



Meeting Notes and Actions Lotmead

Issued: 11/07/23 Revision: Final

Meeting	Officer Meeting	Time and Date	2:30pm 22/06/23
Location	Countryside Partnerships Office, Lotmead, Swindon		
Present			
Ron Moss	SBC	Andy Cull	Countryside Partnerships
Emma Geater	Countryside Partnerships	Mark Sommerville	Savills

Ref.	Item	Actions
1.	Introductions	
	<p>MS suggested meeting focussed around the structure of the key applications, deferring detailed discussion regarding conditions etc to future meetings / calls. All agreed.</p> <p>EG provided an introduction from Countryside, emphasising the flagship nature of the site for both Countryside and Sovereign. EG noted the priority of getting to a start on site as soon as possible.</p>	
2.	S.73	
	<p>MS provided an overview of the applicant's view on the need / rationale for the proposed variation, as set out in the cover letter, including the implications of the Approved FRA Addendum for net developable area, soil importation, placemaking and viability.</p> <p>MS confirmed that what the cover letter did not seek to do was to set out the case in terms of the development plan and other material considerations. MS confirmed that this will be provided in writing to SBC shortly, however, as means of overview, it is the applicant's position that the proposals fully accord with the adopted development plan and that diminished weight should be given to the NEV Drainage SPD.</p>	MS
	<p>In response, RM confirmed he has discussed the proposals with Richard Bennett (LLFA) who feels a lot of work was undertaken at outline stage to get to the position within the Approved FRA Addendum.</p> <p>RM acknowledged importance of having comprehensive drainage comments to being able to move the application forward and confirmed these should be available very shortly, however, from conversation with Richard, it is likely that the LLFA will raise objection. RM to follow up on comments.</p> <p>EG queried whether it might be possible to have a workshop with the LLFA. RM to consider.</p> <p>If this is the case, RM confirmed it is then for officers to reach a judgement based on the planning balance; a position which has been discussed with Tracy Harvey.</p> <p>To aid officers in the consideration of the positives of the scheme for the planning balance, and to evidence that all possible options have been investigated as part of any reporting to committee, RM requested further information relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The benefits of the proposals; • Evidence to demonstrate all options have been exhausted to increase numbers (via variations in mix or other opportunities) whilst delivering a drainage strategy pursuant to the Original FRA Addendum; • Any opportunities to incorporate more SuDS features within layout; • The applicant's thoughts on risk of precedent / why approving this s.73 would not set a precedent for other site's in the NEV; and • Commentary on viability may also be needed. <p>EG / AC / MS to consider and provide information ASAP.</p>	<p>RM</p> <p>RM</p> <p>EG/AC/MS</p>

	<p>With regard to other consultees, RM confirmed that the EA have been consulted but are yet to respond. RM confirmed he sees the LLFA as being the key consultee. MS confirmed that CSS have sought to expedite feedback from the EA via engaging in their paid discretionary advice service, however, CSS are yet to receive a response via this. MS to keep RM updated.</p> <p>On the Parish Council, MS explained that the Parish appear to have misunderstood the application and concluded that CSS are seeking to increase unit numbers beyond 2,500 which is not the case. MS to provide written response to Parish Council via RM.</p> <p>On the Canal Trust, MS explained that although a response had been received to this application, it appeared to relate more closely to separate discharge of conditions applications, rather than the content of this proposal, which does not affect the safeguarding of the canal route. MS to provide written response to Canal Trust via RM.</p> <p>MS confirmed that all other comments received raised no objection.</p>	<p>MS</p> <p>MS</p> <p>MS</p>
	<p>MS confirmed that CSS have engaged AECOM and Stantec (the authors of the Original FRA Addendum) to undertake independent reviews of the proposals and the Revised FRA Addendum. As an early conclusion, both are satisfied that the Revised FRA Addendum accords with the adopted development plan.</p> <p>EG confirmed that it is the intention of CSS to provide copies of this work to the Council.</p>	
3.	Phase 1 Reserved Matters	
	<p>MS queried whether RM would support the Phase 1 Reserved Matters application being determined pursuant to the existing consent, as a means of taking pressure of the s.73 and facilitating a start on site.</p> <p>RM noted that this would first require a drainage strategy to be submitted and approved showing a strategy that CSS are arguing against within the s.73. On this basis, RM thinks this would create confusion and conflict and therefore would prefer that the drainage strategy is resolved once and for all via the s.73 and that the whole site is delivered pursuant to that.</p> <p>EG / AC agreed.</p>	
	<p>MS noted the urban design comment responses issued recently, responding to the comments of Peter Garitsis. MS asked whether it would be possible for a call to be arranged between Focus and Peter, to work through any remaining issues.</p> <p>RM acknowledged CSS's keenness to progress the Phase 1 RM at the same time, however, requested that we collectively reach a position of agreement on the s.73 drainage strategy first. If there are any opportunities to increase the provision of SuDS or altern mix in Phase 1, resulting from the further work on the s.73 then this would need to be incorporated into the layout. Post meeting note: RM confirmed the suggestion is to pause work on the Phase 1 RM application until a position of agreement is reached on drainage matters, rather than until the S.73 is determined.</p>	
	<p>Notwithstanding the above, RM to discuss vehicle crossovers with Urban Design and Highways and provide feedback as this could influence what drainage features can be provided within Phase 1.</p>	RM
4.	Relationship of s.73 to other Applications	
	<p>MS provided RM with a latest copy of the conditions tracker, setting out how CSS would like live applications to be determined.</p>	
5.	Questions / Requests from SBC	
	<p>RM requested that any updated submissions of information are accompanied by commentary explaining what changes have been made and how this responds to feedback received. MS agreed.</p>	
	<p>RM also requested that all submissions are comprehensively checked for consistency across different plans prior to submission. MS agreed.</p>	
6.	Meetings	

	EG / MS confirmed that CSS are happy to make the project team available for any workshops that would aid officers in taking proposals forward. RM acknowledged.	
	RM agreed to reinstatement of fortnightly meetings. RM to suggest recurring time. RM confirmed he is based in Bristol. MS confirmed Savills would be happy to host if this were better than virtual meetings.	RM
	RM confirmed working for SBC 5 days a week, on Lotmead and two other sites, including Great Stall East.	