

Public Document Pack

THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Monday, 29 July 2024

Attendance:

Councillors
Brook (Chairperson)

Wallace
Achwal V
Clear
Laming

Pett
Reach
Bolton

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor Batho

Deputy Members:

Councillor Power (as deputy for Councillor Batho)

Other members in attendance:

Councillors Godfrey, Lee, Horrill, Cook, Porter, Tod and Warwick

[Video recording of this meeting](#)

1. **APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

Apologies for the meeting were noted as above.

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Several members advised of the following non-pecuniary interests:

1. Councillor Laming advised that he was the Chairman of the Badger Farm and Oliver's Battery Residents Association.
2. Councillor Porter advised that she was also a member of Hampshire County Council.
3. Councillor Pett advised that he was a member of the South Downs National Park Authority appointed by the City Council.
4. Councillor Wallace advised that he was also a member of Hampshire County Council.
5. Councillor Tod advised that he was also a member of Hampshire County Council.

3. **CHAIRPERSON'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Brook provided an introduction and advised members of the following:

1. The committee's task was to assess whether the policy responses in the Regulation 19 plan were suitable to address key issues and whether they met the four tests of soundness in the national planning policy framework:
 - Was the evidence base robust and credible?
 - Was it the most appropriate strategy when considered against alternatives?
 - Was the document effective?
 - Was it deliverable?
2. She emphasised the need to focus on substantive areas such as technical issues or fundamental flaws in the policies.
3. The meeting's purpose was not to determine personal preferences for the policies or allocations but to assess their fitness for consultation.
4. Officers would categorise the main points discussed into three categories:
 - Comments that were noted but required no further action.
 - Comments necessitating alterations to the document, such as technical details.
 - Comments requiring review to decide on potential adjustments to the plan.

Feedback and recommendations from the committee would be reported to the Cabinet meeting in September, followed by Full Council at the end of September.

4. **LOCAL PLAN REGULATION 19 – CABINET MEMBER INTRODUCTION TO THE LOCAL PLAN.**

Councillor Jackie Porter, Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan introduced the Cabinet report, reference CAB3462 and made the following points:

1. Winchester City Council, regardless of political persuasion, wanted to provide the homes and employment necessary for growth, health, and well-being.
2. The new plan included an unwavering commitment to reducing the carbon footprint.
3. A strong local plan provided certainty for residents and clear guidelines for developers and the development planning team.
4. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) indicated that the local plan should offer a succinct and up-to-date vision for each area's future.
5. Extensive consultations had involved Councillors at every stage and utilised various media.
6. Despite its length, the IIA had to go out for public consultation alongside the Regulation 19 document. The IIA was a commissioned objective study to support local plan decision-making.
7. The IIA examined the local plan vision and objectives, spatial strategy, and development principles through the lens of 14 objectives, including the commitment to decarbonise the district.
8. The assessment combined sustainability appraisal, strategic environmental assessment, health impact assessment, and equalities impact assessment.

9. Winchester City Council commissioned LUC to carry out the IIA, and they had used available data on metrics such as air quality, noise, flood risk, access to services, transport, open space, and importantly, reducing the carbon footprint for living, working, and travelling between new buildings and facilities.
10. Winchester City Council had a highly qualified and experienced team of planners, and the success of the local plan's efficacy was evident through a strong record of delivery, appeal judgements, and proof of the five-year land supply.
11. This scrutiny committee meeting was to monitor the local plan process from the publication of the Regulation 18 draft plan to the Regulation 19 proposed submission to reach the examination stage.
12. The Inspectorate must be confident that the local plan was sound, with a deadline for submission by June 30, 2025. Comments from this meeting would go forward to Cabinet, and then Full Council in September 2024.
13. If agreed, the Regulation 19 plan would go out for public consultation in 2024. The Inspectorate would receive full responses from the consultation.
14. The plan acknowledged smaller sites coming forward in sustainable locations on previously developed land, identified as windfall sites.
15. The local plan dictated a "brownfield first" approach to ensure the countryside was not developed while brownfield sites were available. Greenfield sites would only be given planning permission after 2030.
16. The South Downs National Park contributed significantly to biodiversity, leisure, and tourism, occupying 40% of the district's land. Although it had duties as a national park, it was not a housing authority and would contribute 350 homes to the local plan.
17. Detailed studies of employment and retail land requirements were carried out using three different methodologies, updated recently and reviewed to reflect current economic situations and work patterns.
18. The plan allocated sufficient employment land to meet predicted requirements if all opportunities were taken up.
19. The three major spatial areas discussed in the local plan were South Hampshire urban areas, Winchester town, and market towns and rural areas, each contributing about one-third to the district's economy.
20. Despite the different directions these areas faced, they were all part of Winchester District, and efforts would continue to deliver homes, jobs, and infrastructure for all residents.

5. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The following members of the public and Councillors addressed the committee, and a summary of their points is detailed below.

1. Councillor June Perrins:

1. Raised concerns about the settlement boundary change for South Wonston, highlighting that the process for the boundary review, including desktop reviews, site visits, and consultation, was not applied. The last review was in 2006, and the Parish Council only learned of the proposed boundary state after the draft new plan was published.
2. It was noted that the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 versions indicated a settlement boundary adjustment, including the gardens of 63 to 69 Wrights Way and the open space to the West of Chaucer Close, which were previously rejected for development.
3. The Parish Council feared that the inclusion of SWO1 might lead to a larger extension of the settlement boundary, affecting the rural setting and causing negative impacts such as increased vehicle movements on the road network and pressure on local facilities and infrastructure.
4. The background paper to inform the Local Plan (Appendix 3, 2020-2024) stated that SWO1 achieved a high sensitivity designation for which protection from development was the preferred option. However, the main document concluded that it provided an opportunity to build homes.
5. Development on this Greenfield site was considered inappropriate, based on little more than a general requirement to deliver homes, and the Parish Council did not consider the inclusion of SWO1 justified.

2. Councillor Pauline Mauder:

1. Referred to the late inclusion of site reference SU01, Land at Brightlands, and the concerns of sewerage issues and flooding risks in Sutton Scotney. The Parish Council had consistently opposed future development until these issues were resolved.
2. Sutton Scotney was a village with a very high water table, at constant risk of flooding, and suffering from severe sewerage issues. Developments in the village had relied on waste being removed by tankers for over five years.
3. The justification for the late inclusion of Land at Brightlands in the Regulation 19 was that Southern Water had provided reassurances that a pressurised pipeline would be operating and able to accommodate additional flow by 2030. However, Southern Water had previously advised that tankering of waste would end in 6 to 12 months (July 2019) and that the pipeline would eliminate the need for tankers during storm conditions (August 2022), which had not been the case.
4. A flood risk assessment commissioned by Wonston Parish Council concluded that any development at Brightlands would influence the water and floodplain. The Parish Council felt let down by the Local Plan proposals and would respond robustly to the Regulation 19 consultation.

3. Councillor Liz Winn:

1. Raised concerns about the limited planning guidance for the development of the Sir John Moore Barracks site.
2. The approach taken relied on a developer-led master plan, which risked sidelining the community from having an effective role in this and future sites. The Parish Council had not yet seen any detail that would guide and inform the development, such as how it connected to adjoining communities, requirements for zero-carbon housing, and conservation of sites of importance for nature.
3. The lack of clarity about the Winchester/Littleton settlement gap policy NE7, also known as the Littleton gap, was highlighted. The maps showed an overlap in the allocation of development for the Sir John Moore Barracks with the existing settlement gap, increasing its vulnerability to development and potentially removing the voice of local people from any decision.

4. Councillor Tiggy Ayoub:

1. Spoke regarding the Gypsy and Traveller topic paper concerning Boarhunt and other villages with poor infrastructure.
2. At present, there had been no opportunity given to parish councils for consultation of any shape, size, or form by Winchester City Council on the siting of new Gypsy and Traveller sites. While it was a legal requirement, the lack of consultation undermined confidence in both the parish councils and Winchester City Council.
3. The parish already had three Traveller sites, one of which had over 40 homes, making it unsustainable without further consultation. Future plans should involve thorough consultation before finalisation.

5. Richard Baker:

1. Spoke on behalf of the City of Winchester Trust and raised two issues relating to the proposed Regulation 19 Local Plan.
2. The first issue was about public consultation. The Trust had sent 23 pages of detailed comments in December 2022 and expected to find a schedule of these comments and the Council's responses in the report. Without such a schedule and an appendix showing Regulation 18 Local Plan with track changes, it was not possible to know what changes had been made and whether they were fair and reasonable.
3. The second issue was about employment policy. The council revised its timetable for publishing a Regulation 19 Local Plan to allow a town and employment study to be made to inform the plan. An employment land study by Lambert, Smith, and Hampton was published this month. It was questioned whether the study was adequately assessed and integrated into the Regulation 19 plan.

6. Councillor Caroline Horrill:

Raised several points, including:

1. Were the Regulation 18 responses, in full available to view? Residents wanted to know where their original comments had gone after almost two years.
2. A summary of changes would be helpful for individuals to know whether their points had been taken on board, given the substantial size of the documents to review.
3. It was requested that the schedule of public meetings be shared as soon as possible so residents could attend and understand how things had changed.
4. Concerns were raised about the discrepancy in housing numbers between Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 and why substantially more housing was offered to neighbouring districts under the duty to cooperate.
5. The allocation of only 350 houses to the South Downs National Park, despite representing 40% of the district, was felt as unfair and impacting village areas within the park.
6. Issues were also raised about the Sir John Moore Barracks site merging with Winchester town, the lack of clarity on settlement gaps, and the inconsistency in settlement boundary adjustments. Further consultation with the Parish Council was urged on this and several other matters.
7. Concerns were raised about the accuracy of housing numbers at Carousel Park and the inclusion of a new site in Sutton Scotney without proper consultation or infrastructure commitments from Southern Water.

7. Patrick Davies:

1. He endorsed earlier points about the processes followed and was concerned over the lack of public engagement and the handling of Regulation 18 comments.
2. He expressed concerns about the Integrated Impact Assessment's 2200 pages and the impression that sections might refer to other districts.
3. A better way of dealing with these issues was suggested, noting that many meetings had been private for members only, which could have been held publicly.

8. Councillor Eric Bodger:

1. He raised concerns about the gap between Curdrige and Whiteley not being covered in the settlement gap policy, despite assurances that it would be protected through the countryside policy.
2. Curdrige was moving towards a neighbourhood plan, and a notification had been sent to the City Council of its intent to produce one.
3. It was noted that it was not immediately clear what had changed between Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 for their area, but they believed there were very few changes and were content with the Regulation 19 submission.

9. Councillor Susan Cook and Councillor Maggie Hill:

1. Concerns were expressed about the hierarchy ranking of Colden Common and the lack of detailed infrastructure plans. Colden Common had been ranked as a market town, which the Parish Council believed was incorrect.
2. Issues were highlighted regarding flooding and sewerage problems in Colden Common, with a call for no additional homes to be built until these issues were resolved. Residents lived in fear of flooding every time it rained, and there were ongoing problems with burst water mains.
3. It was noted that improvements promised from Section 106 money from the last plan had not yet been seen, leading to concerns that future infrastructure plans might also be delayed or not happen.

10. Janine Pickering:

1. Advised that she was the Strategic Estates Manager for the NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight Integrated Care Board (ICB).
2. Currently, 90% of GP surgeries in the Winchester City Council area had more patients than their infrastructure capacity could manage. The new local plan could add a further 30,000 patients, creating a significant impact on access to healthcare.
3. The ICB had been working with the Council's planning team to highlight the impacts on primary care and requested that the local plan include the needs of primary care, ensuring sufficient capacity for the increased population.
4. Asked that the City Council supports the NHS by ensuring that the policies within the Regulation 19 were updated to include the needs of primary care in the same manner as Education.

11. Councillor Craig Manuel:

1. He highlighted a discrepancy in the allocation of homes for Wickham Parish, with concerns about the inclusion of specific sites and the lack of consultation regarding it.
2. In 2021, the City Council sent the Parish Council the recommended spatial distribution and housing strategy, allocating 90 to 100 homes. However, the Parish Council was later told that site WI18 was not suitable for selection and that the settlement map had been redrawn without a detailed explanation.
3. The Parish Council objected to this change, and despite rejecting site WI 18, it was still included in the updated local plan, leading to an allocation of 300 homes, three times the original calculation.
4. Concerns were raised about the impact of 6000 homes being built by Fareham just 150 metres away from the parish boundary.

12. Fred Schiff:

1. He raised concerns about the Integrated Impact Assessment and its approach to identifying a preferred allocation at Sutton Scotney.
2. He felt that insufficient consultation had taken place, with a limited questionnaire providing little detail of potential sites and the decision-making process. The site assessment scoring of the draft allocation itself was considered flawed, not adequately reflecting the implications of noise, pedestrian movement, or community integration.

3. He also questioned the lack of comparable assessment to alternative sites and the potential negative effects on residential site options.
4. He supported the view of the parish council that proper consultation was required for an allocation and beyond that had a significant impact on the future of Sutton Scotney.

13. Councillor Danny Lee:

1. He was concerned about the timing of the publication of the Integrated Impact Assessment and the lack of transparency in the response to Regulation 18 comments.
2. He also asked about the local plan's alignment with national policies on wind energy, the achievement of net-zero carbon for new residential dwellings, and the protection of rivers.
3. Concerns were also expressed about the need for a final Local Plan viability report at the end of the Regulation 19 process and the potential for a partial or full plan review to ensure sustainable growth without accelerating climate threats.
4. He queried why the Environment Policy for example chapter didn't refer to the Nature Emergency declaration.
5. He urged for a definition of valued landscapes to be included.

14. Councillor Stephen Godfrey:

1. Concerns were raised about Policy CN1 on mitigating and adapting for climate change, which was at odds with the allocation of small rural sites.
2. Policy NE5 on biodiversity and Policy NE7 on settlement gaps were also questioned, noting that the allocation of Sir John Moore Barracks was at odds with these policies.
3. Further concerns were raised about Policy HE10 on development in conservation areas.
4. Site SU01 had not been included in Regulation 18, and there had been no public consultation on this proposal, so no consideration of expected comments had occurred.

15. Councillor Jan Warwick:

1. The allocation of Bushfield Camp (W5) as a landscaped-focused employment area was questioned due to its environmental significance and the potential impact on biodiversity.
2. She raised concerns about the potential impact of 5000 daily vehicle movements on the local area and the motorway network, and the conflict with Hampshire's Local Transport Plan 4, which prioritised planning for people and places over vehicles.
3. It was urged that Bushfield Camp be designated for nature conservation instead, supporting its wildlife-rich habitats and aligning with climate goals.

16. Jeremy Gardiner:

1. Spoke on behalf of Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land and expressed support for the draft plan's spatial strategy in distributing housing across a hierarchy of settlements based on their relative sustainability.
2. He pointed out a discrepancy in the housing figures between policies SP2 and H1 for market towns, which needs correction.

3. He noted issues with policy H3, such as inconsistent housing allocations among rural settlements and errors in categorizing settlements.
4. He argued that misallocating homes to smaller settlements undermines the strategy focused on sustainable settlements.
5. He proposed amending the plan to reflect its strategy accurately by reallocating homes to more suitable settlements and correcting errors.

The Chairperson thanked all members of the public and Councillors for attending the meeting. These points would be responded to by officers and the Cabinet Member accordingly during the meeting.

6. **CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT CABINET REPORT**

The following is a summary of the points raised in this section of the meeting.

1. What were the risks of challenge to this Regulation 19 Local Plan, specifically regarding reliance on other providers such as Southern Water and Health Services for GP provision, and challenges based on consultation with parishes and other agencies?
2. How had these risks been assessed, and were we adequately protected?
3. Regarding paragraph 3.7 of the Regulation 19 document, how would scrutiny comments be brought forward to the Planning Inspector?
4. How did paragraph 11.12 address the integration of the strategic issues and options paper into Regulation 18 and 19 and how did this approach apply to Wickham and other settlements?
5. Would officers review in detail the comments made by members of the public today?
6. Considering paragraph 2.1 in the Cabinet paper, what were the financial implications to the Council of the work undertaken on the Local Plan?
7. Regarding Appendix 4 which outlined risks arising from changes in government policy, did we have sufficient reserves to ensure the council could produce a compliant plan in the face of such changes?
8. If the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) introduced a shift from Brownfield to Greenfield priorities, how would this impact our current plan, particularly regarding a site at Sutton Scotney?
9. The strategic transport assessment implied that Hampshire's Bus Service Improvement Plan had minimal impact on Winchester. How reliable was this assessment, given the limited bus services in rural areas?
10. Had transport issues, particularly relating to Badger Farm & Olivers Battery been assessed with the new Local Plan's proposed developments?
11. How would infrastructure such as doctors and dentists be addressed given the current lack of amenities?
12. How would potential government changes affecting brownfield sites, such as golf courses and garden centres, impact our emerging plan?
13. What were the implications of the Local Plan on achieving net zero by 2030 for the district?
14. Further information was requested regarding the viability report by Dixon Searle, particularly around affordable housing.
15. Given the expected NPPF update, did the delegated authority in the Cabinet report allow for substantial changes without further consultation and scrutiny?
16. Regarding the availability of comments from the Regulation 18 consultation, it was felt that a large number of comments were not available on the website.

Could officers provide an update on this and what could be done to make these comments easier to find on the website?

17. With the new plan asking for Low Energy Transformational Initiative (LETI) standards, would we be able to enforce this standard?

These points were responded to by the Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan and officers accordingly.

7. **CONSIDERATION OF LOCAL PLAN TOPIC CHAPTERS**

The following is a summary of the points raised in this section of the meeting.

Carbon Neutrality and Designing for Low-Carbon Infrastructure

1. Should there have been more emphasis on the nature emergency within the Local Plan, considering the frequent mentions of the climate emergency?

High-Quality Well-Designed Places and Living Well

1. Regarding Policy D2, what input could the Winchester Town Forum make to the design principles for Winchester Town, considering it was not a statutory consultee but had contributed in previous years?
2. Officers were asked to explain the role of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) as we moved from the current Local Plan to the next one.
3. How could we prevent poorly designed buildings, such as the flats just outside the Winchester District, from being constructed in the future?
4. How could individuality in housing design be encouraged to avoid uniform styles from major developers and promote distinctive housing?

Sustainable Transport and Active Travel

1. Why was there no employment allocation in major housing developments such as those at the Abbots Barton site?
2. How would the change from employment to mixed-use developments impact the outskirts of the city and its business centre?
3. Were there any inaccuracies in the hierarchies of facilities for example in Colden Common, and how would these be addressed and updated?
4. Did the 20-minute neighbourhood concept apply to places like Waltham Chase and Whiteley, and would it still be effective in the future?
5. How did the lack of linkage between the City Council and Hampshire County Council as the transport authority impact the development of active transport and public transport policies?
6. How could we ensure adequate parking provisions in new developments, considering changes in household makeup and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)?
7. Were the sizes of garages considered in parking provisions, ensuring they were functional for modern vehicles?
8. Were there provisions to ensure every house had access to a charging point for electric cars?
9. Were there considerations for changing the standard size of parking spaces to accommodate larger modern vehicles?

Biodiversity and the Natural Environment

1. In reference to Policy NE9, had we taken advice from ecologists and horticulturists regarding the planting of non-native species, considering climate change had made native species less resilient?
2. Should we consider prioritising non-native species for climate resilience, rather than making exceptions for them?
3. Regarding Policy NE5 and CN1, were these at odds with rural small local sites?
4. What considerations were given to settlement gaps, specifically regarding the Sir John Moore Barracks site/Littleton and Curdrige and Whiteley?
5. Why was only the River Itchen referenced in Policy NE16?
6. What challenges do we foresee with biodiversity net gain, especially considering the reliance on 100% offset credits in the viability assessment report?
7. Could officers comment on the concerns raised by Siobhan Brophy regarding wildlife sites and habitats, specifically the 17 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in the district?
8. For Policy NE4, could we change the Wickham to Alton Meon Valley trail reference to reflect that it stops at West Meon?
9. Could we adopt the South Downs National Park's SD2 policy directly, given the different ecosystem services approaches?

The Historic Environment

1. Were we giving enough thought and prominence to the cultural role that historic buildings play, as opposed to focusing solely on their physical and structural aspects?
2. There was a comment that Policy HE10 - Development and Conservation Areas was subjective. Could officers comment on that?

Homes for All

1. In Policy H13, could officers clarify why Carousel Park appears in both lists for Travelling Show People and Gypsy and Traveller pitches?
2. Why had the housing numbers changed from Regulation 18 to Regulation 19, specifically the reduction in the South Downs National Park allocation from 500 to 350?
3. How does the reduction in housing numbers in the South Downs National Park affect the accessibility and affordability of housing?
4. Regarding Tynfield Caravan Park on page 322, had there been any consultation with the town council about increasing the traveller sites from 18 to 30?
5. There was a question about whether the housing numbers split in Policies H1 and H3 had been calculated correctly. Could officers clarify that?
6. Why does Wickham have an increased allocation of 300 homes, when it was originally 200?
7. Could officers explain the changes in the Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) allocation for unmet housing needs from Regulation 18 to Regulation 19, and how it affects our housing numbers?
8. What happens if we cannot meet the housing request from Portsmouth and Havant, given the unmet need allocation?

9. How do we ensure that the inspector would not require Portsmouth and Havant to meet their own housing needs instead of allocating it to Winchester?
10. Could it be clarified that our unmet need allocation was not specifically for Portsmouth or Havant but was a general addition to our housing numbers to help meet overall regional needs?

These points were responded to by the Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan and officers accordingly.

8. **CONSIDERATION OF LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATIONS**

The following is a summary of the points raised in this section of the meeting.

Winchester Site Allocations

1. Why was 42% of all the employment land allocated to Bushfield Camp, considering the potential increase in vehicle movements and whether this allocation had been tested?
2. How could we ensure that the development at Bushfield Camp would not be car-led and would prioritise active travel connections to Winchester Town?
3. Because of the live planning application for this site, it was asked whether this policy was academic.
4. Regarding Sir John Moore Barracks, could we address the concerns about limited planning guidance, settlement gaps, and the involvement of parishes in the master planning process?
5. How does Policy NE7 affect Sir John Moore Barracks, and what were the implications for the site?

The Market Towns and Rural Area

1. Given past issues with infrastructure providers not delivering on their commitments, what measures could we take to ensure that necessary infrastructure was in place before development proceeds in areas like Colden Common, Brambridge, and Sutton Scotney?
2. Could we impose conditions to prevent development until the required infrastructure, particularly water and wastewater systems, was completed?
3. What actions were being taken to address the concerns raised about the lack of consultation regarding the new allocation in Sutton Scotney, and how could we ensure better communication with affected communities in the future?

These points were responded to by the Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan and officers accordingly.

9. **CONSIDERATION OF THE REMAINING APPENDICES TO THE DRAFT CABINET REPORT.**

The following is a summary of the points raised in this section of the meeting.

1. Local Plan Monitoring Framework

Would these KPIs come to scrutiny for future scrutiny meetings, or do we propose to monitor them through some other means, please?

2. The Evidence Base

Could officers address an earlier question from a member of the public concerning South Wonston, and that a boundary review hadn't taken place since 2006? The local plan mentions boundary adjustments which could cause issues within their ward, impacting the site allocation of SW01.

3. Habitat Regulations Assessment

Could officers address an earlier comment about valued landscapes being quoted in some places and not others and hadn't been defined?

4. Integrated Impact Assessment

Several Councillors commented that it was challenging to get such a large document a week before a meeting and asked officers to consider looking at alternative ways of providing this information going forward.

These points were responded to by the Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan and officers accordingly.

10. **COMMITTEE RESOLUTION**

The committee resolved that it had given due consideration to the report, and it had no specific recommendations for Cabinet to consider, however it asked that cabinet consider the following points further:

1. Review how Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultation responses were advertised and published to prevent future issues.
2. Investigate opportunities to mitigate reliance on third parties.
3. Monitor risks from government changes, especially regarding the NPPF, and address major changes as they arise.
4. Seek opportunities to align policies with neighbouring councils for example the South Down National Park. Consider mutual support strategies and align policy development timelines.
5. That the Cabinet Member consider the points made during public participation and members debate as summarised above.

The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 6.00 pm

Chairperson

This page is intentionally left blank