

DRAFT SOUTH EAST PLAN

EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC

Note of the First Preliminary Meeting

Held on

Thursday 7 September 2006

At Reading Town Hall

Panel Secretariat Office
RSS Examination in Public South East
Bridge House
1 Walnut Tree Close
Guildford GU1 4GA
Tel 01483 885256

Email: panel@eipsoutheast.co.uk

EiP website: www.eipsoutheast.co.uk

Prepared by the Panel Secretariat
Approved by the Panel Chair
September 2006

**NOTE OF THE FIRST PRELIMINARY MEETING HELD AT 10.00 am ON
THURSDAY 7 SEPTEMBER 2006 AT READING TOWN HALL**

PRESENT:

EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC PANEL MEMBERS

Corinne Swain, Chair

Martin Shaw, Inspector

Mary Travers, Inspector

PANEL ASSESSOR (Thames Basin Heaths)

Peter Burley, Inspector

EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC SECRETARIAT

Sue Morgan, Panel Secretary

Sarah May, Panel Assistant

Angela Crease, Panel Support Officer

MINUTES

APPENDIX 1 List of attendees

APPENDIX 2 Post meeting updates from the South East of England
Regional Assembly

1 INTRODUCTIONS

- 1.1 Corinne Swain, the Panel Chair, introduced herself, the other members of the Panel (Mary Travers and Martin Shaw, both Planning Inspectors), Peter Burley the Assessor on Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas issues, and the Secretariat (Sue Morgan Panel Secretary, Sarah May Panel Assistant and Angela Crease Panel Support Officer).
- 1.2 Corinne Swain and Martin Shaw had both worked on the RPG9 mini review Examinations in Public in 2003 and 2004, and Mary Travers was the Inspector for the Eastleigh Local Plan Inquiry in 2004. Corinne Swain then explained the background and experience of each of the Panel members. She noted that there were also 3 Planning Officers (Elaine Quinn, Christian Ford and Hilary Templer) who were providing technical assistance to the Panel.
- 1.3 All communication with the Panel must be through the Secretariat as it would be improper for any Panel member to have contact with any individual Participant.
- 1.4 The team working on the Examination in Public (EiP) for the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) introduced themselves – Catriona Riddell, Planning Strategy Director, and Nikki Nicholson and Nick Woolfenden Regional Planners. The Government Office of the South East (GOSE) then introduced themselves: Richard Lemon RSS Team Leader, Sunethra Mendis RSS Team Lead on Housing and Economy, Caroline Wood RSS Team Lead on Environmental Matters, Andrew Parker RSS Team Lead on Infrastructure Matters and Lesley Creedon Housing Delivery responsible for work on Thames Basin Heaths.

2 PURPOSE OF MEETING

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the meeting was an opportunity
 - To give context for this EiP
 - To share the Panel's thinking behind the Draft List of Matters and Participants, and the current consultation process on it
 - To indicate the preparatory work that will take place on Thames Basin Heaths issues
 - To discuss background material and
 - To indicate the work that needs to take place before the EiP
- 2.2 There was to be a Second Preliminary Meeting scheduled for 17 October, and guidance on participants' written statements and the conduct of debates would be given then.
- 2.3 In the meantime the Notes for Participants gave general guidance on the procedures for the EiP. This had been put onto the EiP web site on 31 August (www.eipsoutheast.co.uk). Participants could seek further advice from the Secretariat as necessary.

3 PURPOSE OF THE EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC

- 3.1 **What will be examined** – Corinne Swain advised that the examination would focus on 3 of the 6 documents in the March 2006 submission package: the Core Strategy (Sections A - E), the Implementation Plan (Section F, although this will be updated before the EiP) and the Monitoring Framework (Section G). SEERA had drawn attention on their website to a few minor errors and this list would be kept up to date. The adopted Waste and Minerals alterations had been published since the submission of the draft Plan, and the Panel also noted that there was a suggested update of Policy SH8 on Town Centres by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire authorities in their representation, and a suggested update of Policy MKAV1 in the Milton Keynes Council representation.
- 3.2 **Relationship to mini reviews.** The Chair explained that there were 7 subjects which had very recently adopted policies - 5 technical topics - transport, renewable energy, tourism, waste and minerals, and parts of 2 sub-regions - Milton Keynes/Aylesbury and Ashford. For these, the aim was not to open up issues covered in the recent EiPs, but instead to focus on where SEERA had made changes &/or where there had been a change or updating of Government policy. This approach was reflected in the Preliminary List of matters and in the indicative timetable.
- 3.3 **Process.** Corinne Swain noted that the Panel are asked to test the soundness of the draft Plan, and given a list of criteria against which to do that in the Government's Planning Policy Statement 11, para 2.49. Three of the 12 criteria related to the Panel satisfying itself that the process used by SEERA to prepare the draft Plan had been satisfactory (one in general terms of whether the Regulations had been complied with, and two substantive issues). On the two substantive points, the Panel had done an initial review of SEERA's consultation/stakeholder involvement and the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment process followed (with help from one of the Planning Officers, Elaine Quinn) and was satisfied that there were no showstoppers at this stage.
- 3.4 However the Chair explained that the Panel had some concerns, on which it will want to hear further debate at the examination
- Although SEERA had undertaken a large amount of stakeholder involvement using a number of different methods, as explained in their presubmission consultation statement, the Panel had some concerns about their attempts to involve hard to reach groups. The Panel hoped to probe the implications of this, and issues on vulnerable groups, in the Social, Cultural and Health debates.
 - Many of the representations raised questions about the Sustainability Assessment process followed. Often these related to the way in which the forecast impacts had been taken into account, or not, in finalising the policies. This related to the balance between

environmental, economic and social issues struck within the Plan, and there would be a chance to discuss that in several sessions, including the first.

- From the Panel's own review of the Sustainability Assessment process itself, the methods used at the regional level appeared to be transparent and rigorous. However the methods used to accompany the preparation of sub-regional strategies appeared much less rigorous, and this would inform the questioning in the debates including the specific question on the Sustainability Assessment in the first session.
- There was also the issue of the Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Directive. The Panel accepted that the timing of this European ruling was too late to influence the plan preparation process, but looked forward to seeing the results of the work currently underway.

3.5 Corinne Swain continued, saying that there was a more general concern that the Panel had on the preparation process, and that related to the range of options tested (both in terms of levels of growth and spatial distribution). From the extensive responses on this subject, the Panel knew that these concerns were shared by many. The Panel did not think that this invalidated the Sustainability Assessment process itself, and it perhaps reflected more on the plan preparation process (ie the instructions given to the Sustainability Assessment team). However the Panel was content that this could be probed in the debates, both under the spatial strategy matter and in the sub-regional sessions. The Panel envisaged that the Roger Tym and Partners work commissioned by GOSE would provide useful material for those debates. The Panel was aware that this work did not seek to justify a different level of housing growth from that included in the submission draft, but provided an indication of the implications of alternative levels.

3.6 In conclusion, the Panel did not think that there was anything so fundamentally flawed in those process elements that would necessitate the deferment of the EiP. But by having shared their concerns at this stage, the Panel hoped that the subsequent debates would be more constructive and focused.

4. QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

4(i) Edward Dawson, CPRE South East
Were there any lessons to be learnt from the East of England EiP particularly in relation to the level of detail that was appropriate in response to the Matters? The East of England Panel had ruled out some of the evidence that had been presented as being more appropriate to the Local Development Framework.

Martin Shaw replied that there were two issues at the East of England EiP. The first related to the sub-regions and how many there should be which led to a lot of detail being presented for those sub-regions that was

felt to be inappropriate by the Panel. This Panel would look at question of sub-regions but their consideration was more a matter for debate at the actual EiP. The second aspect related to the question of locational specificity – how precise should the Panel be in considering sites. The East of England Panel required brief Sustainability Appraisals of alternative potential development sites and that had created a large body of detailed work. The Panel would not be asking for such Sustainability Appraisals of possible development areas for this EiP as, apart from anything else, it raised an expectation that the Panel would consider and comment on numerous individual sites. That would not be the case. The Panel did not want information on individual sites that would be more appropriate to the Local Development Framework which was also where the Sustainability Appraisals of such sites must be considered.

- 4(ii) Stuart Roberts, Hampshire County Council
Asked about the Appropriate Assessments (AAs) of the Plan and their expected timing.

Catriona Riddell replied on behalf of SEERA explaining that the AA of the whole Plan was due to go to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on 29 November but that much of the work should be completed by the end of September so there was a chance that a draft could be made publicly available before it went to the RPC (see para 11.6). The Sustainability Appraisal of the Implementation Plan was due to go to the RPC shortly and it would be published on SEERA's website on about 15 September.

- 4(iii) Mark Sullivan, Folkington Estate
Firstly, the Panel had alluded to the process of the Plan development and to the consultation with stakeholders, but had not mentioned this in relation to sub-regional strategies which had been written by the county councils and appeared to be bolted in to the Plan. For the Sussex Coast there had been a few meetings about housing numbers but little else. Would the Panel be testing the stakeholder involvement of the sub-regional strategies? Secondly, was it a possible solution to concerns about certain sub-regions for the Panel to conclude that the parts of the Plan relating to them should be withdrawn and tested again at a later date? Thirdly, the Panel had said that they would not be revisiting the mini-review subjects, but of these the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) was controversial in that GOSE had disagreed with Section D4 and wanted substantial changes. This was not however included among the Matters in the draft list.

Corinne Swain noted that the Panel had some concerns about the evidence base behind the sub-regional strategies and had found it difficult to piece together the evidence used. The Panel had looked at the work presented in December 2005 by the Principal authorities but as yet the Panel did not have a full understanding of either the technical work at sub-regional level or the consultation procedures used. However, the Panel was working on this and knew it to be an area of concern.

Mary Travers said that the Panel was aware that there had been variations in the consultation process at sub-regional level and this was something that SEERA might like to comment on. However, overall, the Panel was satisfied that the consultation effort had been very considerable and as a whole had been sound.

Catriona Riddell, SEERA responded that there had been three separate consultations at sub-regional level. The first was on the strategy and that had been included in the consultation draft plan that the Assembly carried out itself. Each of the lead authorities also carried out one on housing that went to at least district level. There had been variation in how that had been done but all had met at least a minimum requirement. Then there had been a third round of consultation on the whole package.

Mary Travers said that the Panel would look at the question of the options available should they decide that any parts of the Plan were unsound. It was theoretically possible for the Panel to advise that any part should be rewritten and examined again.

Corinne Swain noted that the Panel recognised that transport was the most substantive of the 5 topics that were already the subject of mini-reviews. It was the hardest area to see what new work had been done by the Assembly and was an area where national policy had been evolving recently. This was why a whole day at the EiP had been allocated to transport.

Martin Shaw told the meeting that the Panel would want to look at the subsequent developments in Government policy since the RTS had been originally examined. In particular there was now a clearer indication of the amount of money available for transport in the region, a much firmer line on road user charging and demand management, and an explicit policy in relation to airports in the South East. The Panel believed that the questions set out in the draft list of Matters provided adequate scope to debate those issues but if anyone felt otherwise then they could let the Panel know during the current consultation phase.

4(iv) Brian Horsley Civic, Trust South East

He had attended two consultation sessions on the sub-regional strategies, one on the Sussex Coast and the other the Kent Thames Gateway. He had found the consultation very well done, with the local authorities providing full reports and documentation.

4(v) Michael Thornton, Maidstone Borough Council

His authority had recently gone through an examination under PPS12 on their local development plan. This examination obviously followed a different process and clarity was needed about exactly what decisions were open to the Panel - was it a case of finding the whole document sound or unsound, or could parts of the document be referred back with or without recommendations?

Corinne Swain noted that the process at regional level had been more stable than at local level and the process was not unknown territory.

Mary Travers said that the Panel were charged with testing the soundness of the Plan and it was potentially open to the Panel to find some parts of it more sound than others. There could be issues that the Panel concluded need to be re-examined and referred back for reconsideration in some form.

Corinne Swain reiterated that the Panel had considerable discretion in what it could conclude. Because the regional EiP process was now established and the Panel had the benefit of time and of well informed people, it was to be hoped that by the end of the debates it would not simply be a case of saying that something was unsound but of being able to suggest something else in its place.

- 4(vi) Bob Sellwood, Sellwood Planning
Would it be right to say that the key difference that Inspectors have between the LDF process and the current process was that the LDF Inspectors make a binding report whereas the RSS Panel make recommendations to the Secretary of State – the buck did not stop with the current Panel, whereas it did with an LDF Inspector?

Corinne Swain agreed that was a good way of putting it.

- 4(vii) Mark Sullivan, Folkington Estate
A matter of concern was whether the Panel had any experience of looking at parts of sub-regional strategies that had been written as a sort of promotional document. Both policies SCT1 and SCT6 had strange references to the region being open for business and were couched in non-planning terms. The third period of consultation referred to by SEERA earlier was actually the depositing of the Plan so the public never saw the wording of the policies for SCT until they went on deposit in March 2006. Were the Panel aware of authorities using their part of the Plan as a promotional tool in conflict with the rest of the Plan; that must be a matter of a soundness test?

Corinne Swain replied that the Panel would be probing the internal consistency of the Plan and consideration of how the sub-regional strategies meshed with the overall Plan was a matter that would be given careful consideration. If there were any policies that were pure advocacy policies then the Panel were likely to recommend that they be removed. If anyone had particular concerns they should either write in advance or include it in their statements.

5 DRAFT LIST OF MATTERS AND PARTICIPANTS

- 5.1 Corinne Swain noted that the draft List had been published on 31 August. It had been a hugely complex task in the time available, and the Panel members had done their best to absorb and do justice to the

massive amount of material submitted in the responses to the submission draft, and to the issues raised in the extensive background research that underpinned the draft RSS.

- 5.2 In relation to the responses to the submission draft, there were:
- over 7,000 responses (equivalent to 6-7 ft of paper)
 - of these, just over 6,000 were from members of the public and 12 Members of Parliament or Members of the European Parliament.
- 5.3 The remaining 1,000 or so had come from organisations and were split in roughly equal proportions:
- interest groups and voluntary bodies;
 - developers/business interests;
 - parish and town councils; and
 - local and central government and its agencies.
- 5.4 In terms of distribution within the region,
- over half the total response was from the Wokingham/Bracknell Forest area,
 - another 15% were from Dover/Folkestone, largely from the area around Lydd Airport, including Romney Marsh, but also a very sizeable response from north Dover.
 - there were smaller groupings from the Basingstoke area, east of Frimley about the future of Deepcut Barracks, and from South Hampshire.

6 SELECTION OF MATTERS

- 6.1 Martin Shaw then summarised the Panel's approach to the selection of matters for debate. The main starting points had been the responses to the consultation on the draft South East Plan, together with the Government's Policy Planning Statement 11.
- 6.2 In preparing the draft topics for discussion the Panel had sought to include all the main issues of controversy of regional significance. They had looked in particular for:
- Potential conflicts with national policy
 - Inter-regional implications, including conflicts with the strategies of neighbouring regions
 - Any conflicts between different policies in the document itself ie the internal consistency of the plan.
- 6.3 Martin Shaw explained that the Panel was particularly concerned to test whether policies were soundly based on the available evidence, and were regionally specific – Regional Spatial Strategies such as the Plan under consideration should not simply repeat national planning policy.
- 6.4 The Panel wanted to test whether it was clear how the policies could be delivered and by whom. That meant examining whether delivery

mechanisms were in place, and whether the draft Plan provided the right level of guidance - for those preparing other regional strategies as well as Local Development Frameworks ie neither too little or too much.

- 6.5 Martin Shaw noted that the Panel had tried to avoid including questions on:
- Technical issues covered in the partial reviews in the 2003/4 EiPs (as had already been mentioned by Corinne Swain). The Panel would focus instead on where SEERA had made changes/updates e.g. apportionment of London waste and/or where there had been progression of Government policy e.g. transport including ports and airports
 - Soundness of the Plan – on the basis that all the evidence the Panel would hear would contribute towards the judgement on this, and the conclusions would be set out in the Panel Report.
- 6.6 Martin Shaw explained that at regional level the questions were grouped into 7 topic areas:
- The first main topic was about the overall strategy in terms of the external context of the South East, climate change, infrastructure, the economy, and housing levels. In order to ensure that the broader spatial planning remit promoted in the Government's Planning Policy Statement 1 was embraced questions were included on social, cultural and health issues and, given its significance, a session to debate water.
 - While the Panel did not wish the examination to be dominated by housing issues, given the key role of the district housing figures to be handed down to LDFs the Panel recognised that housing issues would figure more than most. The opening sessions under Matter 1 would enable the Panel to examine housing levels in relation to infrastructure and demand management and broader sustainability issues, as well as questions on the key subject of housing/jobs alignment.
 - There was one aspect of housing that in the Panel's view should be considered early on in the Examination. That was the hypothetical question (raised under spatial strategy, 2A.5) about the implications of a higher level of housing provision than was proposed in the draft Plan. However, while raising this issue in a broad way as part of the discussion on Regional matters the Panel recognised the need to return to it after the sub-regional debates. The Panel was very much aware of the concerns expressed in many representations about the impact on the region of the housing levels proposed in the Plan. The Panel would of course consider the appropriateness of the overall housing provision during the housing levels debate. But in view of the Government's latest household projections, the Panel had not included a hypothetical question specifically on the implications of a lower level of housing provision. Martin Shaw emphasised that the Panel was not in any way prejudging the outcome of the discussion on regional housing levels.

- 6.7 Martin Shaw noted that in topics 2 to 7 the Panel dealt with the spatial structure of the region in terms of the proposed overall spatial strategy, green belt and strategic gaps, the regional transport strategy, detailed housing policies, economic development & employment land, town centres, waste & minerals, and landscape & biodiversity.
- 6.8 Martin Shaw pointed out that the Panel had not included specific questions on tourism or on renewable energy policies per se apart from the general question on sustainable housing. There was also nothing on gypsies and travellers which were subjects for a subsequent EiP.
- 6.9 In the sub-regional topics, numbered 8A to 8J, Martin Shaw noted that the Panel focussed in turn on each of the sub-regions as defined in the draft Plan.
- For each sub-region questions were generally grouped under three broad headings. These varied among the different sub-regions since the Panel preferred to allow the issues to emerge from the plan and the representations rather than to impose consistency for its own sake.
 - Those sub-regions that had not been used before as building blocks for strategy had an opening question on the role of and rationale for the sub-region. However the Panel did not see any merit in discussing the precise limits of individual sub-regions because they wished to focus debate on the strategy for those areas, rather than giving undue prominence to their boundaries
 - Questions relating to the effect on housing provision of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA would be dealt with in a joint session of the London Fringe and Western Corridor/Blackwater Valley sub-regions (8H & 8J respectively). Peter Burley would say more about the TBH issue later in the meeting.
- 6.10 Under topic 9 the Panel would deal with questions about the areas outside of the sub-regions defined in the draft Plan (the “Rest of County” sessions). Although covering large parts of the rural SE, the areas included quite sizeable towns and, in the case of Rest of Kent, two proposed Regional Hubs.
- 6.11 Martin Shaw said that having examined both housing issues and questions relating to the delivery of strategies in relation to each of the sub-regions the Panel would end the examination by:
- revisiting the case for and implications of any revised housing levels
 - discussing the implementation of the overall plan
 - considering questions about monitoring, review and format.
- 6.12 Finally, Martin Shaw gave a few words of caution on questions relating to the location of development. The Examination was not a forum to lobby on site specific issues, nor to debate matters that would be included in subsequent LDFs, although debate about where the dividing line should be between regional/sub-regional policies and those to be included in future LDFs such as on affordable housing would be relevant.

- 6.13 Martin Shaw commented that in many of the representations advocating alternative or additional locations for development, it was anticipated that additional material including a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) would be submitted before the EIP. This may have been influenced by the approach taken by the East of England Panel, in their request for two page SA statements for all major proposals. The Panel was not looking to repeat this process, since (as given in their answer to the CPRE) they feared it might raise expectations that the Panel would be considering individual sites, which they would not. The Panel did not want to receive site-specific information that would be of more relevance to the subsequent LDF process. The appropriate SA/SEA work would no doubt be done in preparing the housing allocations DPD at local level.
- 6.14 Martin Shaw added that the Panel wanted to take a more strategic view on capacity, informed by broader considerations such as those included within the Roger Tym and Partners work. Hence in the sub-regional questions the Panel was inviting consideration of the appropriate level of growth but only in the context of the overall strategy for the sub-region. In the Rest of County areas, the Panel was encouraging a discussion of whether there might be additional capacity, but in the context of what effect growth here might have on the nearest sub-regional strategies (ie the effect on the integrity of the Plan).
- 6.15 Martin Shaw continued, saying that the Panel was interested in broad locations if they represented a strategic way of accommodating a significant level of growth such as the proposed Strategic Development Areas in South Hampshire. The Panel was not interested in site-specific information just because a potential strategic allocation straddled a boundary. It would be unrealistic to expect the Panel to recommend a definitive Policy H1, with precise housing levels for each district for the next 20 years with no qualifications. In the draft Plan there were currently 9 footnotes indicating where work was ongoing to refine the figures for those particular districts. Hopefully with the benefit of some of those study results and the EIP debates, the Panel could recommend more precise figures for some of those districts. But the EIP might throw up other areas where there were still boundary issues to be solved. It was possible that resolving these would require joint studies either before or during the LDF preparation process. That was the reality of plan preparation, which takes place at different levels concurrently, not following a descending spatial scale in strict sequence.

7. SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

- 7.1 Mary Travers explained how the Panel had set about the task of identifying suitable participants for the debates. First, for each matter or sub-matter the Panel had aimed to select approximately 20 people. That number was manageable in practical terms for an interactive debate and it should enable a broad range of views to be explored in some depth.

- 7.2 In the selection of participants the Panel had looked for:
- an understanding of strategic issues
 - a mix of participant types, including for example, public authorities, infrastructure providers, business and developer interests, amenity groups and community/voluntary sector representatives
 - a broad range of viewpoints
 - representation from different parts of the region.
- 7.3 Mary Travers reported that the total number of invitees on the draft list was a little over 300, and many of those were invited to appear at several sessions. The Panel's decision to split the sub-regional debates generally into 3 sessions was designed to allow a larger number of parties to take part, while still keeping each debate manageable.
- 7.4 Because of their special roles, SEERA and GOSE were invited to all the debates:
- SEERA as promoters of the draft SE Plan; and
 - GOSE to advise amongst other things on the application of relevant national policy to the region. All references to GOSE should be taken to mean that they will be supported by Government Departments as appropriate. Where the Panel had specifically invited a representative from a particular Government Department that was identified in the draft list for that sub-matter.
- 7.5 Mary Travers explained that there were some general points about selection that the Panel would like to clarify:
- **local authorities:** the Panel had invited particular County, Unitary and District authorities where they took a contrary view to the draft RSS or had something specific to contribute to the debates, based on their representations and their acknowledged expertise as advised by SEERA. Where there was an existing grouping of authorities e.g. Partnership for Urban South Hampshire or the Diamonds for Growth local authorities, the Panel would leave it to the group to decide who to appoint as a representative. The Panel thought it appropriate to invite the South East County Leaders (SECL) to many of the key regional matters because they had commissioned some significant technical work (e.g. on infrastructure, affordable housing and economic growth) and they could represent the views of the counties. The Panel would leave it up to SECL how they would be represented. The District Councils had also grouped together to submit a joint representation, and for some of the overarching regional debates the Panel had invited them to nominate their most appropriate representative.
 - **agents and developers:** some agents had submitted multiple representations for different clients, and some developers were represented by more than one agent, as well as in some cases submitting their own representation. It had been a complicated task to analyse that. But in compiling the draft List, the Panel had generally identified one particular client against an agent's name, and this indicated that the representation was especially pertinent to the topic

under discussion. It was for the parties to identify the most appropriate representative to speak about that topic.

- **panel invites:** in a number of cases the Panel had invited certain organisations or specialists who did not make representations on the draft RSS but who had particular expertise that would help to inform the debates, again taking advice from SEERA and GOSE. The Panel might identify additional Panel Invites in the Final List.
- **shared seats:** where this would make best use of limited space around the table, the Panel had indicated particular authorities/organisations that would share a seat -- again this was a way of increasing the number of parties that could take part, while keeping the debates manageable.

7.6 Mary Travers advised that the Draft List of Matters and Participants had been published for consultation. Comments were invited by Thursday 28 September and should be made in writing to the Panel Secretary, Sue Morgan. Her contact details were shown on the EiP website, www.eipsoutheast.co.uk. The Panel was particularly interested in ways of sharpening up the focus of the questions or filling any gaps that might be perceived. There was limited scope to add many more participants, but if anyone wanted they could make a case for a person or organisation to be added to the list of participants. The written comments should indicate what particular skills and expertise would be brought to the debate by the extra participant, and why that viewpoint would not be covered by others. The Panel would take account of all requests and comments and the Final List would be published on Thursday 12 October.

8. QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

8(i) Where groups of local authorities had been invited to share a seat, were they expected to produce one statement or could they each submit a statement?

Corinne Swain said that if possible it would be preferable to have one statement that covered the concerns of the group. However, if one of the group members had a different view on any part of the statement, that could be put into an appendix (see also paragraph 15.4 of these minutes in relation to this issue).

8(ii) David Brubens, REASON Milton Keynes
Referred to the question at the top of page 32 of the Preliminary List of Matters and Participants that referred to the level of housing beyond Milton Keynes City. As existing proposals for growth allow for housing within the city area and urban extensions immediately adjoining, was it correct to say that the question referred to only those areas within the rest of the Borough outside the city?

Corinne Swain confirmed that Mr Bruben's interpretation was correct and said that the question would be clarified in the Final List.

- 8(iii) Chris Kenneford, Buckinghamshire County Council
Some growth related to the expansion of Milton Keynes was planned for Mid-Bedfordshire which is outside the South-East Region. Would this be discussed as part of the interregional session in the regional level debates, or would it (as he hoped) be discussed at the sub-regional session on Milton Keynes/Aylesbury Vale and then revisited at the end when all the housing figures are reconsidered?

Corinne Swain replied that it would be debated as Mr Kenneford had hoped.

- 8(iv) Stuart Roberts, Hampshire County Council
In relation to 'Rest of' areas, throughout the Plan the housing figures had been arrived at by downward apportionment of the county figures to the districts, but under the current timetable the debates on the 'Rest of' Central Hampshire and Rest of North Hampshire etc were being considered separately and the debates were two months apart. How would debate on the complexities of the inter-relationship between the two areas be handled? Secondly, where there are a number of organisations hot-seating, how would that work in practice particularly where authorities had a different view?

Corinne Swain responded that the Panel did not as yet fully understand how the work below regional level had been derived so apologised if things were not organised in a way that seemed logical to those more closely involved. North Hampshire had been put in with the 'Rest of Surrey, Buckinghamshire and West Berkshire' because the Panel wanted to consider capacity in relation to the sub-regional strategies rather than in a vacuum. If the questions were split to put the 'Rest of' Hampshire in with the debate on South Hampshire, that would mean that participants with a knowledge of the implications for the Western Corridor Blackwater Valley area would not be at the debate. There was no easy answer, but Mr Roberts should write to the Panel as part of the current consultation with views on the two options.

The Chair continued, saying that the Panel sympathised with potential problems with hot-seating. In sessions discussing housing the Panel had tried to be as generous as possible in seating for local authorities who would be tasked with taking forward the housing figures. However, the Panel was in difficulty with numbers. If there were particular sessions where local authorities had different views and difficulties would be created by hot seating then they should let the Panel know as part of the current consultation.

- 8(v) Peter Wilson, Adams Hendry representing Bovis Homes
Wanted to be sure about what had been said earlier about the housing debates. Was it correct to say that the district housing figures would be discussed as part of the pan-regional debate but the more detailed

discussion about how the district figures had been compiled would take place in the sub-regional sessions?

Martin Shaw said that, while Mr Wilson was generally correct the most important point was that the figures would be revisited at the end of the EiP in the light of all the debates that had occurred

Corinne Swain noted that it was unlikely that there would be discussion of an individual district's housing numbers at the pan-regional debate. The discussion would be broader, in terms of issues such as east v west, sub-region v sub-region, the overall balance in the region in relation to the constraints and opportunities

8(vi) Chris Todd, South Downs Campaign

Had concerns about the selected Participants for the South Coast session as there were no bodies representing the South Downs in the Role and Economy session yet it had strategic importance. More generally, while it was obviously difficult to ensure an absolute balance of type of participants, in sub-matter 1A Strategic Vision and Objectives economic interests outweighed environmental interests by 2:1. Under the Sustainability Appraisal session, there was no one from the Sustainability Appraisal Sounding Board.

Corinne Swain replied that the Panel would look at individual points that had been made in the round and welcomed written input to the current consultation exercise. In relation to the Sounding Board, perhaps the Assembly could take forward and advise on who would be most appropriate from the Sounding Board; if Ricky Therival of the Board were available that would be excellent and the Panel would look to the Assembly to facilitate.

8(vii) Mike McKenna, David Tucker Associates

He was acting for clients with a particular interest in Matter 3.4. Given that large transport infrastructure schemes such as rail freight interchanges had regional significance, was it right to assume that these could be discussed even though they are site specific?

Martin Shaw replied that that was correct and in addition it would be a matter for debate at the EiP how site specific and detailed the Plan should be on things such as inter-modal freight exchanges.

8(viii) Jason Stratton, Thames Water

Would the same answer apply to water resources development where there is an identified regional need for water infrastructure development?

Martin Shaw responded that yes – if there was to be a debate about for example a new reservoir then it was obviously necessary to talk about the broad location.

8(ix) Gerry Wyld, Slough Borough Council

Wanted clarification on hot seats as Slough BC had been given a hot-seat with 2 others for the session on the Western Corridor. Was it correct that more than one of sharers could speak?

Corinne Swain said that was correct. If a sharer wanted to put forward a differing view they would be asked to come forward to sit at the table at the appropriate point in the debate. The Western Corridor Blackwater Valley session was the most difficult to accommodate so the Panel hoped that hot-seating would be acceptable.

- 8(x) Steven Walker, Environment Agency
Noted that there were a number of topic specific debates first, which then moved on to Spatial Strategy sessions. In the generic discussion of housing levels under Matter 1H3 water management, supply, flood risk and water quality would be relevant factors. In the spatial strategy session on housing there were questions that also covered the environmental opportunities and constraints, and then there would also be further talk in the sub-regional sessions. How would the debates be pitched for the various sessions?

Martin Shaw replied that when the Panel was dealing with overall housing levels then they would consider the extent to which water issues had influenced the content of the regional strategy, when they came to consider the spatial distribution, they would consider how far water issues had influenced the distribution. There would be a progression from looking at the region as a whole to then considering its spatial structure to then considering the individual sub-regions. The Agency would have a different input at each stage and more detail would be needed at the sub-regional level. The Panel would reflect on the Agency's contribution at each of the sessions; if Mr Walker had any suggestions for how the Agency's input could be most effectively channelled they should write to the Secretariat.

- 8(xi) Howard Cheadle, Arun District Council
The Environment Agency had effectively stopped the work on the Local Development Framework in Arun because there was no strategic flood risk assessment. However, the Agency was not invited to the Sussex Coast infrastructure session. The Panel had said that they did not want Sustainability Appraisals at the beginning, but when would they be considered? If the Panel concluded from the regional debates that more housing was appropriate in certain areas, yet when it came to the sub-regional sessions it became apparent that there were physical constraints preventing that number of houses being built, there was a problem.

Corinne Swain said that it was a question of progression. Debate at the regional level would be very general, to understand the big issues. It would be more detailed at sub-regional scale including environmental issues. The Panel would not have made their minds up about anything until all the evidence had been heard and the report writing was

underway. The Panel would take these issues in the round, and if a key party such as the Environment Agency had been missed from a particular session, then the Panel needed to be told.

8(xii) Mark Sullivan, Folkington Estate

Firstly, there was unlikely to be even an interim decision on the South Downs National Park in time for the EiP. The National Park area covered both areas inside the Sussex Coast sub-region but also 'Rest of' Sussex areas. The debates on these 2 areas were not together. Would the Panel consider holding the 'Rest of' Sussex session at Chichester immediately following the Sussex Coast? Secondly, hot-seating did work but each sharer should be allowed to produce individual statements. On the Sussex Coast there was a chance to provide seats for local environmental groups such as the Hastings Alliance because if the debate were to move in consideration along the coast, then those parties whose areas had been considered could give up their seats to another group.

Corinne Swain responded that the Panel would give thought to the issue of statements (see paragraph 15.4 of these minutes) and also look at ways of letting more local environmental groups have their say. The session on 'Rest of' Sussex was located immediately after the Gatwick sub-region because some of the Sussex authorities were within the influence of the Gatwick area and the Panel wanted to consider the 'Rest of' housing in relation to that sub-region as well as the Sussex Coast.

8(xiii) Mark Fox, Pegasus Planning

Would supplementary proofs be required for the session on housing that was scheduled to occur after the sub-regional sessions, and would there be any additional questions issued by the Panel part way through the process?

Corinne Swain said that the Panel would have to let that evolve. There may have to be some refocusing of the questions for the later housing session. Please keep a watch on the EiP website.

8(xiv) Martin Simmons, Association of London Government and the South London Partnership.

He was pleased to have been invited to a number of sessions that involved areas contiguous to London. However, he had not been invited to any of the regional debates although his organisations had things they wanted to say about them, particularly Matters 1B and 1G. Would it be possible to make comments on matters that had already been considered at the regional sessions when at the sub-regional debates?

Corinne Swain replied that the Panel would be content to hear new points arising in those sub-regional sessions if the party had not been directly represented at the relevant regional session, but would be seeking to avoid repetition of points already made. The Panel would remind participants at the start of each session of the points that they

already had lodged in their minds and did not require further discussion. However if there were specific sessions which Mr Simmons felt his organisations should be able to attend, then he should write and say so during the current consultation.

9 TIMETABLE

- 9.1 The Panel had scheduled the debates over a 4 month period -- with an initial 3 weeks before Christmas, and 4 fortnightly sessions after Christmas. The sessions after Christmas would take place in different parts of the region.
- 9.2 The sessions before Christmas were all on regional-level topics, and those after Christmas largely on the sub-regional components. The Panel had originally hoped to conduct all the regional-level debates before Christmas, but in the event some topics were programmed in the first sessions of the New Year, but with town centres left for the first session in Maidstone. As one of the main issues for debate related to Bluewater, then the timing was a reasonable fit.
- 9.3 For each sub-regional strategy, the Panel had allocated 1.5-2.5 days, less where there had already been recent discussion and other recent EiPs, more where this would present a new policy framework and/or there had been significant volumes of objection in the representations. Issues did not always follow the same order but the Panel had tried to avoid splitting the same topic over 2 days for the convenience of participants. The Rest of County sessions always followed the debate on the sub-region or sub-regions to which they most closely related.
- 9.4 The regional-level Biodiversity session, and the debates on the 2 sub-regions most affected by the Thames Basin Heaths (London Fringe and Western Corridor Blackwater Valley) were timed to take place downstream of the technical meetings. Peter Burley would explain.

10 PREPARATORY WORK ON THAMES BASIN HEATHS

- 10.1 Peter Burley explained that his role as assessor was to consider whether the draft Delivery Plan that was published in May 2006 was a practical and deliverable solution for dealing with housing development around the Thames Basin Heaths SPA or whether it could be improved in any way. Full details of his terms of reference were published on the EiP website.
- 10.2 He would be holding 3 technical meetings. These were provisionally scheduled for 21-23 November, 18-20 December 2006 and 2 February 2007 and would take place in Woking.
- 10.3 The technical meetings would focus amongst other things on the appropriateness of the zonal approach; the package of mitigation measures suggested in the plan in respect of on-site mitigation, off-site compensation and access management; the realism of the mitigation

land standards set by Natural England; and the impact that these measures might have.

- 10.4 On the morning of the first day of the first meeting, Peter Burley would be asking Natural England, SEERA and DCLG to give short briefings on the current position regarding the Delivery Plan, Appropriate Assessment and a number of other studies, some of which were still ongoing or yet to commence, which were relevant to the issues raised by the Delivery Plan. The rest of the first day would be an open discussion to allow everyone who had expressed an interest in the subject on the EIP website to make known their views on the comprehensiveness of the evidence on which the Delivery Plan was based and on the general issue of the impact of new housing on the TBH SPA. The following two days would be spent in exploring in more detail with invited attendees the issues of zoning, mitigation and management.
- 10.5 The technical meetings would not be exploring the implications of the Delivery Plan on housing numbers within the relevant sub-regions, which would be a matter for the relevant EIP session. Neither would they be considering the suitability or deliverability of any of the mini-delivery plans or DPDs which had been or were in the process of being produced by District Councils except in so far as these had a direct bearing on the soundness of the overall Delivery Plan.
- 10.6 A letter of invitation to attendees would be sent out on 6 October together with a background paper that he would prepare setting out a number of questions. A draft of possible questions and attendees would be posted on Monday 11 September on the EIP website and any comments on those should be submitted to the Secretariat by 29 September.
- 10.7 Invited attendees would be expected to submit a brief paper setting out their position on the questions he had framed by 30 October. The final agenda for the 1st technical data meeting would be sent out on 6 November. Mr Burley would expect all participants to have read both the Delivery Plan and the study published in July this year on the availability of mitigation land.
- 10.8 In addition, he was hopeful that the current peer review of the Delivery Plan would be completed in sufficient time for attendees to include any necessary reference to it in their position paper. It was currently expected to be published in early October. If there should be a slight delay on its publication he would allow submission of a further update sheet provided it was submitted at least one week before the first technical meeting.
- 10.9 The second technical data meeting would seek to explore in more detail the main areas of disagreement and areas where there may be scope for the Delivery Plan to be improved. Shortly after the close of the 1st

technical data meeting he would send out a further letter setting out what he considered those areas to be.

10.10 The final technical meeting was intended primarily to allow participants to comment further on the question of on-site mitigation and accessibility management in the light of Natural England's additional research on this issue. He understood that there was a delay in commissioning this research due to funding difficulties. However, those problems had been resolved. He was therefore extremely hopeful that the 3rd meeting would take place as programmed. He and the Panel were extremely keen to avoid any delay because of the knock on effect this could have on the related EIP sittings and the Panel's report. Peter Burley asked what the expected publication date for the access management and mitigation study would be. Rob Cameron of English Nature replied that it was due at the end of January 2007 but that he would aim to ensure that draft information was available as early as possible

10.11 Once he had concluded the third data meeting Mr Burley would be writing a report for the Panel setting out his conclusions on the soundness of the Delivery Plan and whether it could be improved. That report was due to be published on 19 February 2007 in time to allow participants at the London Fringe and Western Corridor/Blackwater Valley session on 22 March 2007 to comment on its implications for housing development in the sub-regions. The Panel would take into account the report and any comments on it in reaching its conclusions on the appropriate housing levels in the affected sub-regions and the consequent implications, if any, for the rest of the region.

10.12 Participants at the London Fringe and Western Corridor/Blackwater Valley session joint session on 22 March who wished to comment on the implications of the Assessor's report should submit their comments in writing to the Secretariat no later than 5 March 2007 as a brief addendum to their previous written statements.

10.13 There were no questions from the floor.

11 EXISTING AND FORTHCOMING REPORTS

11.1 **Documents List** : The Panel had prepared a draft Documents List which had been placed on the web site on Tuesday 5 September. The Panel had tried to include all of the documents that underpin the regional policies from SEERA's web site, and with the help of Sarah May the Panel Assistant, had tried to pick up relevant national material as referred to in the East of England EiP which reported earlier this year.

11.2 Where the List was most deficient was on the material that underpinned the sub-regional strategies. Although the Panel had seen the December 2005 submissions, the details of the evidence base were not always clear to them. In some cases, respondents to the submission draft

identified particular studies, and the Panel had tried to reference these. But the Panel did not consider it their role to search through the web sites of each constituent authority. So the Panel had asked SEERA to draw together a list of the studies that lie behind the sub-regional strategies (and any work on the Rest of County areas). The Panel would then identify which material looked relevant to the questions on the draft List and request copies for the library. The Panel would like to ask for the cooperation of the relevant contacts in the principal authorities in facilitating this exercise as speedily as possible. The Panel's target would be for the principal authorities to provide a note of the sub-regional evidence base for which they were responsible to SEERA by 18 September. This should contain weblinks where possible. The Panel would then hope that any documentation not available electronically could be assembled by end of September.

11.3 It was also be open to any other party to recommend additional documents for the library. However, it should be noted that the List was already over 40 pages, so additions needed to focus on the really important material.

11.4 **Briefing Papers:** There might be issues on which the Panel felt that it would be helpful for SEERA to provide the Panel and participants with an additional explanation of some of the background to the draft RSS (in addition to the role of data meetings). The Panel had suggested that these became a numbered series, and they would appear on the EiP web site.

11.5 The Panel had already asked for one such paper on the structure of the Experian model, as they had found difficulty in understanding the way in which the demographic/supply-side data was used to constrain jobs/output forecasts. The Panel would also be making a second request for SEERA to indicate the actions that have been taken in response to the good practice guide on Employment Land Reviews produced by ERM for ODPM in December 2004. And a third request so that everyone was using the same figure work in Matter 9, was for a table of housing provision levels required in each district within each Rest of County area to meet Policy H1 i.e. 5 separate tables. This could be worked out mathematically from the Plan but it was better for SEERA to supply it for everyone.

11.6 **Forthcoming studies:** The Panel was more than conscious that there were several more documents due to appear before the start of the EIP (and no doubt during it). Some of the most pertinent appeared to be:

National level

- DCLG's notification of short term funding for potential Growth Points, expected in October (as confirmed by GOSE)
- final PPS3 guidance and associated documents (GOSE confirmed due autumn)

- consultation draft new PPS on climate change (GOSE confirmed due autumn)

South East region

- the Appropriate Assessment of the draft RSS and Implementation Plan (SEERA confirmed that the AA for the whole Plan would be complete by the end of September and be taken to the Regional Planning Committee in November but with something in the public arena before then. The AA of the Implementation Plan would not be ready until at the earliest the end of October. It was for discussion whether this would be debated at the regional sessions at the start of the EiP or could be left to the Implementation sessions at the end)
- An audit by SEERA of crosscutting policies and their integration into the rest of the draft Plan (SEERA confirmed end of October for completion)
- SEERA's updated Implementation Plan (due end September)
- research by South East County Leaders on jobs-housing alignment, (confirmed by South East County Leaders as being available by the end of September) and housing affordability (confirmed by South East County Leaders as being available within the next 2 weeks)
- Further work on Defence Estates land .SEERA said that this was Defence Estates work and it was not clear whether it would be publicly available. The representative from GVA Grimley working for Defence Estates and SEERA said that the studies were drafted and should be available before the start of the EiP, probably by early October. (SEERA reiterated post meeting that the defence work may not be planned for public dissemination).
- Further work by the Environment Agency on :
 - (i) water quality and sewerage capacity - the Environment Agency noted that the report about this was on SEERA's website and the Agency was currently working to see if there were engineering solutions to some of the constraints identified in the report. The work should be completed by the commencement of the EiP.
 - (ii) costs of environmental infrastructure - the Environment Agency said the first part of the study which related to the costings for water supply, water quality, waste, flood risk and biodiversity infrastructure should be complete by the end of September. The second part would look at the different funding sources for that infrastructure and whether the sums required could be delivered, and if not the sort of things that had to change. That phase of the work should be completed by the end of December.

Sub-regional level

- Interim DCLG delivery plan for Thames Gateway (GOSE would let the Panel know as soon as possible about its progress)
- results of the consultation on the longer term growth strategy for Milton Keynes by Milton Keynes Council and Bucks CC;
- flood risk assessment at Didcot by the relevant local authorities to assist in the division of housing figures between Vale of White Horse &

South Oxfordshire District Councils (Ian Walker for Oxfordshire County Council said that the work would not be completed until the end of November. They had just completed some work on employment land which he would forward to the Panel).

- 11.7 Val Mason of the River Thames Society noted that PPS 25 had not been mentioned as one of the documents that were awaited. She understood that the new version would redefine the flood zones taking account of climate change which would clearly affect the sequential testing that housing authorities had to go through. Corinne Swain said that because the Panel would not be looking at site specific issues they had not mentioned PPS 25 in their brief summary. Ms Mason explained that in her view it had potentially huge implications because if the flood zones changed markedly the housing numbers and distribution would be significantly affected.
- 11.8 Mark Sullivan, Folkington Estate, said that in looking at the Plan it appeared to some people that SEERA were trying to reintroduce transport schemes that the Secretary of State had decided, following the partial review, should not be pursued. The investment framework listed a number of schemes which were noted as 'to be updated by SEERA'. It was not clear when this would appear and how it would be done. Mr Sullivan was concerned that the list of schemes would appear without proper consultation and he wanted the decision-making process to be made public. This could be done by holding a transport technical meeting before the EiP. Mr Shaw replied that the Panel did not see the need for a data meeting on transport, bearing in mind that the purpose of such meetings was to look at data and information rather than to debate policy. However the mechanisms and processes of the transport planning work would be the subject of scrutiny during the EiP transport and implementation debates. Catriona Riddell for SEERA explained that both the regional and sub-regional investment framework would be part of the Implementation Plan that was going to the Regional Planning Committee on 27 September, so the work would be in the public arena from the end of the following week. The work of the Regional Transport Board and other bodies underpinning that were transparent and minutes of the Regional Transport Board were available on the SEERA website. Mr Sullivan noted that when the Secretary of State had announced in July the priorities for transport investment in the South East, this had only gone as far as 2011 and the second stage was to be dealt with afterwards. It was not clear how long this would take; the current Plan was running in parallel and although the Secretary of State took the final decision the Plan was putting forward priorities.

12 DATA MEETINGS

- 12.1 In order to make the most of valuable discussion time at the EiP itself, Corinne Swain explained, the Panel had been considering which topics would merit prior consideration in a data meeting. Such sessions would primarily focus on background data sources and measurement/modelling

techniques, in order to identify where there was agreement or disagreement between participants.

12.2 The Panel currently saw the need for such meetings on demographic forecasts, economic forecasts, jobs-housing alignment, and housing capacity studies. Additionally, the Panel considered that such meetings might have benefit for participants to help them understand the results of new work since the submission of the draft Plan. The Panel had identified the current and recent work on water supply and sewerage treatment capacity as one such topic. A draft note setting out the proposed scope for the data meetings had been made available to those attending the meeting.

12.3 In terms of timing, the Panel had reserved the day immediately before and the day after the Second Preliminary meeting, together with the afternoon following that meeting for those initial data meetings. The current suggestion on timing was:

Demographic Forecasts (as background to the housing levels debate)	Mon 16 Oct AM
Economic Forecasts (as background to debates on the economy and employment land)	Mon 16 Oct AM/PM
Jobs-Housing Alignment	Mon 16 Oct PM
Urban Potential and Land Supply (as background to the spatial strategy debate)	Tues 17 Oct PM (post meeting changed to Wed 18 Oct)
Water	Wed 18 Oct AM (post meeting changed to Tues 17 Oct PM)

12.4 The Panel envisaged that each session would be attended by participants for the relevant sub-matter. It would be open to any other participant and the public, subject to space availability. But full meeting notes would be available on the EiP web site.

12.5 The format envisaged was largely a question and answer session, providing the opportunity for Panel members and other participants to question SEERA, and where appropriate their consultants, on the background work that underlay the draft Plan.

12.6 Prior to each session, the Panel envisaged that SEERA might circulate a briefing note identifying the most relevant reference material used by the Assembly on that topic. Where alternative evidence was put forward by other participants, they would be asked to do likewise. In respect of demographic evidence, most developers and their agents appeared to use the Government's 2003-based household projections as their starting point, or refer to earlier stages of SEERA's own analysis.

- 12.7 In respect of economic forecasts, the other parties that would be requested to provide additional reference material would include:
- Barton Willmore for the South East Consortium and others who say that they commissioned the Institute of Employment Research at University of Warwick in March 2005 to produce alternative economic forecasts (the Barton Willmore representative confirmed that details could be provided), and
 - Development Land and Planning for Strategic Land Planning Trust and others who had assembled information from the Temprow forecasts (the Development Land and Planning representative confirmed that details could be provided).
- 12.8 Where studies were ongoing or particularly complicated, a brief opening presentation could precede the question and answer session. This could be useful e.g. in relation to
- work by Cambridge Econometrics for the South East County Leaders on jobs-housing alignment, and also Cambridge Econometrics' work on commuting patterns as that is particularly data intensive
 - the method and data used by Roger Tym and Partners to identify those parts of the region which they considered might have greater capacity to accommodate additional housing (not the output), and
 - ongoing work by the Environment Agency on water issues.
- 12.9 If anyone had any views on the proposed scope of the data meetings they were invited to write to the Secretariat by the early part of the following week. The Panel would then prepare a revised paper and send out invite letters to those participants invited to the most relevant sessions, and also put the same information on the EiP website so that parties could register their interest in coming along to the session.
- 12.10 In addition, there might be other areas not yet identified that would benefit from data meetings. If so these would be slotted in late October. If anyone had suggestions they should let the Secretariat know.

13 QUESTIONS

- 13(i) Martin Simmons, Association of London Government and the South London Partnership
He had an interest in the economic forecasting session which spilled over into the jobs/housing alignment meeting. Another great difference between forecasting methodology was between forecasts that had been prepared by GLA Economics for London and those by Experian for the South East region. This had led to a very wide disparity in employment forecasts for outer London and for those areas adjoining London. Professor Ian Gordon of the London School of Economics had been commissioned to look at the issue. He had produced a preliminary report and Mr Simmons would see if this could be made available to the Panel before the data meeting on the subject on 16 October.

Corinne Swain said that this would be very useful and ascertained that Mr Simmons would be at the relevant data meeting and able to talk to the paper.

14 PANEL TOURS

- 14.1 Corinne Swain commented that the Panel had a reasonable working knowledge of the region from their previous work. However the Panel had supplemented this with
- a tour of Kent Thames Gateway and East Kent and Ashford in early May,
 - a visit to Central Oxfordshire yesterday.
- 14.2 The Panel would be touring parts of Western Corridor Blackwater Valley and the western part of London Fringe, including a Thames Basin Heath SPA, that afternoon and the next day.
- 14.3 The Panel were aiming for a general familiarity with the settlement structure and environmental characteristics of the region - focusing on towns or locations mentioned in the draft Plan. In a few instances, the Panel might get a feel for the areas where an alternative/additional broad location for strategic scale development had merited some local authority consideration, e.g. MOD land at Whitehill Bordon, and the south side of Oxford. But the Panel was not conducting site visits in the way that an LDF Inspector might. And they did not consider that it would assist their understanding of strategic issues to visit the vast number of individual sites mentioned in developer representations, for the reasons that had already been given in response to the question from CPRE.
- 14.4 The Panel would continue their visits to other parts of the region during the autumn before the EiP, and may undertake further visits during or after the EiP.

15 PREPARATION BY PARTICIPANTS

- 15.1 The Panel had already asked for forewarning of any significant work being undertaken by any party that would be relevant to the debates.
- 15.2 Apart from the data meetings relevant to certain sub-matters, the Panel requested that participants put their energies into preparing their written statements, which should be addressed to the questions in the Final List.
- 15.3 The general guidance on written statements was set out in the Notes for Participants, and the Panel would provide more guidance at the Second Preliminary meeting. The deadlines for statements were on p5 of the Notes for Participants and there was a rolling programme of dates to make it fair on participants.

15.4 Non-participants were also able to submit written statements. The Panel asked that if sharers hot-seating were used to working together and had broadly similar views, could there be an attempt to produce one statement with an appendix for differences. However, the Panel recognised that some hot-seats were to be shared by groups not used to working together and in these cases the Panel would allow more than one statement.

16 THE EXAMINATION ITSELF

16.1 As most of those attending knew, the EiP would be run as a series of debates. The Panel's style would be probing. The Panel would discourage the reading of prepared statements. The Panel was anxious that the debates should be as spontaneous and interactive as possible. Further guidance would be given at the Second Preliminary meeting.

16.2 All sessions would be recorded.

17 CONCLUDING REMARKS

17.1 Corinne Swain thanked those attending for their patience in listening to what had been a long meeting due the amount that had to be covered.

17.2 Everyone should keep an eye on the EiP web site – it would be used to alert those interested about forthcoming meetings and for posting meeting notes and so on. Those who did not have internet access should contact the Secretariat who would be pleased to help.

17.3 The meeting closed with Corinne Swain giving a reminder on deadlines:

- for the consultation response on the Preliminary List of Matters and Participants – Thursday 28 September,
- for comments on the questions for Peter Burley's technical meetings - Friday 29 September; and
- the date of the Second Preliminary Meeting – Tuesday 17 October.

APPENDIX 1

LIST OF THOSE WHO ATTENDED THE FIRST PRELIMINARY MEETING 7 SEPTEMBER 2006

Peter	Wilson	Adams Hendry
Anne	Dugdale	Adams Hendry
Andy	Blaxland	Adams Hendry
Martin	Hendry	Adams Hendry
Colette	Blackett	Adur District Council
Mick	Galey	Anglian Water
Howard	Cheadle	Arun District Council
		Association of London Governments & South London
Martin	Simmons	Partnership
Neville	Surtees	Barton Willmore
Max	Baker	Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Stuart	Hylton	Berkshire Authorities Joint Strategic Planning Unit
James	Matcham	Boyer Planning Limited
Bev	Hindle	Bracknell Forest Borough Council
John	Shephard	Bretherens Gospel Trust
John	Devine	Bretherens Gospel Trust
Philip	Pocock	Bretherens Gospel Trust
Roger	Tustain	Broadway Malyan
Chris	Kenneford	Buckinghamshire CC
	Hallam	Carter Jonas
William	Charles	Charles Planning Assoc Limited
Alistair	Watson	CMS Cameron McKenna LLP
Alan	Read	Country Watch
Don	Bulcock	CPRE
Elizabeth	Rix	CPRE Kent
Christine	Drury	CPRE SE
Edward	Dawson	CPRE South East
Timothy	Harrold	CPRE Surrey
Peter	England	CTC
Paul	Buckley	Dartford Borough Council
Owen	Pike	David Lock Associates
Michael	McKenna	David Tucker Associates
Winne	Kuta-Dankwa	DCLG
Margaret	Davies	Didcot Town Council
Paul	Geehan	District Councils in the South East
Mary	Hyde	DLP Consultants
Jim	Bailey	DLP Consultants
Richard	Christian	Dover Harbour Board
Mike	Langthorne	East Sussex County Council
Steve	Williams	English Heritage
David	Howarth	Environment Agency
Stephen	Walker	Environment Agency
Ben	King	Environment Agency
Fiona	Harrison	Environment Agency
		Federation of Sussex Amenity Societies & Civic Trust South
Brian	Horsley	East
Adam	Noble	FLP
Mark	Sullivan	Folkington Estate
Richard	Lemon	GOSE
Lesley	Creedon	GOSE

Sunethra	Mendis	GOSE
Richard	Lee	GOSE
Caroline	Wood	GOSE
Elizabeth	Mitchell	Guildford Borough Council
Claire	Beaumont	Guildford Borough Council
Gary	Stephens	GVA Grimley
Nicola	Parker	Hallam Land Management
Peter	Glazebrook	Hallam Land Management
Clive	Chatters	Hampshire & IOW Wildlife Trust
Claire	Burnett	Hampshire Constabulary
Stuart	Roberts	Hampshire County Council
Karen	Everett	Hampshire Police Authority
Christopher	Woodman	High Wycombe Society
Judith	Ashton	Judith Ashton Associates
Tim	Martin	Kent County Council
John	Richards	Knight Frank LLP
Michael	Thornton	Maidstone Borough Council
Richard	Linton	Mayor of London/GLA
Diane	Webber	Milton Keynes Council
Katherine	O'Leary	Mole Valley District Council
Chris	Price	Network Rail
Graham	Ashworth	New Forest District Council
Tony	Spence	New Forest National Park Authority
Sarah	Applegate	New Forest National Park Authority
Ian	Walker	Oxfordshire County Council
Mark	Fox	Pegasus Planning Group
Mike	Allgrove	Portsmouth City Council
David	Rumens	REASON
Val	Mason	River Thames Society
Lillian	Harrison	Robert Brett & Sons
Michelle	Kirby	Roger Pym and Partners
Peter	Hitchen	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
James	Dawkins	RSPB
Philip	Brown	Savills
William	Naylor	Scott Brownrigg
Laura	Garrod	SE Protected Landscapes
Jane	Griffin	SEEDA
Nick	Wolfenden	SEERA
Catriona	Riddell	SEERA
Nikki	Nicholson	SEERA
Robert	Sellwood	Sellwood Planning
Karen	Stalbow	Shelter
Gerry	Wylde	Slough Borough Council
Paul	Newbold	Smart Futures
Laura	Tilston	Smith Stuart Reynolds
Lewis	Thomas	Smith Stuart Reynolds
Peter	Beckford	South Bucks County Council
Chris	Todd	South Downs Campaign
Becky	Whale	South East Counties
Huw	Williams	South East Protected landscapes
Graham	Cooke	Southampton City Council
Alisdair	Jones	Stoneleigh Planning
Peter	Shadbolt	Surrey County Council
Jenny	Rickard	Surrey Heath Borough Council

Timothy	Greenwood	Terence O'Rourke
Jason	Stratton	Thames Water Utilities
Phil	Jameson	Thames Water Utilities
Peter	Hartley	Waverley Borough Council
Jeremy	Gardiner	White Young Green
Jim	Dunning	Wokingham District Council
Steven	Brown	Wolf Bond Planning

APPENDIX 2

POST MEETING UPDATES FROM THE SOUTH EAST OF ENGLAND REGIONAL ASSEMBLY

1. The Appropriate Assessment of the Plan will now be considered at the Regional Planning Committee on 20 November, not 29 November as originally planned. It will be available in the public arena around the 10 November.
2. The Regional Planning Committee will consider papers related to the EiP on September 27th. See item 5.6,7 at <http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/meetings/planning/2006.html>)
3. Forthcoming reports (ref para 11.6, sub-regional level) – the Interim Thames Gateway Strategic Framework is due to be published on 20th November.