

**MINUTES OF MEETING WITH GOSE TO DISCUSS THE INSPECTOR'S REPORT INTO
THE RBWM CORE STRATEGY AND POLICIES DPD**

19th November 2007
1pm, GOSE Offices, Guildford

Attendees: Mr Kevin Bown (KB); Mr John Aldworth (JA) (GOSE); Mr Ben Linscott (BL) (PINS)
Mr Tim Slaney (TS); Mr Peter Hitchen (PH); Mrs Sarah Ball (SEB); Mr Ian Bellinger (IB);
(RBWM); Cllr Derek Wilson (DW)

		Actions
1	<p>Introduction</p> <p>BL explained that the minutes of this meeting will need to be published on the Council's website.</p> <p>SEB requested an update in relation to the <u>South East Plan</u> – JA explained that the proposed changes for the South East Plan are due to be published early in January 2008.</p> <p>SEB requested an update on the <u>Draft PPS12</u> – JA indicated that the Draft PPS12 and associated regulations will be published this week. This will be a slimmed down policy document. Supporting documentation will deal with process including the SA. The Preferred Options stage of DPD production will effectively be dropped. There was discussion around the presentation of the Council's revised LDS and whether this should take into account the Draft PPS12 or whether 2 scenarios should be submitted to GOSE within its LDS. Whilst KB indicated that the Regulations should come into force in April 2008, SEB indicated that with such an uncertainty, it would be preferable if RBWM submitted only one LDS scenario based on the existing Regulations. Agreed that GOSE were to be kept informed of the Council's progress on its LDS. JA also indicated that PPS4 was also to be published shortly.</p>	<p align="center">SEB</p>
2	<p>PINS Liaison</p> <p><u>Requesting a certain Inspector</u> - BL explained his role within PINS. BL is an Inspector Manager who also manages the LDF admin team. A question was raised in relation to how PINS can ensure consistency and how PINS would deal with an authority that had to withdraw and then submit a new Core strategy after being found unsound. The next Inspector would seek advice from the PINS internal working party; read previous decisions on other CSs. PINS will try and appoint the same Inspector or one which has been requested, but this depends upon timelines.</p> <p><u>Opinion on reserve sites and the Inspector's view of the RBWM UPR -windfalls</u> – It was noted that the RBWM Inspector focussed in on windfalls and came down firmly on this issue. KB indicated that LAs may be able to put a PPS3 case together but may not be able to rely on a certain amount throughout the whole plan period. All depends upon the risks attached to windfalls. GOSE advised to complete allocations work prior to thinking about windfalls ie through the production of a SHLAA – reliance on windfalls will be reduced. Need to look at whether windfalls will come forward. Identify a suburb and indicate that the Council will expect X number of windfalls to come forward. However a point will be reached when an area cannot take anymore windfalls. At this point need to ask where will the need now go if area X is full.</p> <p>TS enquired as to the ability to influence where development came forward in suburban locations. BL indicated that this is a matter relating to the balance of material considerations. An inspector can take into account a Supply A when considering the appropriateness of Supply B. While you cannot overprotect areas against development which is compatible with the overall strategy, a strict windfalls/infill policy can be supported in the event of confidence in the alternative supply.</p>	

3	<p>CS –the way forward</p> <p><u>Banking of CS Policies</u> - SEB explained RBWM's view on banking policies particularly in light of the SA. BL agreed with the RBWM position. SEB asked whether a SA scoping report is necessary and whether one is required on sound policies. JW indicated that advice should be sought from CLG.</p> <p>KB also gave the example of the peer review of SA which is being undertaken in surrey. DW raised the issue of Maidenhead Town Centre and TS explained PRoM and key issues including the need to re-invigorate the town centre; perceptions of the town centre over the last 20- years; the early visioning work that the Council has undertaken and the implications of the Inspector's report. KB cited other examples including Crawley; Bracknell and West End of Oxford. A question was raised about how site specific the CS could be in relation to the town centre. KB indicated that Crawley were site specific in their CS.</p>	
4	<p>Evidence base including Green Belt Review</p> <p>IB explained the progress the Council had made in relation to the Green Belt review and the proposed methodology (review purposes – grid squares); sustainability indicators; overlays; strategic review of boundaries. There was some discussion regarding sustainability criteria and the level of sophistication needed for such a study. KB indicated that RBWM should look at the reasons why the GB was established. IB confirmed that this information was included in the study. KB talked about broad economic, environmental and social indicators then weighing up the positives and negatives. BL commented that the review would be a strategic document and that it should not be overcomplicated by process of too finer level of detail. IB indicated that key stakeholders would be consulted on aspects of the methodology. The SoS's proposed changes for the SE Plan will need to feed into the GB review</p> <p><u>Urban extensions</u> – BL indicated that the need for urban extensions depended on circumstances and there is no need for a defined boundary within a Core Strategy. An authority proposing an urban extension in its CS would mention that the actual extent would be dealt with elsewhere, eg the site allocations DPD.</p> <p><u>Transport modelling</u> – JA advised that RBWM should speak to Joanna Chau. Need continual engagement with HA. Copy GOSE/PINs into any future correspondence on this issue.</p> <p><u>Townscape assessments</u> – KB suggested CABA and Urban Splash as consultants to consider.</p> <p><u>SHLAA</u> – BL questioned why the RBWM SHLAA was predicted to take more than 6 months and whether it was needed to inform the I&O stage of DPD production. Speak to Cherwell (David Peckford).</p>	SEB to note.
5 a	<p>LDS</p> <p>LDF Structure</p> <p>KB indicated that the new LDF structure was acceptable. SPD work should not interfere with DPD work. TS gave an update on the work RBWM had been carrying out to update its SPD on Planning Obligations. TS also explained the Council's view on its proposed SPS on sustainable design and construction.</p>	
b	<p>LDS programme amendments and timeframe</p> <p>KB indicated that the LDS should be as realistic as possible. The LDS period should look at September 2007 (the time of receipt of the Inspector's Report) until March 2011. The date on the cover will be the date that it is brought into effect.</p> <p>KB questioned the need for MTC to run ahead of DDP DPD and its submission after 2012. KB was concerned that the RBWM LDF is not high enough in the local political agenda. CS</p>	

	<p>and DDP DPD should take priority. Allow officers enough time to develop evidence base.</p> <p><u>Timeframe</u></p> <p>KB indicated that the I&O should come at the end of the process of talking to stakeholders. He questioned the need for 11 months between R25 and R26. This should be completed quicker. R26-R28 should be quicker than 11 months. Timings for R28 onwards is OK. TS commented that there were substantial realistic options which needed to be assessed which would lead to a longer period than suggested between I&O and PO stages.</p> <p>KB suggested that draft timeframes should be submitted to him by December. Kate Barker's report indicated that some DPD should be done within 2 years. KB indicated that RBWM should reconsider the need for a MTC DPD and its delivery ahead of DDP DPD. KB confirmed that RBWM had the right approach in terms of limiting the number of DPDs</p>	<p>SEB to reconsider in light of resources available</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>AOB Costs of Examination – BL offered to look into RBWM costs.</p>	