

MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a **MEETING** of the **CABINET** held on 9 February 2018 at 10.00 am

Present

Councillors C J Eginton (Leader)
R J Chesterton, P H D Hare-Scott,
C R Slade, Mrs M E Squires and
R L Stanley

Also Present

Councillor(s) Mrs H Bainbridge and F J Rosamond

Also Present

Officer(s): Stephen Walford (Chief Executive), Jenny Clifford (Head of Planning, Economy and Regeneration), Kathryn Tebbey (Group Manager for Legal Services and Monitoring Officer), Tristan Peat (Forward Planning Team Leader), David Pickhaver (Torbay Council) and Julia Stuckey (Member Services Officer)

123. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

124. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT

Cllr R L Stanley declared a Personal Interest as he had received correspondence from residents of Sampford Peverell.

There were no other interests declared.

125. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Mr P Drew, referring to item 5 on the agenda, said I am a Chartered Town Planner and I live in a house on Turnpike, within the Grand Western Canal Conservation Area.

The NPPF says the significance of a heritage asset, such as a conservation area, can be harmed through development within its setting and that great weight should be given to an asset's conservation.

Policy SP2 refers to conservation area, in the singular, which is a reference to Sampford Peverell Conservation Area at the top of the hill. The reason it does not refer to areas, plural, is because the Council did not notice the Grand Western Canal Conservation Area. One year ago when I asked the most senior officer representing the Council at a local plan consultation event in the village hall what the red line was around my property he wrongly identified it as the Sampford Peverell Conservation Area. As the Council did not identify the Grand Western Canal Conservation Area in its SA it has not assessed the impact of the proposal upon it. This was not addressed in the Historic Environment Appraisal. The Council has refused to

apologise for this elementary error, which means the evidence base is not only unsound but leaves the Council in breach of its statutory duty.

I naively assumed that the Council would take this opportunity to correct this clear and highly material error but, astonishingly, it has not. The full appraisal on page 405 of the report pack still envisages access being derived from Turnpike. That led the company, Place Land LLP, which was formed within a week of the Cabinet meeting on 15 September 2016, to propose a gash in the hillside opposite my driveway, comprising a 100 foot wide cutting, and housing on the opposite side of Turnpike on land that is around 9 m above the level of my house. Since a 2-storey house is typically 9 m to the ridge that would mean built forms on even the lowest level of the site would be around 60 feet above the entrance to my house within the Grand Western Canal Conservation Area. The new dwellings would define the skyline and destroy the open rural setting of the Conservation Area, for example when viewed from the towpath to the south-east. However this form of development would fully accord with your unsound policy and the inadequate evidence base on which it is founded.

I am far from reassured this highly partisan additional work is fair or thorough. It is a blatant attempt to justify an earlier decision that your QC had major concerns about. Moreover if the Council seeks to draw any comfort from the consultant's report, Appendix 1 sets out the various EU requirements and in almost every case it says: "*It is assumed that this requirement was met in the earlier SA report for the proposed submission local plan*". In other words, the scope of the consultant's review did not extend to the very point that I say renders your SA, and hence the allocation at Higher Town, unsound.

So my question is, why has the Council not applied the approach in Historic England's Advice Note 8 in its SA for Higher Town with regard to the Grand Western Canal Conservation Area?

Mrs Christine Holland, representing Sampford Peverell Parish Council and referring to agenda item 5, said in the event that J27 comes forward, the Sampford Peverell Parish Council is not opposed to 60 houses being brought forward in the village, however we feel that the Council has identified the wrong site, in Higher Town, and would respectfully request that Councillors revisit that decision and, if a reasonable alternative site is not available elsewhere, consider allocating a site at the eastern edge of the village. This would better relate to any development at J27, as well as the strategic transport network, including the railway station, the M5, and the approved improvement of Station Road with footpaths, street lighting, bus stops and a 30mph speed limit.

We note that in Table 5 (Page 92 of the public pack) that MDDC considers that several sites in the east of the village would be reasonable alternatives but that they are more extensive tracts of land. We ask you to consider restricting for development a smaller area of one of these other sites that have already been assessed within the SA process, just as you selected a smaller area of the Higher Town site for dwellings within the Higher Town site.

My question is please can you reflect the views of most residents in the village and choose one of the reasonable alternative sites that have been identified to be available?

Mr J Byrom, referring to item 5 on the agenda said that this is an evidence based exercise into the SA update and I have studied all of the assessments for the Higher Town site in sustainability appraisals and updates since January 2014 to January 2018. None of these ever mentions any assessment of impact on the Grand Western Canal Conservation area, a heritage asset that lies only 50 meters away from the site at its closest point. What is assessed is impact on the Sampford Peverell village conservation area. For 4 years your SA's have always talked of impact on the conservation area in the singular, so too does the SP policy itself and yet on page 476 of the packs a table in the executive summary of the 2018 SA update states that criteria have now been included in the policy to ensure landscaping and design respect the conservation areas, plural, we have suddenly gained a conservation area. By using the plural this council wrongly implies that it has formally assessed impact on a second conservation area that it has never once considered in any version of its Sustainability Appraisal of this site. Papers from Council meetings in late 2016 show that the canal conservation area was never mentioned in allocating SP 2 to the proposed Local Plan. The last minute historic environmental appraisal of December 2016 does mention the canal conservation area but that is not a Sustainability Appraisal. On pages 91, 241 and 406 of the packs correct wording from earlier SA's is used. This just adds to the confusion. If the extra S on page 476 was just a slip of the pen then it is a slip that may betray assumptions being made by officers and experts in this evidence based exercise. So what now? If you cut the extra S on page 476 you will rightly show that you only ever assessed one conservation area in relation to the site at Higher Town. If you leave the extra S in place I will be sure to urge the inspector to ask to see evidence that your Sustainability Appraisal of this site did assess impact on the canal conservation area. He will find none. My question is what will you do about the extra S on page 476 and what will you do about the fact that appeared there at all.

Dr C Chesney, referring to item 5 on the agenda said it is now 18 months since plans for the Higher Town, SP 2 and J27 were postponed for further studies. Having reviewed the subsequent report by your officer and all the relevant material in the public reports for this meeting, I do not believe the comment in paragraph 1.5 that a 'fair and thorough assessment be undertaken'.

I am particularly struck by the almost complete omission of any reference to the light pollution which would inevitably be produced by development at both J27 and SP 2. The chief reference to lighting and all the documentation states that the overall strategy for Mid Devon area is for the dark night sky to be protected and that 'lighting schemes which could affect these special qualities should be resisted'.

The night time lighting of the large area at J27 would be visible for literally miles around. Similarly, lighting the SP 2, the highest land in the village, would be a shining beacon on a hill, but in a most deleterious sense. Astonishingly official advice has been given that the residential areas should be well illuminated throughout the night. Not only would this lighting be a disturbance to residents but it would inevitably disrupt nocturnal wildlife, mammals, birds, insects and reptiles. Will you now carry out an assessment of this pollution?

The papers state that the 'development is proportional to the size of the existing village'. However Sampford Peverell is designated a village under policy SP 13 and is therefore considered appropriate only for a 'limited level of development'

elsewhere Council documents describe limited development as being some 6 to 10 houses, not sixty. Why is this particular policy not being followed?

Finally on a question of costs. Through service for 16 years as a member of the Royal College of Surgeons Disciplinary Committee, I learnt something of the costs of QC's and Inspectorates. The relevant statutory instrument states that the current daily rate of payment for an Inspector is £993. We can safely assume that the other consultants do not come cheaply either and then there is the cost of your own staff. It would appear that the Council will already have run up unnecessary bills of tens of thousands of pounds since meeting in September 2016. This can only be because the Council has not listened to what the residents have been saying. Having lived in Sampford Peverell for over 11 years and for the last 5 been Chairman of the Village Hall Committee I know that there is considerable dismay at the proposals. Villagers are united in saying the site at Higher Town is entirely unsuitable for housing.

Will you now please listen and act upon what I and other residents are saying?

Mr P Dumble, referring to item 5 on the agenda, said the brief given to LUC Consultants is narrow and was highly controlled by MDDC Planning Officers. As stated in section 1.4 of the LUC report, consultants did not reassess the February 2015 Sustainability Appraisal or SA report. Consultants were not able to critically reappraise the SA process nor allowed to do an independent assessment of the SA for SP2 site nor to compare this allocation objectively to alternative sites within Sampford Peverell or elsewhere.

Any changes to the 2017 SA appraisal update have been made entirely by MDDC Planners. Any technical opinions and judgements are those of MDDC Planners, not independent consultants.

The full and unchanged SA appraisals are included as annex 3 within the new SA update January 2018 report for approval today. As it is these appraisals that lie at the heart of the questions raised for last years suspended hearings it seems to me that this exercise has been a complete waste of time and ratepayers money.

Planners have chosen to ignore the many well-argued and in some cases expert submissions from members of the public and seem determined to defend the indefensible allocation of SP2, even if this risks further delaying the adoption of the Local Plan.

I would like to remind Councillors of the 5 questions raised by the Planning Inspector about SP2 for the aborted hearings:

These are if a site for Sampford Peverell is necessary to cater for additional housing need resulting from J27 allocation, is this site the best performing? Does the proposed allocation have sufficient regard to the historic environment? Does the proposed allocation have sufficient regard to the character and appearance of the area? Is the proposed allocation of property accessible, for pedestrians in particular? Is the tie to J27 strong enough? None of these have been considered within the LUC review. But these issues have not gone away. The Councils failings in assessing the site will I am sure eventually lead the Inspector to find that Policy SP2 is unsound. I sadly predict that we will all be here again in a years' time unless something changes. Councillors, you are being led along a very high risk pathway.

My question is will councillors please grasp the nettle and take the opportunity today to dismiss these wasteful reports, avoid another year of delay and vote now to recommend the Full Council immediately cut Policy SP2 from the Draft Local Plan.

The Chairman read a letter from Mrs Bryony Byrom regarding item 5 on the agenda. The letter said that on 5 September 2016, after officers had spent at least 16 weeks preparing an implications report on the possible allocation of land for development at Junction 27, your Planning Policy Advisory Group sat down to consider allocations for extra housing caused by that J27 Policy. The papers that informed Cabinet of that group's recommendations were to be sent out on 8 September. You therefore gave sixteen weeks on J27 and approximately three days on selecting and confirming additional housing allocations.

In, or possibly just before, those three days, officers apparently received 'new information' about the site at Higher Town that 'access is achievable'. In the light of this new information, they then changed the Sustainability Appraisal scoring so that Higher Town appeared to be more favourable than it was a day or two before. Higher Town was duly added as an allocation to the Local Plan as Policy SP2.

The wording used about the 'new information' on Higher Town is that *'there has been confirmation that access is achievable'*. This strongly suggests that officers went looking for that confirmation. I can find nothing in the Public Report Pack to suggest that you went looking for similar new information on sites other than Higher Town in response to Policy J27.

Since that time you have received new information from the public that you missed a listed building adjacent to the site when you assessed and scored Higher Town. You have not changed its scoring.

You have also received new information from the public that you failed to note the existence of a Conservation Area within 50 metres when you assessed and scored Higher Town. You have not changed its scoring.

You have also received new information that, should it be needed in conjunction with Policy J27, there is now a carefully-prepared alternative and suitably scaled-down site proposal at Mountain Oak. This has been ignored in this report.

My question is "Why did you change the scoring of Higher Town so swiftly when you went looking for new information in the three days when it suited you and why do you ignore other 'new information' of enormous significance when it comes from open consultation with the general public in the months that follow?"

The Chairman read a question from Hayley Keary, regarding item 5 on the agenda.

My question concerns Item 9 on Page 467 of the Public Reports Pack.

LUC advised in Paragraph 1.34 of its report that MDDC should satisfy itself that site options at Cullompton can definitely not be considered to be reasonable options.

In response, you have stated that 'any additional development [at Cullompton] on top of the current Local Plan allocations would not be appropriate until longer-term strategic highways improvements have been delivered'.

You have just announced that Cullompton has been given £10m to improve its highways.

You have rightly imposed a condition on the SP2 site that the site must not be developed until slip roads have been added to the A361 at Sampford Peverell. This means that Policy SP2 is – exactly like Cullompton sites - dependant on highways improvements.

The difference between the two sets of highways improvements is that you have been told by Devon County Council that no funds will be available to do the required work on slip roads at Sampford Peverell for the foreseeable future. Cullompton, on the other hand, now has funding.

My question is:

£10 million has just been granted to develop highways at Cullompton. Is MDDC still satisfied that the evidence shows that site options there are not reasonable alternative options to SP2?

The Chairman indicated that questions would be answered at the agenda item.

126. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the last meeting were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

127. **LOCAL PLAN REVIEW UPDATE 23:41**

The Cabinet had before it a report * from the Head of Planning, Economy and Regeneration providing an update on the Local Plan Review, specifically information on the findings of the review of Mid Devon District Council's Sustainability Appraisal Update 2017 (SA Update 2017) carried out independently by a consultant. This had been commissioned to advise whether the SA Update 2017 met the legal requirements and to consider matters of reasonable alternatives.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Regeneration outlined the contents of the report, reminding Members of the context for why the report was before the meeting and why the resolutions sought were important to Mid Devon.

Mid Devon needed an adopted up to date Local Plan. There was a legal requirement for this, and a public expectation that the new local plan was adopted as soon as possible.

The new Local Plan would be used to guide the development of new homes, jobs, and the infrastructure that was needed to the right places across the district. It would help to protect valued countryside from speculative unplanned development. It would help the Council to achieve its corporate priorities.

He reminded Members that decisions taken by the Council on 22nd September and 1st December 2016 had given approval for the content of the Mid Devon Local Plan Review (incorporating proposed modifications) and for the submission of this plan to the Planning Inspectorate for examination.

He said that he accepted that not all Members had supported all aspects of the plan, but he wished to make clear that the decisions taken reflected the position of the Council as a whole. The Council had approved what it believed to be the best plan for Mid Devon.

The preparation of the new Local Plan had involved significant work by the Council, and had already been subject to extensive consultation with the Mid Devon community over the last 4 years. There had been ample opportunity throughout for comments to be made on this plan. There had been ample opportunity for Members to consider the plan as this had evolved, to have their say and shape its content. He asked Members to recognise the need to progress this through its examination without further delay.

The Cabinet Member further explained that the report in front of them was regarding process and procedure in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal. It was about additional work that had been undertaken by officers in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal. The Sustainability Appraisal was technical evidence that was required to support the Local Plan.

This had followed a Barrister's legal advice to the Council, and a need for confirmation that the Sustainability Appraisal work that had helped shape proposed modifications to the Plan and decisions taken on these had complied with the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA regulations).

The Cabinet Member stated that Members would recall that the Local Plan was subject to proposed modifications approved by the Council, prior to its submission to the Planning Inspectorate. The Plan was modified to include proposals for mixed use tourism, leisure and retail uses on land adjacent to Junction 27 on the M5. This proposal had made it necessary for the Plan to make provision for some additional housing over the Plan period – 13 new homes each year. These had included land at Higher Town, Sampford Peverell (SP2), and at Blundell's School (TIV16). Where the content of the Plan had been contested, objections would be considered through the examination process and cases heard at examination hearings. The Inspector would consider matters of planning merit, as well as ruling on the Plan's legal compliance.

The Cabinet Member reminded Members to note that the Plan was submitted in March 2017 to the Planning Inspectorate. The Plan was technically at its examination and would be the subject of forthcoming hearings. The precautionary approach had caused delay to the examination hearings but the work undertaken was justified. It reflected due diligence by the Council in meeting its obligations and this would help the examination process and participants at the forthcoming hearings.

The report drew from the conclusions of an independent assessment of the Sustainability Appraisal work. LUC (Land Use Consultants) were commissioned by the Council for this purpose. LUC's report formed part of the suite of documents with the report before Members.

LUC had concluded the work carried out for the Sustainability Appraisal update for the proposed modifications to the Plan “was proportionate and appropriate to meet the SEA regulations”.

Land Use Consultants had advised it had not been necessary to undertake additional SA work in relation to sites or other options, but that it would be helpful if the Council could sign-post where the requirements for a Sustainability Appraisal were met in each of the previously published Sustainability Appraisal reports and where reasonable alternatives were considered. This was due to information being spread between different existing documentation.

The Council had updated the Sustainability Appraisal in light of Land Use Consultant’s review. The updated Sustainability Appraisal Report and associated work included sign-posting, re-ordering and clarification of its content. This work was shown in Appendix 2 as the completed SA Update 2018.

An Executive Summary of SA Review process (2018) had also been prepared which set out the changes made to the previous SA Update (2017) and the reasons for them (Appendix 3).

A schedule of amendments made to the SA Update (2017) and included in the SA Update (2018) had been prepared (Appendix 4).

The Cabinet Member informed Members that he wished to make clear the findings of the independent review.

In light of the Land Use Consultant’s findings there was nothing which would appear to steer the Council to a different conclusion to that reached in its previous decisions on the proposed modifications made to the Mid Devon Local Plan Review Submission Version (the plan as submitted) and hence there was also nothing arising from this review that would steer the Council to a different position at the examination of this plan.

The Cabinet Member talked through the next steps that would be required, should the recommendations be approved which included:

The suite of documents for the Sustainability Appraisal review be published as set out in the report.

A 6 week period of public consultation would be held at the earliest practicable date for the Schedule of amendments made to the Sustainability Appraisal update (2017). The scope of this consultation was the schedule of Amendments and not the unchanged contents of the submitted Plan.

The suite of documents and all representations received be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate where they could be considered together with all previous consultation responses received to the Mid Devon Local Plan Review Submission Version (incorporating proposed modifications).

This focused consultation was therefore not an opportunity to revisit previous consultations of the Mid Devon Local Plan Review Submission Version (incorporating proposed modifications).

A proposed timetable was set out as follows:

- 6 week public consultation - February – April 2018
- Submission of the suite of documents and consultation responses - April 2018
- The Council would write to the Planning Inspectorate to update them on the above timetable, but it was for the Inspectorate to determine when the examination hearings should be reconvened, having considered the findings of the additional Sustainability Appraisal work together with all previously submitted documentation.
- The restarting of the examination timetable would require a 6 week period of public notification prior to the commencement of the examination hearings. Officers estimated that examination hearings would take place during summer/autumn 2018, but stressed that decisions over timing rested with the Planning Inspectorate.
- Through informal contact with the Planning Inspectorate it was understood that examination dates would not be scheduled until the consultation period had elapsed and associated documentation and responses had been forwarded.

In response to questions raised at Public Question Time the Head of Planning, Economy and Regeneration provided the following responses:

In response to Mr Drew's question the officer informed the Cabinet that in terms of the SA process both the NNPF and National Planning Guidance said that the Sustainability Appraisal process should only focus on what was likely to be needed to assess the likely significant effects of the Local Plan. It should focus on the environmental, economic and social impacts of the sites that were likely to be significant. That it did not need to be done in any more detail or using more resources than was appropriate for the content and level of detail in the Local Plan. In relation to the Grand Western Canal Conservation Area officers did take it into account through this process but the critical issue was that it was not felt to have a significant impact upon it, accordingly it had not formed part of the written inclusions within the SA in relation to impacts because those impacts were not considered to be significant. Accordingly it was also not referred to specifically within mitigation measures, again because the impacts were not considered to be significant. There was therefore a fundamental difference of opinion with Mr Drew in relation to the SA process and the degree of impact in the terms of Policy SP2 and the relationship with the Grand Western Canal conservation area.

David Pickhaver, Planning Officer from Torbay Council and Project Manager of the SA independent review process, agreed that the historic environment appraisal did consider the Grand Western Canal and did not identify any substantial harm. The Land Use Consultants were asked whether the process undertaken had considered reasonable alternatives and their advice had been that reasonable alternatives had been considered and therefore there was no reason to reassess the sites in detail. Their advice was that the work had been proportionate to meet the requirements of the regulations. In relation to the question regarding Historic England's advice, this

advice only came out at the end of 2016 so some of the SA work had been carried out before that. The legal requirements had been met.

With reference to the question asked by Cllr Holland, the officer said that the updated information before Members went into detail about whether there were any reasonable alternatives and the conclusion from that process had been that, with planning judgement, SP2 was still considered to be the most reasonable of those sites and that there were concerns in relation to the others. The sites to the east were not seen to be reasonable alternatives. One of the issues being scale, the sites on the east were being promoted for larger scale allocation and were less acceptable in how they could be scaled up or down and there were affects and impacts with those other sites.

Mr Pickhaver confirmed that LUC were asked whether or not it was necessary to rerun assessments for other sites put forward and their advice had been that those sites had already been considered and rejected. He said that it was a matter of planning judgement and that sites on the east side would result in a larger village extension, which would affect the overall Plan strategy. This was a legitimate reason to reject those sites.

With regard to questions asked by Mr Byrom the Head of Planning, Economy and Regeneration said that as already explained officers had considered both conservation areas and in the case of the Grand Western Canal did not consider there to be significant effect. The officer referred to page 476 of the papers which showed criteria to be included in the policy to ensure that landscaping and design that affected the setting and design of the area. This was where it said conservation areas and this was where Mr Byrom had picked up on the plural by use of the 's'. The officer did not think that this fundamentally affected the basic premise that had already been explained. She explained that officers would look carefully, prior to Full Council, at the question raised by Mr Byrom over the use of the plural rather than singular this part of the report.

With reference to the question asked by Dr Chesney the officer informed the Cabinet that there were no designated dark sky areas in Mid Devon and that in relation to the SA process this was not considered to be significant. Detail regarding items such as lighting would be considered at application time rather than during the SA process. She did not consider this to be a significant impact.

Mr Pickhaver added that he did not recall the LUC being asked specifically about light issues but they were asked whether the sustainability impact appraisal had met the legal requirements and had not picked up that anything to do with light pollution had been missed from the work done. The effects of light pollution would relate to other sites as well and would be picked up within the planning process.

With regard to the number of dwellings the officer explained that in relation to the strategy of the plan and distribution of development it was felt that 60 dwellings was not counter to the strategy of the plan which sought to direct the majority of development towards Tiverton and Cullompton. The allocation of 60 dwellings at Sampford Peverell was not seen as counter to the Plan, and taking into consideration the current size of the village and the facilities available was considered to be acceptable.

With reference to questions asked by Mr Dumble the officer said that the scope of the review was very much around the modifications stage of the Plan. This was that stage at which the Council resolved to add Junction 27 and associated housing sites not only at Sampford Peverell but also at Blundell's Road, Tiverton, these being the major modifications to the Plan. The SA review by LUC did look specifically at this stage of the process and did take into account the SA work in relation to those allocations. This was indeed where the focus of LUC's commission laid. It was an independent process and their outcomes are within the report.

Mr Pickhaver confirmed that in section 1.3.1 of the report LUC advice was that they considered it appropriate and proportionate to SA the modifications rather than revisiting the whole SA process.

Referring to the question asked by Mrs Byrom the Forward Planning Team Leader stated that the alteration to the scoring had come about as a result of additional information received and that the situation according to Devon County Council Highways Officers was that it was feasible to get a reasonable means of access into the SP 2 site and footway improvements to the centre of the village.

The Head of Planning, Economy and Regeneration added that there was already recognised to be a slight negative impact in terms of Sampford Peverell Conservation Area in the scoring in the SA. The SA framework for sites methodology was used and the scoring becoming more positive as a result of clarification of the likelihood of a technical solution for access to the site.

In response to the question asked by Mrs Kearly the officer explained that the funding received for Junction 28 was not to deliver longer term strategic highway improvements, but to unlock some planned for development at Cullompton at an earlier stage. This award did not affect the constraints on further growth at Cullompton due to the road network. The bid funding did not introduce alternative sites in Cullompton and still left a requirement for the site at Sampford Peverell.

Consideration was given to:

- The public could make comments through the examination of the plan;
- The need for detailed papers in order that Members could make an informed decision;
- Land at Jersey Farm (north of A38) was not included in the Junction 27 allocation;
- Housing needs figures were confirmed as 7860;
- The proposed SP 2 allocation criterion that development would not take place until access works for the A361 had been completed;
- The risk of not having a 5 year land supply and speculative applications coming forward.

A request from Mr Drew to meet with the Cabinet Member and Head of Planning, Economy and Regeneration prior to Council was agreed.

RECOMMENDED that:

Council notes this report and its appendices and having regard to their contents;

- a) Reaffirms its decisions of 22nd September 2016 and 1st December 2016 regarding the Mid Devon Local Plan Review (incorporating proposed modifications) and instructs officers to liaise with the Planning Inspector to restart the examination process as quickly as possible subject to (2) and (3) below;

and, in accordance with part 4 of this report

- b) Approves the publication of the LUC SA Update Review (2018), the Schedule of amendments made to the Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017), the Sustainability Appraisal Update (2018) and the Executive Summary of SA Review process (2018);
- c) Approves a 6 week public consultation on the schedule of amendments made to the Sustainability Appraisal Update (2017).

(Proposed by Cllr R J Chesterton and seconded by Cllr P H D Hare Scott)

Note: - Report * previously circulated and attached to Minutes.

(The meeting ended at 11.12 am)

CHAIRMAN