

*DRAFT SOUTH EAST PLAN*

# **EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC**

## **Note of the Second Preliminary Meeting**

---

**Held on**

**Tuesday 17 October 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](mailto:panel@eipsoutheast.co.uk)

EiP website: [www.eipsoutheast.co.uk](http://www.eipsoutheast.co.uk)

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

**NOTE OF THE SECOND PRELIMINARY MEETING HELD AT 10.00 am ON  
TUESDAY 17 OCTOBER 2006 AT READING TOWN HALL**

**PRESENT:**

**EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC PANEL MEMBERS**

Corinne Swain, Chair

Martin Shaw, Inspector

Mary Travers, Inspector

**EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC SECRETARIAT**

Sue Morgan, Panel Secretary

Sarah May, Panel Assistant

Angela Crease, Panel Support Officer

**PLANNING OFFICER SUPPORTING PANEL**

Elaine Quinn

**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), and the Secretariat (Sue Morgan Panel Secretary, Sarah May Panel Assistant and Angela Crease Panel Support Officer). She explained that the Panel also worked with Peter Burley, the Biodiversity Assessor who had been at the last meeting, plus Planning Officers from the Planning Inspectorate who were providing technical support.
- 1.2 SEERA and GOSE were both represented by their relevant teams.

## **2. PURPOSE OF MEETING**

- 2.1 Corinne Swain explained the purpose of the meeting as being
- To introduce the Final List of Matters and Participants, and minor amendments to the timetable
  - To provide more focussed guidance on issues the Panel is interested in exploring in the debates
  - To provide feedback on the data meetings held so far
  - To ensure everyone was aware of studies recently published & exchange information on those likely to be published before or during the EIP
  - To provide guidance on preparation of statements and the conduct of debates to reinforce that in 'Notes for Participants'.

Attendees were reminded that the meeting was not the place to start discussing the technical merits of any parties' case.

## **3. FINAL LIST OF MATTERS AND PARTICIPANTS**

- 3.1 The Chair reported that over 150 responses to the Preliminary List of Matters and Participants had been received containing nearly 700 individual comments. After consultation with SEERA and GOSE the Final List of Matters and Participants had been published last Thursday (12 October).

### CLARIFICATION OF MATTERS

- 3.2 Corinne Swain explained that some amendments had been made to avoid duplication between sessions, some for clarification, and some to improve consistency between sub-regional sessions particularly on infrastructure and implementation.
- 3.3 In general the Panel see the early regional sessions as broad scoping exercises. There would then be an increasing level of detail as the debates looked at key topics and descended down the spatial scale.

### 3.4 The Chair noted three general points:

- i. The Panel understood that the Appropriate Assessment was well on its way to completion, see para 9.5. Because of its fundamental importance, the Panel had added more specific references to it at
  - 1A.4-- an opportunity to discuss process issues
  - 6A.1, as originally drafted, to discuss the implications on the Natura 2000 sites themselves (biodiversity session)
  - 8Hiv/8Jiv, Combined TBH session -- to discuss the implications of the proposed housing provision in Western Corridor Blackwater Valley (WCBV) and London Fringe
  - Implications on any other policy topics will naturally arise in the relevant session.
- ii Growth points, which feature within the spatial strategy debate at question 2A.3. The Panel had not specifically included them in their questions for debates below regional level because everyone was awaiting the Department's announcement about which bids had been successful for short term funding. However, for those areas that were successful there would be an opportunity to discuss the implications in the appropriate sub-regional or Rest of County session.
- iii Re the Rest of County areas (Matter 9), the Panel's philosophy was that any discussion of the capacity of these areas should take place within the context of the proposed policies for the adjoining sub-regions. The Panel had done their best to relate areas to the appropriate sub-region or sub-regions. This was difficult for the Central Hants, southern Surrey, and northern West and East Sussex areas, and the Panel had been asked to reconsider this. As a result, the only restructuring that had been done was in relation to the Rest of Hants (9A & 9E). This followed the points made by the Hants County Council representative at the 1<sup>st</sup> Preliminary Meeting. The Panel's agreement to treat all parts of Central Hants together did not relate to the administrative convenience of how the background work was done, but more because the Panel could understand that the southern rural parts of Basingstoke and Deane & Hart Districts are functionally related just as much to South Hants as they are to the WCBV and London Fringe sub-regions.

### 3.5 Corinne Swain made some points of clarification going through the final list:

- the Panel had been asked about where any discussion on national and inter-regional transport proposals that cut across sub-regions would occur. The answer was in 1B. It should also be noted that whether the plan is adequately future proofed had been deleted from 1B.1 in

recognition of the fact that this issue needed to be considered throughout the whole EiP

- amendments had been made to question 1D.1 to avoid overlap with the water session 1E immediately following. The detailed discussion on demand management and new infrastructure should be reserved for the water debate that will immediately follow it.
- issues on the adequacy of the policy framework to promote investment in water infrastructure would come up under 1E.4
- 2A.5/6 – it had been suggested that the Panel should define one or more higher housing levels on which parties could base their comments to give some structure to the exercise. The Panel had concluded that this would not be appropriate. The difficulty with that was that if the Panel suggested levels, it could look like they were prejudging the issue. Plus, has some topics, it may be possible to identify threshold levels beyond which certain implications would kick in and particular issues would arise. However, the Panel did not want to straightjacket the debate. They wanted participants to comment on the work done for GOSE by Roger Tym and Partners, 'Augmenting the Evidence Base', and also on the work undertaken by Principal Authorities at sub-regional level where they had looked at the implications of higher housing levels on the sub-regions as an earlier part of the Plan process. The issue of overall regional housing levels would be revisited after the sub-regional sessions.
- the Panel had dropped the question in Matter 3 on car parking standards as Policy T7 had not given rise to much comment in the responses and in addition had been examined at the previous Regional Transport Strategy examination.
- the Panel had amended 6B.4 to specifically include "provision of green space". That was the place for those participants wanting to argue for a dedicated policy. But green infrastructure might also come up as a component of the general discussion on balance between better use of existing infrastructure versus new infrastructure in 1D.1, and in each of the sub-regional implementation debates
- the importance of flood risk had been made more explicit in the relevant sub-regional questions
- Sussex Coast, S Hants & C Oxon strategy questions had been sharpened
- The WCBV economy questions had not been supplemented, but the Panel took it as implicit that Heathrow airport as an economic driver and the implications for this sub-region would be covered.
- The questions in Matter 10, the final implementation and monitoring sessions had been sharpened.

### ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS

- 3.6 Corinne Swain explained that the Panel had received far more requests for participation than they could accommodate and apologised to those who had been disappointed. The requests had been of 2 main sorts:

- some had felt they, or another group they were recommending, had particular knowledge to bring to that session;
  - some had felt that the balance of viewpoints within a particular session could be improved.
- 3.7 On the knowledge criterion, the Panel had been most persuaded where the respondent provided details of background research that they could share, or details of practical involvement in the subject area. The Panel had been less persuaded by the extent of a developer's landholding in a particular area, or by details of an individual scheme, particularly if that scheme was already going through the planning system. On the balance criterion, the Panel had weighted additional invites in favour of local interest groups, particularly for the sub-regional debates, and of environmental groups and individuals for the regional debates.
- 3.8 The Panel had already invited over 300 participants to the EiP on the preliminary draft list. Anyone who had been on the Preliminary List remained there unless they had declined the seat, although some had been asked to share their seat. Some 35 extra parties had now been added to the final list, mainly covering local interest and environmental groups, cultural, community safety and marine interests. In addition the Panel had invited a further 5 or so individual experts or organisations with particular technical expertise to provide an independent input.
- 3.9 Over 70 previous invitees have been given additional slots. These were spread across a wide range of interests throughout the examination. They also allowed consistent representation from the Highways Authority, Network Rail, the Environment Agency and the relevant water company at all sub-regional implementation sessions.
- 3.10 The Chair made a specific point in relation to the East Kent and Ashford economy (8Di). The Panel had received several requests to increase representation of local interests about Wye College, and this had been accommodated. The Panel had noted the fact that Imperial College had declined their seat, and according to SEERA, had withdrawn their proposal for their research campus. The Panel therefore asked participants to take account of the current position in producing their statements.
- 3.11 The session that had received the single largest set of requests for additional participation was Spatial Distribution (2A). The Panel appreciated that this session was considered crucial to developer interests. The Panel had already included a sample of agents who were representing clients throughout the region who it was felt could give an analytical view of the merits of different spatial patterns, and this developer representation had not been increased. However it was possible that in the "revisiting" session (2A.5/6) on the penultimate day of the examination the Panel might be able to accommodate a small number of additional participants and may ask some of the existing participants to hot-seat. If the Panel chose to do that it would be made

known before Christmas, based on the particular aspects of the housing level issue that needed to be revisited and on how useful previous inputs to the regional sessions had been

- 3.12 There were 2 options available to those who had not been selected for a particular session:
- to submit a further statement addressing the relevant questions on the final list
  - to liaise with parties who were on the list and who shared similar views, to see if they could assist in putting a non-participant's views across.
- The representations database had been put on the EiP website towards the end of September and had an easy search facility to aid identification of those with similar views. Some had already commented to the Secretariat about individual entries, and those were being dealt with.
- 3.13 The Chair noted that it was also possible for anyone to observe the debates – there would be public seating. The Panel had tried extremely hard to include as many parties as possible within the examination process. That had meant increasing the number of hot-seats and the logistics of this would be covered later in the meeting

#### **4. EiP TIMETABLE**

- 4.1 The Chair noted that the Panel had received requests for more local venues, particularly for the Rest of County sessions and apologised that it had not been possible to accommodate that. The timing and location of the Rest of sessions was dictated by the desire to have covered the relevant sub-regional debates before testing the areas adjoining them, so that the interrelationships could be taken into account.
- 4.2 The Panel had also received several requests to provide longer for particular topics. As a result there was now provision for the Rest of Hants/Isle of Wight session to be up to one day, given the disparate nature of the area covered. There was also a rebalance of the time in Matter 8B between the South Hants economy and housing/countryside sessions.
- 4.3 The Panel had not been able, or felt it appropriate, to extend beyond one day the discussion on Milton Keynes city. They appreciated that the publication of the draft Strategy for Growth to 2031 by the Milton Keynes Partnership has caused some concerns within the local area. However, the Chair explained that their role was to test the evidence base for the roll forward of RSS housing provision figures 2021-26, and if possible to define more clearly a district housing apportionment 2016-26. Information in the Growth Strategy to 2031 was part of that evidence base, but the Panel could not examine process issues and the detailed masterplanning content of that document per se.
- 4.4 Continuing, the Chair noted that it had not been possible to accommodate a separate session on implementation and infrastructure

for Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale. The Panel was content that these issues had been examined relatively recently in the MKSM sub-regional examination.

- 4.5 The Panel would be prepared to sit a bit later than the normal times if the subject merited it. However there was now relatively little flexibility within the timetable for any reserve sessions. This contrasted with the format of the East of England EiP which had greater flexibility but fewer changes of participants in the sub-regional debates.

## **5 QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

- 5(i) Nigel Bell, Countrywatch  
Where in the EiP would the subject of the southern boundary of WCBV be considered? While it was understood that the EiP considered only strategic issues, this was strategic.

Martin Shaw replied saying that there was a question in the WCBV session about the role and rationale of the sub-region. However, the Panel was concerned with the strategy and not with close detail such as the drawing of a particular boundary. Corinne Swain added that if it were the case that on one side of a boundary there was the guarantee of development and on the other side that there would not be, and if there was no local planning system to deal with subsequent site proposals, it would be a different matter but that was not the case and was not what sub-regions are about. Mr Bell should put his points of view in his written statements and the Panel could give an opportunity for the issue to be aired in the session to which Countrywatch were invited.

- 5(ii) Andrew Sangster, Association of North Thames Amenity Societies

Martin Shaw had talked at the previous meeting about the 'Rest of county' areas and was reported in paragraph 6.14 of the Minutes as talking about the effect that the 'Rest Ofs' had on the integrity of the Plan. Did he have anything particular in mind?

Martin Shaw explained that it was a question of considering the relationship between the 'Rest Ofs' and the sub-regions. The sub-regions were at the heart of the RSS spatial strategy and therefore anything that was relevant to that relationship was part of the integrity of the Plan. Corinne Swain suggested an example: in considering the possibility of additional housing capacity at some distance from any of the sub-regions, the Panel would want to look at the inter-relationships of homes and workplaces and the transport implications arising from that together with the environmental impact.

- 5(iii) Stuart Roberts, Hampshire County Council

The Panel had mentioned that under 2A.5 they wanted to explore the question of higher house building levels and in particular the Roger Tym

work. Would it not also crop up in the 1H debate and if so what was the boundary between the debates?

Corinne Swain replied saying that the Matter 1 issues were a broad scoping exercise and 1H would be largely pitched at the regional level but without dipping down to consider the distributional impact on Policy H1. 2A would go down the spatial scale and consider the Plan's treatment of broad locations, east v west, sub-region v sub-region and also the evidence from the Roger Tym report. The evidence from previous work carried out for the sub-regional strategy preparation would also be discussed.

5(iv) Mark Fox, Pegasus Planning

In relation to the 2A continuation session scheduled for the end of the EiP and the fact that there might be extra participants, could the time allocated to that session be kept under review?

Corinne Swain responded by noting that the last 4 weeks in Reading were the most congested in the timetable and the only way to create more time would be to extend the end date of the EiP which they were loath to do. However, it would be kept under review.

5(v) Mark Sullivan, Folkington Estate

The sub-regional debates were split into separate sessions. If a participant was in only one of those sessions, would they be able to make remarks that were about the questions in the other session in recognition of the fact that they were not present at the other debate.

Corinne Swain replied that within reason, that would be acceptable. The discussion on strategy and role of the sub-region which opened the sub-regional debates would include elements other than the economy which was the focus of the rest of the initial debate. The Panel would be sympathetic if a participant raised other related issues if they were not attending the later debate(s) which for example covered housing.

5(vi) Southampton and Fareham Chamber of Commerce

Was it correct that there would not be any further assessment of the Implementation Plan?

Corinne Swain replied that the Panel would be examining the revised Implementation Plan (see also Appendix 2 and para 12vii).

## **6 SEERA POLICY POSITION**

- 6.1 The Chair explained that the following section of the meeting was designed to bring everyone up-to-date with issues and studies that may

influence the content of written statements. There was otherwise a danger that the statements might fail to reflect the most recent material.

- 6.2 Martin Shaw thanked SEERA for making available as soon as possible the updated Implementation Plan plus its Sustainability Appraisal which had gone on to the SEERA website on October 13<sup>th</sup>. He noted that there was no formal provision for SEERA to submit pre-examination changes, but the Panel understood that 3 things would be promoted in the SEERA statements: the updated Implementation Plan and its Sustainability Appraisal; an altered freight policy including the deletion of policy T13 about inter-modal facilities; and an agreement to promote a revised town centre policy for South Hampshire as drafted by PUSH, see para 9.2. The Panel had also noted from the Regional Planning Committee Minutes that SERTAB had revisited the apportionment of London Waste and that a brief technical paper setting out some alternative options to Policy W3 would be available in time for the EiP, see para 9.4.

## **7. ONGOING WORK**

### **Documents List**

- 7.1 Martin Shaw reported that the documents list had been updated on the website. The main additions related to fleshing out the sub-regional evidence base, and he thanked SEERA and the principal authorities for bringing the list together. Those schedules had been kept together rather than split them by topic so that it should be easier to assimilate background for each sub-regional session. Where a document already appeared on the first draft list, this entry had been retained and the previous numbering system used as a cross-reference.
- 7.2 Martin Shaw asked the principal authorities to double check their lists, particularly in respect of the sub-regional sustainability appraisal work which seemed to be listed for some and not others. A few more electronic links would also be helpful, particularly for WCBV.
- 7.3 Martin Shaw thanked other parties who had suggested extra documents and/or submitted extra material with responses to the draft list of Matters & Participants. The Panel had made a judgement on whether these should be core documents or participant documents. Everyone was asked to check that their material was included and to liaise with the Secretariat as to best method of providing copies, unless there was a web link shown.

### **Additional Briefing Papers**

- 7.4 The Panel had asked SEERA to provide papers on several topics at last meeting. Two of these have been completed (structure of the Experian model, and actions taken by SEERA in relation to the ODPM guide on Employment Land Reviews). These formed part of the background to the Economy date meeting held yesterday.

- 7.5 The third request was for separate housing provision tables for the Matter 9 sessions. The Panel had been provided with a single table with all the component parts of the Policy H1 figures, including the Rest of district figures and this was very useful. SEERA had promised to revise this to produce smaller separate tables for each of the Matter 9 areas which would be put this on the web site when received.
- 7.6 SEERA had also produced several additional briefing papers as background to the data meetings including updating their demography Technical Paper, and providing an annex to their economic and labour demand forecasting Technical Paper. Post meeting note -- Spatial Options Technical Paper also updated.

### **Forthcoming studies**

- 7.8 At the last meeting, the Panel identified a series of topics where reports were expected soon. It was useful to revisit this list to update everyone:

#### National

Growth points, PPS3, draft PPS on climate change, and PPS25 were still to emerge.

#### South East

- Implementation Plan was now published on SEERA's web site.
- South East Counties Leaders -- both reports were now available. The Jobs-Housing alignment report was on the EiP website under the data meetings folder, and the Intermediate Housing report was on the Documents List. Electronic copies had been sent to the Secretariat and were on the document list.
- Appropriate Assessment and the Appropriate Assessment of the Implementation Plan, see para 9.5. The Panel could now confirm that they would take comments on the Appropriate Assessment of the Implementation Plan during the relevant sub-regional sessions and in Matter 10A after Christmas.
- Audit of crosscutting policies, see para 9.3
- Defence Estates land - there would be a brief presentation on the issue at the following day's data meeting on urban potential.
- Environment Agency studies. The costings study was anticipated previously to be available by the end of September and the engineering solutions study was also underway. The Panel was assuming that the Environment Agency would introduce its findings into the Matter 10A discussion as general infrastructure and water discussions will have taken place at end November.

The Panel also understood from SEERA that a report by Segal Quince Wicksteed on Infrastructure requirements for the South East was due that week, see para 9.4.

#### Sub-regional

Thames Gateway Interim DCLG delivery plan.

Consultation on Milton Keynes long-term growth strategy; Martin Shaw suggested that it might be that the findings would be reflected in Milton Keynes Council and Buckinghamshire County Council's statements. The Panel noted that a review of the Milton Keynes Partnership document by Buchanans for Buckinghamshire County Council and Aylesbury Vale District Council was expected in November, see para 11.1. Further work on Didcot was expected in January. Oxfordshire County Council's work on employment land had been offered at the last meeting.

#### Other reports not previously mentioned

Natural England – a new regional environmental sustainability study had mentioned in the SEERA Regional Planning Committee papers. Kent County Council transport study of Thameside, mentioned in the sub-regional evidence base.

Martin Shaw drew attention to the fact that the Panel would have a huge amount of information to absorb in the coming weeks and could only cope with so much, particularly once the written statements arrived at the end of the month.

#### **Panel Tour Update**

- 7.9 Martin Shaw reported that the Panel had familiarised themselves with WCBV, the western part of London Fringe and adjoining areas immediately after the 1<sup>st</sup> Preliminary Meeting. More recently they had visited western part of Sussex Coast, South Hants and adjoining areas. They were scheduled to see the Gatwick and eastern part of the London Fringe sub-regions, plus the eastern part of the Sussex Coast in late October, and Milton Keynes a little later.

#### **8. DATA MEETINGS**

- 8.1 Martin Shaw thanked those who had submitted briefing notes in advance for each of the data meetings. These had been on the EiP website for the last week or so.
- 8.2 In relation to the Demography data meeting, Martin Shaw commented that it had been a very constructive meeting. It had considered the difference between the forecast used by SEERA and the official national projections. The Panel had also been keen to identify what the inputs were to the various different models, in particular SEERA's Chelmer model, and to see what was a result of the variation in inputs and what was a result of the structure of the model itself. There had been useful contributions from Barton Willmore and from the Greater London Assembly. The meeting had confirmed that there were no very great differences in the methodology used by the various types of forecasts and that the key variant was the assumptions made on migration. The presentation given by Professor King for GOSE would be placed on the EiP website, and a note had been promised from SEERA that would

clarify the relationship between households and dwellings in their work. The Panel were concerned to understand the demographic background to the Plan's average housing figure of 28 900 dwellings pa, and additionally wanted to understand the relationship between the 28 900 figure and backlog.

- 8.3 Martin Shaw reported that the Economic Forecasts and Jobs-Housing Alignment data meeting had also been very useful. The Panel had heard about the different models used by Experian, by Cambridge Econometrics, by Warwick University. The Panel were particularly grateful to Hampshire who had produced a flow diagram that was clear and easy to understand of how they had used economic forecasts, and the Panel would be grateful for similar diagrams to illustrate the structure of the other models. A key finding was that there was a substantial convergence between the outputs of the various models in respect of demand forecasts. There had been other useful contributions on journey to work flows and on assumptions about activity rates and on employment land reviews.
- 8.4 Martin Shaw reminded the meeting that there were further data meetings on Water that afternoon, and Urban Potential the following day. He noted that the Panel had received an extra request from GAIN for a date meeting on waste growth rates and composition. The Panel did not think this was appropriate, as the general waste policies were not being re-examined given that these had only been adopted earlier this year.
- 8.5 Martin Shaw explained that Matter 7A focussed on two issues:
- i) the intra-regional apportionment of London waste. He noted that the East of England Regional Assembly sought to reopen the split of London waste between their region and the South East, whereas this Panel had declined to reopen that issue. The Panel's view was that the subdivision exercise could if necessary be expressed as proportions of whatever total for London waste Government chooses to include.
  - ii) hazardous waste provision.

## **9 UPDATE BY SEERA**

- 9.1 Catriona Riddell for SEERA suggested that it might be helpful to the Panel if they were to prepare a one page summary of how the Implementation Plan had been handled since the submission of the Plan last March. Corinne Swain thanked her; note attached as an appendix.
- 9.2 Catriona Ridell went on to explain that when SEERA submitted the Plan to Government in March they had flagged up that there were 3 areas where work was ongoing – on the Implementation Plan, on freight and on South Hampshire Town Centre policy. These issues had all been put to SEERA's Regional Planning Committee on 27 September and agreed and submitted to the Panel. Details were on SEERA's website.
- 9.3 The audit of the cross-cutting policies work was still underway and it was hoped to get it to the Panel within the next two weeks. The work had

been carried out as part of the Sustainability Appraisal and looked at how well the cross cutting policies were embedded in the rest of the Plan. There was a summary of that work included in the draft Implementation Plan at Annex 5.

- 9.4 The final report from Segal Quince Wicksteed was expected by the end of the month, and the Babbie work for SERTAB on the London waste apportionment should be submitted to the panel by the end of the month.
- 9.5 The Appropriate Assessment of the Implementation Plan was due to go to the Regional Planning Committee on 20 November along with the AA of the whole Plan. The papers going to the Committee should be publicly available on the SEERA website by 10 November.

## **10 UPDATE BY GOSE**

- 10.1 Richard Lemon for GOSE reported that the announcement on New Growth Points was expected very shortly (post meeting note: published 24 October). There was no firm date for the announcements on PPS3, 25 and on Climate Change but they were expected before the end of the year. The KTG framework had been rewritten in the last few weeks and would be made public before the start of the EiP. The Treasury's Cross Cutting Review of Infrastructure Related to Growth was due to be available by early December and he would do his best to supply the EiP with a pre-publication version if possible.

## **11 UPDATE BY BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

- 11.1 Chris Kenneford reported on the progress of documents related to the Milton Keynes Long Term Growth Strategy. The consultants report on the consultation process should be available by mid November. The review by Colin Buchanan and Partners jointly commissioned by Buckinghamshire County Council and Aylesbury Vale District Council, which was an in depth review of the strategy as submitted by the Partnership, should be available on the Bucks CC website by early December. Mr Kenneford noted that he felt that it was likely that those at the debates on Milton Keynes at the EiP would want to talk about the fundamental issues within the Strategy and not just at matters related to housing levels. Corinne Swain replied saying that she accepted that there would be participants with different strategic viewpoints, but she had been warning that the Panel would not be willing to look at the very detailed proposals within the MK Strategy.

## **12 QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

- 12(i) Mike McKenna, David Tucker Associates

In relation to Matter 3 and the change that SEERA were suggesting by deleting policy T13, could the Panel clarify the status of Plan and how could participants take account of that.

Corinne Swain noted that there is no formal arrangement for SEERA to put forward changes to the submitted Plan so, as far as the Panel were concerned, it was the submitted Plan that they would be examining. That

was not to say that SEERA could not promote changes to the Plan, but they would have no formal status and would be discussed alongside changes that anyone else was suggesting. Attention was being drawn to SEERA's proposed changes simply to inform everyone and to allow others to react to SEERA's proposals. Catriona Riddell noted that the changes had been approved by the Regional Planning Committee and were on the SEERA website, but they had no formal status.

12(ii) John Rhodes, RPS

Question 3.3 asked whether there should be greater locational specificity of proposed inter modal freight interchanges. He was concerned at the proposed deletion of policy T13 and suggested that the RSS should be aiming to move the issue forward. Could SEERA comment on the progress of the Regional Freight Strategy?

Catriona Riddell replied that she would send a note to the Secretariat for inclusion in the minutes; attached at Appendix 2.

12(iii) Stephen Walker, Environment Agency

Mr Walker reported that he understood that the Babbie work on environmental infrastructure would deliver in two phases. The first on cost profiles would deliver on 30 October and the second phase on funding streams, which included work on engineering solutions, at the end of November; both would be put on the Agency website. The Chair asked for web links to be provided to the Secretariat.

12(iv) Graham Warren

As time went by, a stream of documents was coming out. How were participants to address these without adding to the paper burden by putting in supplementary statements?

Corinne Swain replied that the Panel very much hoped that participants would keep a close watch and even if a document came out a short time before a debate be in a position to comment on it in debate. Some documents would not be ready in time for the appropriate debate, but the first EiP sessions were a broad scoping exercise and there was generally a slot later in the programme to look at those issues in more detail. That might involve putting in a non participant's statement if the person had not been invited to the later debate.

12(v) Ian Hepburn, South East Forum for Sustainability

Had a concern in that the SERTAB report was due to come out on the day that 7A would be discussed, and that other complex reports were also due shortly before or during the EiP. It was difficult for voluntary groups to take these on board and make comments in time. Also would like details of the report that had been mentioned from Natural England about the appraisal of Sustainable Development in the region.

Corinne Swain replied that there was no need to make the written statements very extensive – some bullet points of the key issues was all that was necessary and further points could be made in the debate. She

pointed out that it was very difficult for the Panel to take into account statements that arrived late because they worked through the Matters and it was difficult to re-focus on a Matter that had already been considered. The timing of the SERTAB report was difficult. Richard Lemon for GOSE said that the paper that went to the SERTAB working party that discussed the London waste apportionment was already publicly available (post meeting note: consultants' report now published).

12(vi) Mark Chessall, Natural England

The Environmental Sustainability study referred to would be ready by 30 October and posted on the Natural England website. The report was broad in scope and relevant to a wide range of Matters/sub-matters.

Corinne Swain noted that because the publication date was expected on the same day as the deadline for the Working Written Statements, those participants should comment on it at the debates rather than write about it, but for the later debates, comment could be included in the Written Statements.

12(vii) Richard Lemon, GOSE

Was it correct to say that the Panel would be examining the revised Implementation Plan, rather than the version submitted in March with the Draft Plan itself, even though the revision had not been the subject of consultation?

Martin Shaw responded that the Implementation Plan was submitted as an integral part of the Plan and the Panel would give weight to the revised version to the extent that it had been legitimised by prior consultation and discussion in the same way that the Panel would make a judgement about the weight to be given to any planning document. Catriona Riddell for SEERA confirmed that it was an integral part of the plan but drew attention to the issue of taking a legal view on whether it constituted a formal part of the Plan. Corinne Swain commented that the Panel would examine the revised plan and this was an exception to the generality that the Panel would be examining the Plan as submitted.

12(viii) Mark Sullivan

Assuming that the SE Plan was approved by the Secretary of State, what was the status of the Implementation Plan viz a viz a statutory development plan and what was the Panel's power in relation to it – could the Panel for example recommend changes to it.

Corinne Swain replied that as far as the Panel was concerned it was within their remit to comment on the Implementation Plan and would comment on anything that they felt would improve it. Mr Sullivan responded that if the Implementation Plan was part of the Plan, then the Panel would have to look at each of the schemes within it to take a view. The Chair replied that while the Panel could comment on the Plan, it was not the final part of the planning process; each of the schemes would still have to go through the normal local planning and consents process.

12(ix) Brenda Pollack, Friends of the Earth

Asked whether there could be any allowance to submit written statements later than the given deadline.

Corinne Swain replied that the deadlines could not be allowed to slip, but statements need only be very brief, perhaps just a series of bullet points or parties could rely on their original representations.

### **13 GUIDANCE ON PARTICIPANTS' STATEMENTS**

- 13.1 Mary Travers noted that written statements should be focused on the particular questions set out in the Final List of Matters and Participants and identify clearly any changes being sought to the RSS.
- 13.2 The preferred maximum length and other format issues were set out in the 'Notes for Participants' which was available on the EiP website. The limit of 2,000 words was per sub-matter, not per question, although if the writer was only interested in one of the questions then all the word allowance could be used to answer that one question. Statements needed to be clearly referenced with the correct Matter or sub-matter so as to avoid being lost in the system. Statements should not have any covers or bindings to make copying easier and ease of recycling.
- 13.3 Mary Travers explained that, as set out in 'Notes for Participants', the deadlines were phased:
- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| 30 October  | regional sessions, Woking                            |
| 4 December  | regional and sub-regional sessions, Chichester       |
| 18 December | regional and sub-regional sessions, Maidstone        |
| 22 January  | regional and sub-regional sessions, Reading          |
| 5 March     | joint TBH addendum comments on the Assessor's report |
- 13.4 There was also a new addition to the deadlines for statements to allow for addendum statements about the revisited sub-matter 2A session (to take place on 29 March). The deadline was 23 February. Mary Travers reiterated the importance of meeting the deadlines and explained the handling difficulties that late submissions would cause. There was a new dedicated e-mail address just for statements - [eipsoutheast@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:eipsoutheast@hotmail.co.uk), and it should be noted that this amended 'Notes for Participants', para 4.11 and Appendix A
- 13.5 Mary Travers asked that the statements were, wherever possible, sent electronically for uploading onto the EiP website as well as in hard copy. The Secretariat had reviewed the need for copies, and 10 copies would be sufficient if the statement was sent electronically (this was different from the figure of 15 published in 'Notes for Participants'). If not sent electronically, 30 copies would be needed.
- 13.6 Copies of the statements would be posted on the website, but this was only possible if they were received electronically. Where someone was relying on their original representation, this should be sent electronically to the Secretariat with a note of explanation, allowing it to be posted on the website.

## **14 NON-PARTICIPANTS' STATEMENTS**

14.1 Mary Travers explained that these should focus on specific questions and avoid repeating their original representation as the Panel had these already. The same deadlines applied as for Participants Statements. If a non-participant's statement made a point that was not covered in the statements of those attending the relevant sessions, the Panel might refer to it in opening the debate and/or follow up in discussion as necessary.

14.2 The Panel made a plea that all statements should be kept as succinct as possible as they would be dealing with large quantities of paper.

## **15 CONDUCT OF THE EiP**

15.1 Mary Travers reiterated that the conduct of the Examination would follow the procedural guidelines set out in PPS11, Annex C, and participants should refer to 'Notes for Participants'.

### **15.2 Purpose:**

- It would provide an informal opportunity for discussion and testing of selected policies and proposals.
- It was not about presenting evidence and undergoing cross-examination

### **15.3 Seating arrangements**

One seat would be provided for each participant with space behind for an adviser and the Secretariat would try to provide additional seating if more than two parties were asked to hot-seat together.

On hot-seating, Mary Travers suggested that to keep the whole process manageable participants were asked to use this facility responsibly. Where parties share common interests, they were asked to produce a single written statement, using appendices to identify any points of detail on which views may diverge. Only where parties who do not share common interests have been asked to hot-seat, did the Panel expect separate statements. The Panel also hoped that there would not be too much jumping up and down during the sessions themselves. It would be nice to think that in most cases parties could identify a lead speaker on each question and generally only swap seats between the questions. But the Panel realised that this would not always be possible. The Panel also recognised that there may also be some additional flexibility on the day, if any of the other named parties did not turn up. In that event where local interests both wish to speak on the same question, the Panel might be able to invite them both to the table for that question.

A seating plan would be produced for each session. SEERA alone would have 2 seats (and GOSE for some topics, e.g. where they would also be with a central Government representative).

#### 15.4 Recording

All sessions would be recorded.

#### 15.5 Format of debates:

- On the first day only there would be an opening presentation by SEERA
- There would be a Panel-led discussion of each sub-issue
- The Panel would open each discussion
- The first contribution would generally be from a participant with a contrary view to the draft Plan – they would be pre-warned just before or at beginning of session
- Thereafter upend nameplate would indicate a desire to join in debate
- SEERA would be given the final comment on each question or group of questions to respond to any unanswered questions and/or to give an overall reaction

#### 15.6 Style of debates:

- The Panel would expect statements to have been read in advance so there would be no need to repeat
- The debate should provide constructive assistance to the Panel
- Contributions should be succinct
- The Panel would expect 'professional' participants to give their own views/opinions unless otherwise indicated
- The questions were intended to guide the discussion and focus it; they were not intended as a straight jacket or to unduly inhibit participants from developing relevant arguments. There might be occasions where the Panel decided to group questions.
- The Panel were seeking a debate that should be as interactive and spontaneous as possible
- The debates were not the place to introduce completely new material. The Panel might refuse if it and it would prejudice the proceedings. Participants should let the Secretariat know if any new material was on the horizon.
- There might be times when the Panel asked an awkward question. This did not necessarily indicate their thinking, but was designed to provoke a reaction and to be testing.

#### 15.7 Links Between Sessions

Because not all participants would be at all sessions, it would be up to the Panel to provide continuity. There might inevitably be some carrying forward of issues between sessions, but the Panel would try to provide the links, so that people in the later sessions would know key aspects of what has already been discussed in earlier sessions touching on that issue.

### **16 QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

#### 16.1 Tim Stansfield, SEEDA

Could he clarify the 2000 word limit? Taking 1G as an example, was it 2000 for each of 1G.1, 1G.2 etc or was it for all four of the 1G questions?

Mary Travers replied that it was for all four questions.

#### 16.2 A question on the timing of the sessions

Sessions would begin at 10.00am, would aim to finish at 12.45, resume at 2.00pm and finish at 4.45pm. There would however need to be flexibility in the timing.

#### 16.3 Tony Hughes, Western Villages Alliance

How would the hot-seating work, given that he had been allocated a hot-seat with a group who had views in opposition to his own? Both of the groups would want to talk at the same moment in the debate.

Corinne Swain was sympathetic to this situation as it was a one of the few occasions where parties with opposing views had been "teamed" together. She would make sure that both would have a chance to speak at the appropriate part of the debate, and if one of the other participants failed to attend the debate, it should be possible for them each to have a full seat.

#### 16.4 Martin Harris, Horspath Parish Council

Mr Harris noted that in downloading information from the website, the coloured header had to be printed as well which was wasteful. Perhaps a text only version could be provided?

Post meeting note: a printer friendly version has been provided.

#### 16.4 Mark Fox, Pegasus Planning

Would the 23 February deadline statements also have a 2000 word limit? Would there be supplementary questions for the 2A "revisited" session? Corinne Swain replied that the same word limit would apply. In relation to supplementary questions, if the Panel felt it was helpful to set out new questions, they would do so before Christmas. The Chair also asked that if anyone wanted to suggest to the Panel different ways of looking at the spatial distribution, particularly in relation to table H1, they should make it very clear in what way they were suggesting changes rather than simply appending a reworked table. Were they for example suggesting the same distribution of a different total number, or were they suggesting greater concentration in certain areas?

### **17 REQUEST TO SEERA**

17.1 Corinne Swain asked SEERA to follow the practice that they had undertaken at previous EiPs and to keep a running list of any policy changes suggested by other parties that SEERA felt able to endorse. This would then be put into the library as a document at the end of the EiP.

## **18 THAMES BASIN HEATHS**

18.1 Corinne Swain explained that the Thames Basin Heaths issue was being handled as a separate, albeit interlinked, process. Peter Burley had set out clearly the parallel process for testing Natural England's draft Delivery Plan at the First Preliminary meeting. Peter Burley was not at the meeting, but it was hoped that the intended process was clear. There had been over 40 comments on Peter Burley's initial list of discussion topics and suggested invitees to the round table discussion, about 10 of which requested changes/additions to questions. His background paper had been published as promised on 6 October, taking account of these. Some 50 organisations or individuals had been invited to attend the open sessions on Day 1, 21 November. Those invited had been requested to notify the Secretariat by 16 October that they would attend. If they wanted to speak, they had also been asked to provide a brief statement. 35 organisations had been invited to attend the subsequent roundtable sessions. The list had been published as part of the background paper and was on the Panel website. Position papers needed to be submitted by 30 October. The final agenda would be published on 6 November, and would give details of how the first day would be handled, including presentations and which questions would be covered. The subsequent 2 days would try to cover all the questions in a greater level of technical detail.

18.2 There was then a second batch of meetings in December that would drill down on certain questions, exploring differences and identifying grounds for reaching agreement on as many points as possible. There would be a third meeting at the beginning of February to give an opportunity to discuss Natural England's Access management Study. The Panel had been told at the First Preliminary Meeting that the results of that study were expected on 19 January and had pressed to see if any of the findings could be released earlier. That was still the Panel request. There would be a new member of the Secretariat for the meetings – Barbara Bay who was located at the Planning Inspectorate in Bristol.

18.3 The Chair thanked attendees and looked forward to seeing them at the debates.



## APPENDIX 1

### LIST OF ATTENDEES

Miss	Anne	Dugdale	Adams Hendry Consulting Limited
Miss	Suzanne	Ellis	Adams Hendry Consulting Limited
Mr	Peter	Wilson	Adams Hendry for Bovis Homes
Ms	Angela	Bell	Adur District Council
Mr	George	Waring	Airtrack Railways Ltd
Mr	Mick	Galey	Anglian Water Services Limited
Mr	Andrew	Sangster	Association of North Thames Amenity Societies
Mr	Keith	Robinson	Aylesbury Society
Ms	Liz	Thomas	Aylesbury Vale Advantage
Ms	Tabitha	Stebbing	BAA
Miss	Olivia	Colett	Barton Willmore
Mr	Max	Baker	Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Mr	Jon	Lambert	Berkeley Strategic
Miss	Ellie	Seaborne	Berks Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust
Mr	Stuart	Hylton	Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit
Ms	Bev	Hindle	Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Mr	John	Devine	Brethrens Gospel Trust
Mr	Philip	Pocock	Brethrens Gospel Trust
Mr	Gavin	Ridewood	Brethrens Gospel Trust
Mr	John	Shepherd	Brethrens Gospel Trust
Miss	Helen	Gregory	Brighton & Hove City Council
Mr	David	Cooper	British Land plc
Mr	Roger	Tustain	Broadway Malayan
Mr	Chris	Kenneford	Bucks County Council
Mr	Ian	Gillespie	Carter Jonas
Miss	Claire	Blacker	CB Richard Ellis
Mr	David	Neame	Charles Planning Associates
Mr	M A	Sullivan	Cluttons for Folkington Estate
Mr	Alan	Read	Countywatch
Mr	Ed	Dawson	CPRE
Mr	Peter	Cleasby	CPRE Buckinghamshire
Mr	T J	Harrold	CPRE Surrey
Mr	P	England	CTC
Mr	Owen	Pike	David Lock Associates
Mr	Michael	McKenna	David Tucker Associates
Mr	Dominic	Stapleton	Didcot Town Council
Mr	Paul	Geehan	District Councils in the South East
Miss	Maxine	Bodell	Dorset County Council
Mr	Richard	Christian	Dover Harbour Board
Miss	Caroline	Tamlyn	DP9 on behalf of ARL
Mr	Paul	Treadgold	East Sussex County Council
Mr	Craig	Steenhoff	Eastbourne Borough Council
Ms	Linda	Rutter	EEF South
Miss	Alison	Booth	Elmbridge Borough Council
Mr	Nicky	Perrins	Elmbridge Borough Council
Mr	Steve	Williams	English Heritage
Miss	Fiona	Harrison	Environment Agency
Mr	Steve	Walker	Environment Agency
Mr	Shaun	Leavey	Farming & Rural Issues Group

Ms	Claire	Burnett	For Hampshire Constabulary
Ms	Brenda	Pollack	Friends of the Earth South East
Mrs	Ruth	Hopkins	Gleeson Land
Mr	Peter	Jaquest	GOSE
Mrs	Sunethra	Mendis	GOSE
Mr	Graham	Warren	Graham Warren Partnership
Ms	Tracey	Haskins	Guildford Borough Council
Mr	Gary	Stephens	GVA Grimley
Mr	Stuart	Roberts	Hampshire County Council
Mr	Ben	Gilpin	Henry Boot Limited
Mr	Martin	Harris	Horspath Parish Council
Miss	Nicky	Rogers	Isle of Wight AONB
Miss	Judith	Ashton	Judith Ashton Associates
Miss	Liz	Shier	Kent County Council
Mr	John	Richards	Knight Frank
Mrs	Marisa	Burnal	London Councils
Mr	Darren	Bridgett	Maidstone Borough Council
Mr		McCutcheon	Medway Council
Mr	David	Hackforth	Milton Keynes Council
Ms	Kathy	O'Leary	Mole Valley District Council
Dr	Rehan	ul-Haq	Monserat Properties Limited
Ms	Jane	Arnott	National Trust
Mr	Mark	Chessell	Natural England
Mr	Graham	Ashworth	New Forest District Council
Mr	David	Waller	Oxfordshire County Council
Miss	Katy	Hall	Parsons Brinokhoff on behalf of the Highways Agency
			Paul Sharpe Associates for Lasalle Investment Management
Mr	Paul	Sharpe	
Mr	Mark	Fox	Pegasus Planning Group
Mr	Mike	Allgrove	Portsmouth City Council
Mr	David	Rumens	REASON
Miss	Angela	Doone	Roger Miles Planning
Miss	Michelle	Kirby	Roger Tym & Partners
Mr	Tony	Clements	RPS
Mr	John	Rhodes	RPS
Mr	James	Dawkins	RSPB
Mr	Phil	Brown	Savills on behalf of Magdalen/Thames Water
Mr	Ian	Wheaton	Scott Brownrigg
Mr	Tim	Stansfield	SEEDA
Miss	Philippa	Hall	SEERA
Mrs	Nikki	Nicholson	SEERA
Mrs	Catriona	Riddell	SEERA
Mr	Nick	Woolfenden	SEERA
Miss	Karen	Stalbow	Shelter
Mr	Gerry	Wyld	Slough Borough Council
Mr	Paul	Newbold	Smart Futures
Mr	Ross	Blumire	Smith Stuart Reynolds
Ms	Becky	Whale	South East County Leaders
Mr	A W	Stevens	South East Districts
			South East Forum for Sustainability & Wildlife Trusts in the South East
Mr	Ian	Hepburn	
Mr	Huw	Williams	South East Protected Landscapes
Mrs	Gill	Oliver	South Oxfordshire District Council
Mrs	Kristine	Salomon-Olsen	Southampton & Fareham Chamber of Commerce
Mr	Graham	Cooke	Southampton City Council

Mr	Derek	Gardiner	Stop Dunsfold Park New Town
Mr	Tony	Gould	Surrey County Council
Mr	David	Edwards	Taylor Woodrow
Mr	Timothy	Greenwood	Terence O'Rourke
Mr	Phil	Jameson	Thames Water Utilities
Mr	Mike	Overall	The Chiltern Society
Mr	David	Steele	The Marlow Society
Mr	Takashi	Shimizutani	Tokyo Institute of Technology
Mr	Suginoto	Takaya	Tokyo Institute of Technology
Mr	Tom	Ashley	Turnberry Consulting
Mr	Peter	Hartley	Waverley Borough Council
Mr	Neil	Border	West Sussex County Council
Dr	Anthony	Hughes	Western Villages Alliance
Mr	John	Townsend	Western Villages Alliance
Mrs	Christine	Drury	Westwell Parish Council
Mr	Jeremy	Gardiner	White Young Green
Mr	Jim	Dunning	Wokingham District Council
Mr	Steven	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning
Mr	Nigel	Bell	
Mr	Leonard	Martin	

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **NOTES FROM SEERA**

#### **1. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

The draft Implementation Plan was submitted as an integral part of the draft South East Plan in March 2006. At that time the Assembly advised the Panel that further work was required and that a revised version would be submitted during the Autumn. The Revised Implementation Plan was sent to the Panel on Monday 9 October 2006.

Specific work streams undertaken since the submission of the draft Implementation Plan in March 2006 include:

- An independent audit of the sub-regional investment frameworks. This has resulted in the significant enhancement of the identification and classification of infrastructure requirements and the refinement of infrastructure cost estimates.
- A stakeholder workshop exploring the actions required to bring about the behavioural change required to mitigate the adverse impacts identified in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Policies (and the identification of specific action to promote behavioural change within the Policy Implementation Framework).
- An independent SA of the draft Implementation Plan.
- A review of infrastructure investment frameworks followed by a sub-regional stakeholder workshop to identify key implementation issues surrounding the delivery of major development sites in South Hampshire;
- The development of proposals for a Regional Infrastructure Fund, working with SEEDA and regional bodies in the South West of England.
- Working with the Environment Agency to cost environmental infrastructure needed to deliver the South East Plan.
- Commissioning an Appropriate Assessment of the South East Plan, including the Implementation Plan
- Review of Access Management on Thames Basin Heaths to evaluate robustness of existing measures for delivering English Nature's Delivery Plan for the SPA.

The Revised IP was endorsed (with minor amendments) by the Assembly's Regional Planning Committee on 27 September as forming the basis of the Assembly's evidence to the Panel in relation to implementation and infrastructure delivery matters. The IP was publicly launched on 29 September at an Infrastructure Summit in Reading to an audience of 150 regional stakeholders, comprising local authorities, delivery agencies and utility companies.

The IP was also subsequently endorsed by the Assembly's Executive Committee on 20 October. The Panel has been informed of the small number of further amendments arising from this meeting.

The Revised Implementation Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal of the Revised Implementation Plan are both available on the Assembly's South East Plan website

## **2. FREIGHT**

### **Regional Assembly proposed changes to freight related policies - October 2006**

In preparing the transport policies set out in the Draft South East Plan there was a recognition that the freight policies would need to be the subject of further consideration (Section D4 para 1.33). The review suggests that they are largely fit for purpose in terms of defining the spatial planning context for freight in the region. This is not surprising given that the policies are themselves an evolution of the policies developed through the partial review of the present Regional Transport Strategy.

However, several changes and updates to existing policies are proposed in order to ensure that freight, logistics and distribution issues are properly addressed. In summary these are:

- i) Extension of Policy T7 (Parking) to refer to secure parking and stopover facilities for commercial vehicles on the strategic road network;
- ii) A redefinition of regional ports within Policy T10 (Ports and Short Sea Shipping) as "Gateway Ports" or "Regionally Significant Ports", and reference to the need for Gateway Ports to prepare Masterplans;
- iii) The deletion of existing Policy T13 (Intermodal Terminals) and retitling of existing Policy T11 (Freight and Site Safeguarding) to refer to "Freight Intermodal Gateways and Site Safeguarding";
- iv) Issues of locational specificity for intermodal terminals (now entitled "Freight Intermodal Gateways") being addressed within the South East Plan's Implementation Plan in conjunction with overall guidance for LDDs being given in Policy T11 as indicated in iii) above;
- v) Extension of existing Policy TC1 (Development of Town Centres) to provide a framework for LDDs and LTPs to consider freight access to Town Centres.

These changes to freight policies were agreed by the Assembly's Regional Planning Committee on 27 September 2006 and updates the Draft South East Plan March 2006 Transport Policies T8, T10, T11, T12 and T13, plus Town Centres Policies TC1. They reflect the Assembly's preferred policies following the Freight Policy Review, although the amended policies have no formal status at this stage.

A fuller justification will be provided as part of the Assembly's submission on Matter 3.3.

Consideration of Wider Freight Issues

The review of freight policies, undertaken with support from the Freight Transport Association, has also given consideration to broader (non-spatial) issues associated with freight and the logistics industry. These issues will be developed further as part of the ongoing work to prepare a Regional Freight Strategy, expected to be finalised during 2007 following consultation.