growth beyond 2028 would automatically discount all but one site,.

It was agreed that the plan should consider SA using 1565 dws and include expandability as part of the next stage criteria

It was queried if the findings of the previous Inspector in 2003 formed part of the source material for the SA. AP confirmed that they were not as this was a new appraisal using the most recent evidence and assessments. However It was confirmed that the 2003 Inspector's report was now incorporated into the SSDC Local Plan evidence base.

4. Assessing the Options - suggested approach – Enfusion.

TC summarised the position in that this latest SA process for Yeovil had not produced any one option which was demonstrably superior or preferable using this strategic process. What been achieved was the establishment of a robust and transparent assessment process fully compliant with the requirements of the SA/SEA with a clear audit trail and an aid to assist decision-making. In order to progress matters from this stage, it was therefore necessary to commission additional work and Enfusion had been requested to outline the parameters and framework of such a additional process.

AP then presented an appraisal matrix of 7 criteria for further consideration of the relative growth options. The matrix would be populated for the next meeting of PMB..

The Board agreed that using the criteria presented by Enfusion was sound and would be used to assess options. Enfusion were requested to provide more guidance around each criterion that would be based on their independent expert knowledge and experience of other LAs. They will further detail text and relative significance of each criteria that will help advise and aid PMB in decision making and formulating recommendations.

The approach using the options Appraisal Matrix was explained and agreed

5. Programme Plan – next stages , and next meeting.

The meeting arranged for the 22nd will now be replaced with an all day meeting on the 25th October starting at 9.30am. This meeting will now not only include the other 6 issues which comprised the original agenda but will also include a re-convened session on Yeovil.

Members were asked to bring their A3 project plan to each meeting. Should amendments be necessary then an updated version will be sent out. Papers will go out electronically on the 18th and will be available on the SSDC website on that date.

Printed copies will be available from lunch time on Monday 21st. SS will collect her copy. AS would like hers posted. Notes will be published and approved within three days of the meeting.

RP closed the meeting and thanked AP for the work done so far. AP was requested to attend the meeting on the 25th and this was confirmed.

DRAFT