

CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE**6 October 2015**Attendance:Committee Members:

Councillors:

Read (Chairman) (P)

Godfrey (P)

Weston (P)

Pearson (P)

Other invited Councillors:

J Berry (P)

Evans (P)

Hutchison (P)*

Ruffell (P)

Tait (P)

*Councillor Hutchison in attendance for afternoon session only

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Simon Cook, Power, Rutter and Weir

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Achwal, Dibden and Thompson

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 September 2015 be approved and adopted.

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Godfrey declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of the following items due to his role as a County Council employee. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, he remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Standards Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council involvement.

He also mentioned a possible disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of Winchester College, if any Winchester College matters were to arise during the Committee's deliberations. However, no such matters arose during the Committee.

The Corporate Director advised that he was a resident of New Alresford but, as the proposals did not impact on him or his family personally, he did not have any interest to declare.

Councillor Pearson declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as a trustee of WinACC. He remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Phil Gagg (WinACC) expressed concern that the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) would not be found sound or sustainable by the Inspector. He believed each of the 13 development areas would have major negative traffic effects and that the Council had ignored the recommendations of the MVA traffic reports. He also considered that the Council should introduce much stronger policies to tackle sustainable transport issues and Policy CP10 would not achieve this.

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that the sustainability appraisal was an iterative process and policies would continue to be refined to take account of its recommendations. With regard to transport, the development strategy was tested as part of the LPP1 process and found to be sound and LPP2 would put more detail on the strategy. The most sustainable locations had been allocated and where any issues were highlighted, a policy requirement had been created to address this.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Rutter stated that at the previous meeting, the Head of Strategic Planning had said that no community would have an exception site imposed upon it. However, this had occurred in Kings Worthy with the approval of the "Top Field" planning application at Planning Committee on 17 September 2015.

The Head of Strategic Planning clarified that he had explained at the previous Local Plan Committee meeting that an exception site would not generally be imposed, but could be in certain circumstances, as had occurred recently in Kings Worthy.

Various questions and statements were also made on specific agenda items and are summarised under the relevant items below.

4. **REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2015** (Report CAB2722(LP) refers)

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the key changes proposed were outlined in Paragraphs 2.1 to 2.4 of the Report. One of these was the requirement for a separate Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), with subsequent cost implications involved in preparation. A minor correction to Paragraph 3.3 of the Local Development

Scheme (LDS) set out in Appendix 1 to the Report was noted to change the year 2011 to 2012.

The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the table on Page 3 of the LDS was not meant as a hierarchical depiction of different policy documents. There was no longer any requirement to list all Village Design Statements (VDSs) but they were referenced and a full list is available on the Council's website.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Gypsy and Traveller DPD would be a separate document, sitting alongside the LPP2. It was acknowledged that the requirement to show a five year supply of gypsy and traveller sites could leave the Council vulnerable to speculative development before the DPD was produced. However, sites would still be subject to LPP1 Policy CP5 and be required to meet the requirements of a planning application which would offer some protection.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that LPP1 contained a policy requiring 40% affordable housing provision on all sites where this was viable, but there was no set numerical target for the number of affordable housing units required in the District. The Annual Monitoring Report would examine whether the policy requirement was being achieved.

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the Report.

RESOLVED:

That the revised Winchester District Local Development Scheme 2015, as set out in Appendix 1 to the Report, be approved and brought into immediate effect.

5. WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2 (LPP2): DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND SITE ALLOCATIONS – APPROVAL OF PLAN FOR PUBLICATION

(Report CAB2721(LP) refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting about 15 members of the public, some of whom addressed the Committee on the appendices, as set out within the report. A summary of their comments are outlined under the relevant appendices below.

The Head of Strategic Planning introduced the Report and explained that this was the second of two meetings examining the responses to the LPP2 consultation (the first was held on 16 September 2015 and considered Report CAB2711(LP)). The purpose of the meetings was to recommend final changes to the Plan for approval at Council on 21 October 2015. If approved, it was aimed that the LPP2 be published on 6 November for a consultation period until 21 December 2015. The consultation would be on the soundness and legal compliance of the Plan and any comments received would be passed to the Local Plan Inspector for consideration, as part of the examination process.

There had been extensive consultation on the Draft LPP2 and the detail of this was set out in a separate consultation statement.

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that Appendix P to the Report contained proposed revised policy wording for site allocations where a masterplan was required, as had been requested at the previous Committee meeting. This change had been incorporated within the proposals for New Alresford (Appendix N of the Report) but would need to be added to the policies listed in Appendix P.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that Appendix Q to the Report contained revised policy map insets for Bishops Waltham, Colden Common, Denmead and Kings Worthy which illustrated revised Policy DM5 notations. These revised maps replaced those previously issued with CAB2711(LP) and the DM5 revisions had been included within the maps for Winchester and New Alresford in CAB2721(LP).

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the proposed amendments to Policy WK1 requested at the previous meeting had been circulated to relevant Councillors for their comments and revised wording would be reported to Council on 21 October 2015 for approval.

The Committee then discussed each Appendix/settlement area, as contained in Appendices M to O of the Report (with Appendix N being considered first).

Appendix N – New Alresford

The Head of Strategic Planning acknowledged that local community views on the proposals for New Alresford had been split between those supporting the strategy set out in LPP2 and an alternative proposal put forward by the Alresford Professional Group (APG). Careful consideration, further studies and investigations have been carried out on the alternatives and it has been concluded that the LPP2 proposal was the most suitable in planning terms and the most deliverable. These included an assessment that allocating the Dean Lane site for mainly employment use would not be viable and transport studies that determined provision of a new junction from the A31 was feasible.

The Chairman highlighted that a number of emails from local residents had been received by Committee Members and would be taken into consideration.

During public participation, six members of the public/local groups spoke and their comments are summarised below.

Jan Field (Chair of Alresford Society) spoke in support of the LPP2 proposals and the opportunities created for additional housing and new infrastructure, such as the new A31 junction. She believed these were in the best interest of the town overall and were deliverable, whereas the APG proposals did not include a credible evidence base and were not deliverable. She considered that the Strategic Planning Team had listened to the differing arguments and comprehensively built a strong evidence base in favour of the LPP2 proposals which now deserved support.

Mark Luken (Luken Beck – Planning Consultant to Sun Lane landowners) also supported the proposals in the Appendix and believed it contained a very detailed and comprehensive report. Specifically he highlighted the following:

- Both options accepted that the Sun Lane site was a preferred location for future housing;
- Independent evidence was that the proposed site in NA3 was sound;
- Other alternatives failed to pass essential planning tests and were not sound.

Peter Pooley spoke as a resident of Alresford for 20 years and a former officer of the Alresford Society. He supported previous comments and highlighted the necessity to avoid future uncertainty and move forward with the proposals as contained in the Appendix.

Jonathan Cranfield (a Nursery Road resident) also spoke in support of the proposals in the Appendix and believed that there was a “silent majority” of residents who concurred with these views, despite a vocal opposition. In particular, he welcomed the proposals for increased open space land.

Brian Tippett spoke as a resident of Alresford for about 50 years and expressed concern that Appendix N was not an objective assessment. He did not believe the proposed new A31 junction would solve access problems to Sun Lane, particularly into the town centre. He highlighted the particular access difficulties to the north of Sun Lane.

Elizabeth Chard also spoke as an Alresford resident in support of the proposals in Appendix N as being deliverable and offering new housing, open space and access onto the A31. She also believed there could be provision for additional parking in The Dean.

At the invitation of the Chairman, local Ward Councillors Power and Simon Cook addressed the Committee and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Power supported all the proposals set out in the Appendix N, with the exception of the lack of a specific proposal for additional offices at The Dean. She believed there was a need for this and highlighted that the current unoccupied retail space in the town centre was in need of improvement. She also believed that there were discrepancies between the population figures used and the actual population growth in Alresford and surrounding villages.

Councillor Simon Cook stated that he preferred the alternative plan promoted by APG but believed that it had been produced too late to be accepted in time. He was not convinced that the proposed highways and access arrangements within the Appendix would work in practice and that the alternative sites could become subject to speculative development interest. However, in conclusion, he did not oppose the proposals because of the need for future certainty and to move forward.

The Head of Strategic Planning responded to the various questions and comments made, as summarised below:

- The Council had not predetermined the Sun Lane site but had carefully examined all the various comments and objections and he was convinced, on balance, that it offered the best solution;
- A transport report had been commissioned which had determined that the proposed new A31 junction was feasible;
- He accepted that access to the town centre from the Sun Lane site was not ideal, but this applied equally to the alternative proposals;
- Assessments had determined that introducing even a small amount of new employment use to The Dean had a significant negative impact on viability.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Head of Strategic Planning explained that Policy NA3 detailed the phasing of works expected regarding Sun Lane. The first stage would be provision of a new access from the A31 and once this was in place, the business area could be made available and only then could residential use be provided. Consideration was also being given to making Sun Lane no-entry above Nursey Road, but this level of detail would be determined through the planning application process. In response to questions regarding the detail of the new access to the A31, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Local Plan required the access to be suitable in transport terms and further detail would also be a matter for the planning application stage.

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised the viability report contained on Page 81 of the Appendix, which indicated a very significant uplift in the current value of the Sun Lane land, after making allowance for the costs of the new junction, affordable housing, open space, etc, which should ensure its deliverability.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that there was potential and scope for office development within New Alresford. He also confirmed that the Perins School playing fields were proposed to remain outside of the development boundary. The alternative of the New Farm Road site put forward by APG was not considered to be as good in terms of the planning criteria as it was further from the town centre and local amenities, including primary schools and there were site access difficulties.

With regard to NA1, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the Policy aimed to retain the existing two central car parks and provide additional parking, either at The Dean or another suitable location.

Appendix O – Development Management Policies

During public participation, Eleanor Bell spoke regarding the Open Space Strategy on Page 7 of the Appendix and in particular the statement that Sports England did not consider the Strategy to be a robust piece of work. She queried how the Council's open space and sports requirements would be met and whether the Council's policies were sufficiently robust.

In response, the Head of Strategic Planning noted that there might have been a degree of confusion between the Open Space Strategy and the Open

Space Study undertaken in 2008. The Open Space Strategy had been considered by the Inspector as part of LPP1 and found to be sound. It was also highlighted that the revised maps set out in Appendix Q to the Report illustrated revised DM5 notations. It was proposed that DM5 should not apply outside settlement boundaries.

The Committee considered each of the proposed Policies DM1 to DM34 and the Head of Strategic Planning responded to detailed questions thereon. As a result of these discussions, a number of changes to Policies were proposed as outlined below.

Some concern was expressed about the effectiveness of Policy DM2 and DM3 in restricting development sizes as the size could often be increased after a property had been built. Concern was also expressed about the sometimes inadequate size of bedrooms in new builds and whether Policy DM2 adequately addressed this. The Head of Strategic Planning acknowledged that permitted development rights were extensive and this limited the Council's control after a property was built. However, one aim of Policy DM2 was to prevent the construction of new 2/3 bedroomed houses which were so large as to not meet the Council's housing mix requirements in LPP1 policy CP2. With regard to room size, the recommended policy DM2 stipulated that the Government's national space standards must be applied in full for all new affordable housing. In relation to market housing, only the minimum standards would be required as it was considered it was generally a commercial decision for the developer/purchaser to decide if the room size was adequate.

One Member suggested that LPP2 should include reference to the existing LPP1 policy and the intention to produce a separate Gypsy and Travellers DPD. It was noted that the intention to produce the DPD was mentioned, but it was agreed to add reference to policy CP5 of LPP1.

One Member expressed regret that Denmead had been classified as a local centre and that it did not have primary shopping frontage. The Head of Strategic Planning explained that this designation had taken place as part of LPP1.

One Member requested that Policy DM7 be amended to include the requirement for "active shopfronts". It was noted that Policy DM33 related more specifically to Shopfronts. Following discussion, it was agreed that reference to active frontages should be included, either here, or in DM33.

With regard to DM11, one Member suggested that minimising flooding and surface water run off be included. However, the Head of Strategic Planning explained these matters were dealt with by other specific policies and the aim was to avoid duplication where possible. Concern was expressed that the Policy DM11 should be strengthened to deal with the situation where existing accommodation on a farm unit is disposed of, and subsequently an application for a new dwelling is received. It was agreed that additional text be included within the explanatory text to take account of any existing accommodation which may have been sold in the recent past.

With regard to DM12, some Members expressed concern about whether the Policy was robust enough to prevent inappropriate development in connection with equestrian use. The impact of lighting in the countryside and associated hardstanding for horse boxes etc was highlighted, along with inappropriate developments and the need for adequate screening and boundary treatments. The Head of Strategic Planning advised that Policy DM23 was intended to cover the protection of the rural character of an area, including against noise and light pollution. It was agreed that Policy DM12 be strengthened/cross referenced in relation to the requirement for development to need a countryside location and for adequate landscaping schemes. References to horse boxes were to be added to the explanatory text.

One Member queried whether the wording of Paragraph 6.4.2 should be amended to reflect the most current situation with regard to the building regulations required by Government. This was agreed.

One Member suggested that the wording of DM16 be amended to reflect the need for design consideration of bin storage areas in new development. It was noted that the High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document included reference to this matter. It was agreed that the wording of DM16 be reconsidered.

With regard to DM17, it was requested that it be amended to include that new development should not impact in terms of surface water run-off. The Head of Strategic Planning agreed to amend DM17 (iii) accordingly.

A change was agreed to DM20 to insert the word “noise” before “pollution” in the first sentence.

It was agreed that the reference to Policy CP20 in paragraph 6.4.68 should be amended to refer to LPP1.

In relation to Policy DM25, it was agreed that the wording of the explanatory text be amended to reflect the Committee’s wish that the public be kept informed regarding archaeological digs/finds etc, should there be a demand for this.

The issue of active frontages was again discussed in relation to Policy DM33. It was agreed that this should be added to the policy, and a reference to the High Quality Places DPD be added to the supporting text. With regard to Policy DM34, it was considered that signs should have regard to the character of the local area. It was agreed that this should be added to the Policy. One Member was concerned that, whilst not wishing to restrict individuality, the Policy should seek to limit the amount of goods for sale and other associated “clutter” outside of shops. The Head of Strategic Planning agreed to consider revised wording to address the issue of clutter/obstruction.

Appendix M – Winchester

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that the Report concluded there was no requirement to identify any new greenfield allocations outside the

Winchester boundary. The updated housing capacity work indicated a current supply of about 4,800 which was significantly above the 4,000 required. The Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the Council considered it had a five year supply of housing land and would continue to argue this strongly in any future appeals by developers against refusal of planning applications outside agreed settlement boundaries.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) had published its Preferred Options Local Plan on 2 September 2015 for a six week consultation period. The proposed comments from the Council were currently being prepared with a view to bringing a Report for Members' agreement to Cabinet on 21 October 2015. (Note: subsequent to the meeting it was agreed that this would be dealt with by the Portfolio Holder Decision Notice process.)

During public participation, contributions were received from two members of the public/local groups as summarised below.

Eleanor Bell (on behalf of WinACC) expressed concerns that the proposed Policies were not sufficient to address the traffic, congestion and pollution difficulties currently experienced within Winchester. WinACC would want to see parking spaces in the centre decreased as more Park and Ride spaces became available. Mitigation measures must be introduced for each of the five development areas addressing routes into and out of the city. WinACC would propose a new Policy WIN12 which would replace and retain Policy W6 of the 2006 District Local Plan.

Patrick Davies (City of Winchester Trust) outlined a number of areas where the Council did not appear to have responded in full to its concerns:

- Reference to special character and setting – it was not clear what was meant by these terms;
- The suggestion of a green belt to the North West and South of Winchester had not been addressed (the SDNP was to the east);
- Whether there was adequate infrastructure capacity in terms of gas, water and sewerage to address proposed levels of growth;
- Concern that additional secondary school education would be required.
- The effect of “local listing”.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Weir addressed the Committee as Chair of the Winchester Town Forum, which had considered the Appendix at a meeting the previous evening. She highlighted the following points raised by the Forum:

- Concerns about the Council's ability to deliver its aspirations regarding the numbers of affordable housing and a request to strengthen policies to challenge developers' claims as to unviability;
- Concerns about levels of traffic and congestion and barriers to introducing a shift towards walking and cycling; consideration of the use of “shared space” in the town centre;
- How the landscape and heritage of Winchester would be safeguarded;
- A requirement to engage honestly with local groups regarding the constraints on the amount of open space and recreation land available;

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services reported that further to the discussions at the Winchester Town Forum on 5 October 2015, a further amendment had been discussed with the Head of Strategic Planning, as set out below:

Page 76, Paragraph 3.6.6 – alteration to new wording proposed (additions in italics):

“The approved walking and cycling strategies, *when implemented*, will facilitate these forms of movement around Winchester, in accordance with the aims of the Access Plan, and projects are monitored on a regular basis, with reports presented to Winchester Town Forum. *Streets and roads within all new developments should be consistent with the principles of these strategies while also creating and enhancing links to the existing network of pedestrian and cycle routes.*”

The Committee agreed to this proposed change.

In response to comments made above, the Committee noted that the matter of the sustainability appraisal had been considered earlier in the meeting. The Head of Strategic Planning highlighted that there were a number of additional strategies such as the Walking Strategy and Cycling Strategy aimed at reducing carbon emissions. The Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) advised that he believed there were strong policies and strategies in place regarding transport and parking. In addition, there were opportunities to deliver improvements such as through the new Park and Ride bus contract. He acknowledged that some actions from the Air Quality Action Plan were outstanding but Government and County Council assistance was required to address this.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that none of the statutory agencies consulted had raised concerns requiring any changes to policies regarding adequate infrastructure (in relation to gas, water and sewerage). There had been regular liaison with the County Council in relation to education provision and they did not believe there to be a need to increase secondary provision.

The Head of Strategic Planning stated that it was not considered to be appropriate to seek to define character and setting too closely as it was generally a matter for assessment on a case by case basis. The introduction of a green belt had been debated at the LPP1 examination hearing and the Inspector had concluded it was not necessary. As it would require assessment of future development over the next 20-50 years, it was a strategic matter and not something that could be included within LPP2.

The Committee considered each of the Policies in relation to Winchester in detail and the Corporate Director and Head of Strategic Planning responded to questions thereon.

With regard to Policy WIN3 (iv), it was agreed to insert the word “energy” between “micro” and “generation”.

In relation to Policy WIN5, one Member expressed concern that the references to improving the public realm and pedestrian and cycling access into the city centre were not strong enough. It was suggested that the wording be expanded to include “streets” and public realm and also include reference to a link to relate access to the city centre. It was agreed that the Head of Strategic Planning make amendments to WIN5 (iii) to strengthen it to refer to links to the surrounding area rather than just within the site.

In addition, it was requested that reference to distinctive buildings that contributed to the character of the area be included, in addition to trees. However, it was noted that reference to specific buildings was included in Policy WIN6 and this was agreed to be sufficient.

In response to questions on WIN5, the Head of Strategic Planning explained that consideration of the potential for accommodation for the elderly was specifically included as a need was identified through the assessment of older persons’ housing. However, whether or not various parts of the area were suitable would be a matter for further consideration.

The Corporate Director explained the Policy WIN9 did not prevent the provision of new Houses in Multiple Occupation, but brought it within the remit of planning applications to determine the impact in the local area. He advised that the University were actively examining possibilities for future possible additional purpose-built student accommodation within the city.

The Committee noted that during the meeting, a number of changes to the Appendices M and O had been requested as detailed above and summarised below:

Appendix M

- Amendment to add wording to Paragraph 3.6.6;
- Change to WIN5(iii) to refer to links to the surrounding area;
- Correction to WIN3 to micro-energy.

Appendix O

Amendments to the following Policies/Paragraphs as detailed above:

- Paragraphs referring to travellers;
- DM11, explanatory text;
- DM12, explanatory text;
- Paragraph 6.4.2;
- DM16 (iii);
- DM17 (iii);
- DM20;
- Paragraph 6.4.68;
- Paragraph 6.4.77;
- DM33/DM16 and DM33 explanatory text;
- DM34.

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the Report.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:

1. THAT THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2 – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND SITE ALLOCATIONS BE APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION (PRE-SUBMISSION) AND SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, TOGETHER WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS INCLUDING THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND THE HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RELEVANT STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

2. THAT THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT, BE AUTHORISED TO SUBMIT THE PLAN AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOLLOWING THE PUBLICATION PERIOD, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RELEVANT STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

3. THAT THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT, BE AUTHORISED TO MAKE EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE LOCAL PLAN AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, TO CORRECT ERRORS AND FORMAT TEXT WITHOUT ALTERING THE MEANING OF THE PLAN.

4. THAT THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT /LEADER, BE AUTHORISED TO MAKE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PLAN BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER THE PUBLIC EXAMINATION PROCESS, IN ORDER TO RESPOND TO MATTERS RAISED THROUGH THE CONSULTATION AND EXAMINATION PROCESS.

5. THAT APPROVAL BE GIVEN TO APPOINT A PROGRAMME OFFICER AND UNDERTAKE OTHER WORK AS NECESSARY TO PREPARE FOR AND UNDERTAKE THE PUBLIC EXAMINATION (INCLUDING AGREEING TO MEET THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE'S FEES), PROVIDED THIS IS WITHIN THE ALLOCATED LOCAL PLAN BUDGET/RESERVE.

RESOLVED:

1. That the responses to the representations, as set out in the attached papers, together with the outcome of the further evidence

studies, be noted and taken into account in considering the Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management and Site Allocations.

2. That subject to changes detailed above, the content of the Pre-Submission Local Plan, as recommended in Appendices M to Q of this report, be approved for submission to full Council.

3. That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, to update the appendices to the Local Plan and make minor amendments to the Plan and accompanying documents prior to presentation to the Council and publication, in order to correct errors and format text without altering the meaning of the Plan.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am, adjourned for lunch between 1.00pm and 2.00pm and concluded at 4.10pm.

Chairman