



Meeting Notes and Actions Lotmead

Issued: 25/08/23 Revision: Draft

Meeting	S73 Meeting	Time and Date	09:30 23/08/23
Location	Teams		
Present			
Tracy Harvey (TH)	SBC	Chris Caine (CC)	Countryside
Ronald Moss (RM)	SBC	Mark Sommerville (MS)	Savills
Emma Geater (EGe)	Countryside	Emily Porter (EP)	Savills
Emma Gillespie (EGi)	Countryside	-	-

Ref.	Item	Actions
1.	<p>Overview of Updated Proposals</p> <p>MS outlined the scope of the work that has been undertaken since we met on site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> CSS and the project team have undertaken a comprehensive review of everything submitted to date to ensure that all relevant matters have been fully reconsidered. This has included Counsel review to provide comfort to SBC and CSS that the evidence and justification is robust. It was essential that CSS had sight of the LLFA comments prior to responding, which were received on the 27th July 2023 (11 weeks after validation). <p>MS explained that the updated cover letter sets out a comprehensive explanation of the updated pack. The following has been enclosed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The benefits of the proposals.</i> These were set out previously, but these are expanded in Section D of the updated cover letter. <i>Evidence to demonstrate that all options have been exhausted to increase unit numbers (via variations in mix, apartments, housetypes etc.).</i> Instead of approaching it based on a proving layout, the team have used the developable areas as defined on the approved parameter plans minus land required for drainage, and the maximum densities allowed by the approved parameter plans, to show the maximum number of homes that could be delivered. This negates any debate around specific layout, developer housetypes, mix etc. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the original FRA addendum, this shows a maximum residential capacity of 1,898. In the revised FRA addendum, this shows a maximum residential capacity of 2,109 – an increase of 211. <i>Evidence to show where existing SuDS features are to be utilised and the different outfall points across the site alongside any opportunities to incorporate more SuDS features.</i> This is marked up on plan ref. 2220, which shows that a wide variety of existing features and outfalls are proposed to be utilised. The application commits CSS to continue to explore all opportunities to increase the number of SuDS features at detailed design, subject to this not compromising residential capacity. TH queried how is this intended to be secured through the consent? MS outlined this could be secured through the criteria within the Revised FRA Addendum, which is itself secured by condition. The updated pack includes proposed amended wording which CSS/Savills are happy to discuss further with SBC. <i>Commentary on the issue of precedent.</i> Commentary, endorsed by Charles Banner KC, is provided at Section E of the cover letter. We trust that this gives comfort that supporting the proposals within the Revised FRA Addendum would not set a precedent for other sites across the NEV, given the site specific justification. 	

	<p>On the basis of the commentary provided, CSS and Savills feel that all previous requests from RM for further information have been positively responded to.</p> <p>RM queried the viability position, noting that the original outline had been based on 2,500 dwellings, and the maximum residential capacity now being suggested is close to 2,109, however, he added that the Council are obviously not keen to revisit viability again if at all possible. EGe confirmed that at 2,109, CSS as a business are comfortable that it can viably be delivered without revisiting the s106, however, if it goes below that then there would be a need to revisit. MS added that what we are stating in the cover letter is that the s73 proposals are viable. Therefore we do not consider that any formal viability testing is required, nor do we consider that the applicant needs to provide evidence as to what the “tipping point” of viability is (with regard to unit numbers). Common sense would indicate that the viability of any development would be very different if residential delivery was reduced by 600 units (ie the original 2,500 to circa 1,900), with all other things remaining equal, which is what the evidence here indicates if development is delivered pursuant to the Original FRA Addendum. The site was purchased based on the 2500 approved at outline, however Countryside and Sovereign have managed to make this work at circa 2109 and still allows all of the planning obligation requirements to continue to be delivered. MS to provide further commentary on this matter to the Council [Postnote: this is to be provided within the updated cover letter].</p> <p>MS explained that the other major addition to the cover letter is the planning justification, which is the written version of the verbal summary MS provided in the meeting of 22/06. This has been fully endorsed by Counsel, which CSS hope provides confidence that this has been thoroughly considered and reviewed.</p> <p>MS advised that there are some final figures that need to be provided regarding vehicle movements following additional testing of the cut and fill and these will be provided imminently. RM stated that the Council including the LLFA has not to date reviewed information relating to levels.</p>	MS
2.	<p>Feedback from Consultees</p>	
	<p>MS provided an overview of key consultee comments received and CSS’s response.</p> <p>CSS are pleased that the EA have no objection, which is the same position for most other consultees.</p> <p>With regard to the LLFA, MS confirmed that a paragraph by paragraph annotated response has been provided in the updated pack following receipt of the LLFA comments. However, CSS and project team do not feel that the content of this response raises any new issues. MS specifically noted that the LLFA comments did not challenge any of CSS’s evidence regarding the effect of drainage on site capacities or the need to raise levels pursuant to the Original FRA Addendum.</p> <p>RM stated that the EA and LLFA undertake different roles. The EA revert to the LLFA on matters of surface water drainage. RM noted that he did not believe the LLFA’s lack of comment on site capacity or levels should be taken as support, and that he will discuss the updated pack and CSS’s annotated response with the LLFA and provide thoughts thereafter. Further information may be required on levels as RM does not yet accept that the site needs to be raised as high as CSS suggest. MS outlined that CSS and project team have shared detailed information on the need for the levels raising with the LLFA and other officers at the Council over the last two years, including specifically a meeting with Richard Bennett (LLFA) and Janet Busby (Planning Officer) on 18/01/23. This information set out long sections showing drainage across the site showing why the proposed levels raising was an absolute minimum to accommodate the necessary drainage gradients. [Postnote: Meeting notes from 18/01/23 confirm that Richard Bennett agreed that CSS’s evidence with regard to levels raising in Phase 1 required to implement a drainage strategy pursuant to the Original FRA Addendum was correct]. MS confirmed that CSS and project team would be very happy to hold a workshop with the latest officers involved to present this information again, if this would be of help to the Council. EGe confirmed that CSS consider it essential that Council officers have reviewed this and understand the need for levels raising given how significant the difference is under the Original FRA Addendum and the Revised FRA Addendum. This goes to the heart of the S73 application.</p> <p>MS confirmed that a written response has been provided in response to the Canal Trust and Parish Council comments. Their comments appear to be a misunderstanding as to the scope of what is proposed. CSS trust that these comments have now been positively addressed. RM confirmed he is yet to specifically review the CSS response however, agrees that they didn’t look like anything particularly controversial. RM to review and provide written confirmation to CSS.</p>	<p>RM</p> <p>RM</p>
3.	<p>Initial Feedback from SGC</p>	
	<p>As RM requested at the last meeting, CSS has halted any progress on Phase 1 RM or other matters, however, CSS are now desperate to drive this forward to delivery and allow a site start given the time that has lapsed</p>	

	<p>since the site was first discussed with the Council in 2021. We are sure the Council are too given the significant contributions that the site makes to the Council's 5YHLS from 2024/2025 onwards. With this in mind, MS advised that it is essential for CSS to understand whether there is a route to the Council being able to support the S73 proposals at a local level.</p> <p>RM thanked Savills/CSS for the updated pack and confirmed that the Council will need to hold an internal meeting (with drainage officer, design officer, landscape officer) to discuss. RM would like to understand whether the situation is a matter of SuDS vs dwellings, or whether there is scope for further amendments to the outline consent.</p> <p>RM advised that he had hoped the proposals might include changes to move closer to the Original FRA Addendum. MS responded that all opportunities to do this have been investigated and that CSS make commitment to exploring further opportunities for the inclusion of SuDS at detailed design stage, subject to this not compromising residential capacity, however, the additional work done has not identified any additional opportunities at a strategic drainage design level.</p> <p>RM confirmed that due to officer leave, the Council's internal meeting will be in the first week of September. This will be a roundtable discussion to talk through the detail of updated pack and make sure all options have been considered, including amendment of parameters. If officers feel there is scope for further alteration, SBC will meet with CSS to discuss. EGe confirmed the internal SBC meeting is welcomed and it is something that was requested by CSS during the early pre app discussions. . CSS look forward to receiving feedback on the roundtable meeting at the earliest opportunity. MS outlined that amending the drainage strategy is a much quicker and more straightforward route to delivery on site, than looking to any formal amendment of parameter plans. Amending parameters would be a much more complicated process, and would likely require a much more complex review of the EIA Evidence. This would delay delivery of housing on site.</p> <p>MS queried whether SBC could commit to internal officer meeting in w/c 04/09, and a follow up meeting with CSS/Savills w/c 11/09. RM confirmed this would be arranged. RM to advise CSS/Savills once meeting is arranged and provide availability for follow up meeting during w/c 11/09.</p> <p>MS outlined the project team are happy to provide additional evidence or feed into workshops.</p>	RM
	<p>MS stated that the EIA Statement of Conformity has not been affected by the updated pack. MS requested SBC feedback on this document. RM stated that he hasn't really looked through it yet. His focus is on drainage. RM to provide feedback on the EIA Statement of Conformity.</p>	RM
	<p>RM confirmed reconsultation will be targeted to those consultees that remain interested and the Council will not be inviting responses from all parties previously consulted. RM to begin targeted three week reconsultation on 23/08.</p>	RM
5.	PPA	
	<p>MS confirmed Savills will issue a suggested updated PPA programme to SBC for their review. TH stated preference for the existing SBC templated to be adapted rather than a new document created. MS confirmed that Savills will amend the previous version.</p> <p>MS asked that SBC confirm the Council are able to write to CSS with invoices to allow payment to be raised. Who should CSS contact regarding this? RM confirmed that an invoice for a PPA payment on another project has recently been raised so this is something SBC can facilitate. RM to confirm the name and contact details of SBC staff member that CSS can contact to request invoice.</p>	EGe / EGi / MS / EP RM