

## **ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL**

**THURSDAY 24 JUNE 2010 AT 10.00 AM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs Rutherford (Chair), Councillors Bainbridge, C Farmer, Harid (substitute for Councillor Hendry) and Mrs Vasey

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Bloxham – Local Environment Portfolio Holder  
Councillor Mrs Bowman – Economic Development Portfolio Holder  
Councillor G Ellis – Performance and Development Portfolio Holder

### **EEOSP.37/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Bowditch, Hendry, Mrs Robson and Watson

### **EEOSP.38/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest in respect of the business to be considered.

### **EEOSP.39/10 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED – That the Minutes of the meetings held on 8 April 2010 be noted.

### **EEOSP.40/10 CALL IN OF DECISIONS**

There were no matters that had been the subject of call in.

### **EEOSP.41/10 CHAIRMAN'S NOTE**

The Chair welcomed Councillor C Farmer as Vice Chairman and Councillor Bowditch to the Panel.

It was proposed and agreed that Item A.5 be taken before item A.4 to facilitate officer's time and the running of the Panel meeting. The Chair also advised that there would be a short workshop following the meeting regarding the Core Strategy (Item A.8)

The Acting Scrutiny Manager (Ms Edwards) submitted report OS.15/10 providing an overview of matters related to the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel's work. Details of the latest version of the work programme were also included.

Ms Edwards reported that:

- Development Sessions had been held during the previous year for the first time for the three O&S Panels. They were generally considered successful and it had been agreed that they should continue
- Members were asked to consider setting a date to hold a development session and to consider the planning process for the session. As the agenda for the meeting on 22 July 2010 had only a few items it was proposed and agreed that the development session should be held immediately following the Panel meeting. Suggestions for the development session included:

Joint work on maintained rights with the County Council regarding infrastructure on the streets

How area teams were working and how they would work in the new set-up following transformation

- The Forward Plan of the Executive covering the period 1 June 2010 to 30 September 2010 was published on 18 May 2010. The issues that fell within the remit of the Panel were:

KD.011/10 – Energy Efficiency Supplementary Planning Document

KD.012/10 – Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document

KD.013/10 – Garlands Hospital Supplementary Planning Document

KD.014/10 – Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

Full details of the items were included in report OS.06/10 considered by the Panel at its previous meeting on 25 February 2010.

There had been some progress on the Parking Task and Finish Group and Councillor Hendry would shortly be setting a date for the next meeting. There had been some movement with the Area Committee and there had also been some work done regarding on-street parking with the County Council that may be fed into the development session.

The Strategic Director (Mr Crossley) advised that the directorate were trying to set terms re the relationship with the County Council and others regarding off-street parking and those terms should be clear within the week.

There was some concern regarding the funding gap in relation to proposed work on the Town Hall.

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder (Councillor Mrs Bowman) advised that the bid had been submitted and a response was expected that week. Officers were looking at the funding and Councillor Mrs Bowman confirmed that she would report back to the Panel.

Mr Hardman advised that with regard to LAGBI the Council were not expecting a high sum and that he expected the sum to be cut. However, any cut would not affect the work programme for the current year but would affect work programmes next year if it was withdrawn from next year.

RESOLVED: 1.) That, subject to the issues raised above, the Overview Report incorporating the Work Programme and Forward Plan items relevant to this Panel be noted

2.) That a development session for all Panel Members, including substitutes, be held at the rise of the Panel meeting on 22 July 2010.

## **EEOSP.43/10      REFERENCES FROM THE EXECUTIVE & SCRUTINY**

### **(a) EX.060/10 – Corporate Plan and Key Performance Indicators**

Minute Excerpt EX.060/10 was submitted setting out the decision of the Executive on 12 April 2010.

The Executive had decided:

- “1. That the Executive had considered the information contained in Report PPP.16/10 with a view to approving the Key Performance Indicators for the new priorities
2. That the Executive thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Panels for their comments and approved the changes made to the Corporate Plan in response thereto
3. That any further changes to the Corporate Plan prior to adoption by Full Council be delegated to the Leader and Town Clerk and Chief Executive
4. That the Corporate Plan be recommended to the City Council for adoption.”

RESOLVED – That the decision of the Executive be noted.

### **(b) EX.067/10 – Reference from the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel – Rickergate**

Minute Excerpt EX.067/10 was submitted setting out the decision of the Executive on 12 April 2010.

The Executive had decided:

“1. That the observations submitted by the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel with regard to Rickergate be received.

2. That the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel be informed that the Executive was concerned to note that the Panel did not support the use of £20,000 from the allocation made by the Department of Communities and Local Government for events in the City Centre, and the negative impact of the recommendation in terms of attracting visitors to the area.

3. That the Executive looked forward to receiving an explanation of the position at a future meeting”

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder (Councillor Mrs Bowman) informed the Panel that she was concerned that comments had been made without full awareness of the situation. Councillor Mrs Bowman believed that the events in the City Centre had brought a boost to the economy. She stated that she was happy to meet with any Member to discuss any issue within her portfolio.

RESOLVED – That the decision of the Executive and further comments from the Economic Development Portfolio Holder be noted.

## **EEOSP.44/10            CORPORATE PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT FOR YEAR 2009-2010**

The Policy and Performance Manager (Mr O’Keeffe) submitted report PPP.25/10 that presented the performance of Carlisle City Council for 2009/2010, measured by national and local indicators.

Mr O’Keeffe explained that the focus of performance over 2009/10 had been around transformation. The changes were reflected in the personnel and value for money measures. The other significant change had seen the introduction of the new priorities Economy and Local Environment.

The transition to a complete Balanced Scorecard for the authority would continue within the coming year with the development of management information and appropriate local indicators.

Mr O’Keeffe stated that the focus for the Panel would be on aspects of environment and economy and that the report had indicated that the most common areas that required improvement were road and pavement repairs, and the level of traffic congestion.

Mr O’Keeffe added that the Place Survey would probably not be continued this year but that was under review and the Council would have to look at how satisfaction was measured in the year ahead.

Mr O'Keeffe stated that overall there had been good examples of good performance in the priority areas but there was some concern around unit lettings. Mr O'Keeffe proposed and Members agreed that it would be useful to hold a workshop for all Members of the City Council to develop their understanding on measuring Key Priorities.

The Performance and Development Portfolio Holder (Councillor Ellis) explained that a workshop for all Members of the City Council would be useful as the indicators depended on external influences as well as internal and it was up to Members to decide what to measure and how. Councillor Ellis believed that some indicators would be stopped but stated that all Members of the Council should be involved in what areas were measured.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

*There had not been a high response to the Govmetric system that the Council was using to provide measures of satisfaction.*

Mr O'Keeffe advised that the system provides real-time measures and allowed officers to gather information via e-mail/web/phone and eventually face to face. Mr O'Keeffe was conscious that some responses when broken down gave very small numbers, but using them as a pattern of satisfaction the figures may not as alarming as they would be when viewed over a two year period.

*The indicators show an increase in the number of voids in the Market Hall and the Enterprise Centre.*

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder (Councillor Mrs Bowman) stated that the policy of the Market Hall management was to allow only 2 stalls selling the same produce at any one time. While they could probably let the vacant stalls they were trying to limit the type of produce to 2 at any one time. That made it more difficult to let vacant stalls but the aim was to keep tenants that were already in there. The Business Development Manager had offered help in the form of a 'Shop Doctor' to give advice and possibly improve businesses in the Market Hall.

Councillor Mrs Bowman advised that the manager at the Enterprise Centre worked hard to encourage new businesses but as new businesses expanded they moved out.

*Profit margins must be narrow and that was not helped by shops in the High Street selling goods such as toiletries at low prices. Could the Council possibly reduce rents for those businesses?*

Councillor Mrs Bowman explained that the Market Hall stalls were leased and that the Market Hall manager dealt with all aspects of rents. In response to a Member's question Councillor Mrs Bowman confirmed that leases could be short term with a view to a longer term as the business progressed.

Mr O'Keeffe stated that he could look at the figures in the management information and possibly break it down to identify voids.

*It was suggested that the Panel consider this issue at its development session with a view to undertaking further scrutiny.*

*Does the business rate system have any impact on stalls in the Market Hall and the Enterprise Centre? What were the possible effects on the Enterprise Centre?*

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) (Mr Hardman) advised that officers were looking at rents in the private sector and how they tied in with rents in the Market hall and the Enterprise Centre. Vacancies were expected in the Enterprise Centre as businesses moved out once established and there was the mechanism in the Enterprise Centre to support that. Mr Hardman believed it was difficult to compete with the private sector but that the voids were generally short term and there was a high turnover in the Market Hall.

Councillor Mrs Bowman agreed to ask the manager of the Enterprise Centre for more in depth information and that would be presented as part of her report to Council.

Mr O'Keeffe confirmed that the issue could be looked at in a performance perspective and a short questionnaire could be produced to determine why stallholders were moving on.

The Strategic Director (Mr Crossley) suggested that the Enterprise Centre could be discussed at the development session.

Councillor Mrs Bowman advised that the market Management Group met twice per year and was comprised of the management of the Market hall, the management agents and the lease holder. Minutes of the meeting are submitted to Council.

*Could the Local Environment Portfolio Holder (Councillor Bloxham) explain how the target for abandoned vehicles had been missed?*

Councillor Bloxham advised that there had been an incident where the police had put a notice on the abandoned vehicle that it was part of a crime scene and was not to be moved. When highlighted that the report indicated '12 out of 44 missed' Councillor Bloxham explained that he believed that to be hours rather than vehicles but confirmed that he would check and provide Panel Members with further information in writing.

*If householders lose green bags for recycling or their green boxes are broken they would put the refuse into the bins. Would that affect the tonnage?*

Councillor Bloxham explained that if the refuse operatives notice that there are no bags or that the box is broken they do report it and replacements are sent out. The householder can also contact the Customer Contact Centre and request replacements.

Councillor Bloxham advised that recycling figures are static at the moment and that the Council needed to find an additional 10% from people who are still putting refuse into the waste bins. He believed that situation would be remedied in part when Shanks went on stream at Hespian Wood as the refuse would be sorted at source. There needed to be continued education and he believed that this may be the time to do it. Councillor Bloxham stated that residents in some areas did not have green bags and boxes and were taking their recyclable refuse to supermarkets but there was a temptation to put items into the normal waste bins.

*A Member stated that he had waited 8-10 weeks to have a green box replaced.*

Councillor Bloxham advised that that should not be the case and he would seek advice.

The Assistant Director (Local Environment) stated that a new waste services contract had started in April and that had raised the profile of recycling. There had been an increase in requests for equipment via the Customer Contact Centre. There had been an improvement in the last 12 -18 months re service delivery. Tonnage could have been low last year as people were buying less but the percentage of recycled waste was higher.

*Members queried the performance figures regarding affordable housing.*

It was agreed that there was little control over affordable housing but Councillor Luckley's portfolio covers housing and planning. Mr Hardman advised that the number of new housing dipped last year but due to the release of new sites the figures were expected to rise this year. He was unsure whether the Sustainable Communities Act grant would be available in the future. Although the figures were not as high as Mr Hardman would like, he assured Members that officers were targeting all sectors.

Councillor Bloxham informed Members that the Council had released land for private associations.

*Who decides whether houses are affordable?*

Mr Hardman explained that there was a standard definition that was used by the Council that was based on how much people earn to work out their rent. Officers were guided by how much developers would take off but as part of the affordable housing scheme rents would be re-evaluated. Mr Hardman stated that officers were working with colleagues within housing.

Mr O'Keeffe added that the figures were an annual measurement and some larger scale developments took several years to reach fruition so the figures were really a snapshot of the situation at the time.

*Have the pilot schemes in Harraby and Longtown affected the satisfaction rates?*

Mr O'Keeffe advised that officers would have been able to measure satisfaction through the Place Survey as they had got a reasonable sample back but as the place

Survey was not now taking place some other way of measuring satisfaction was needed. However from the figures available performance as a district was one of the best in the country. Mr O'Keeffe stated that he would be looking again at the figures and looking at them with the County Council and local communities.

RESOLVED: 1.) That further clarity is provided to Panel Members on the figures regarding abandoned vehicles

2.) Mr O'Keeffe to arrange a workshop for all Members to develop Members' understanding of measuring Key Priorities.

3.) That further information regarding vacancies within the Market Hall and the Enterprise Centre is provided to Panel Members at their Development Session on 22 July 2010 so that Members can decide whether they wish to undertake further scrutiny in this area.

**EEOSP.45/10      TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME: PROPOSALS FOR THE  
NEW ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORATE, AND  
INCLUDING CARLISLE RENAISSANCE**

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) (Mr Hardman) submitted report ED.11/10 which set out proposals for the transformation of the new Economic Development Directorate and included a new staffing structure within which the work of Carlisle Renaissance would be subsumed.

Mr Hardman explained that Executive had considered the report CE.15/10 that outlined a new structure for the Economic Development Directorate at the meeting on 4 June and accepted the principle of the proposal but recognised that additional work needed to be undertaken. The additional work would involve staff in both Economic Development and Carlisle Renaissance who were currently delivering a number of projects and work programmes as well as work on the arrangements for the future of the Carlisle Renaissance Board. It was clear there would be links and overlap with other directorates but it was essential that the new structure was established and that the right people were working on the areas and concepts concerned. Executive had recommended that consultation was undertaken with Members of the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Mr Hardman suggested that it may be helpful to the Panel to hold a workshop to discuss further work required. He believed that staff and the board of Carlisle Renaissance had been delivering some good work and that would be ongoing.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

*A meeting with the board of Carlisle Renaissance was scheduled for the day following this meeting. What are the arrangements for taking staff back onto the City Council payroll?*



Mr Hardman advised that of the 10 staff working with Carlisle Renaissance 2 were seconded from the City Council, 2 were seconded from the NWDA and the remainder were on fixed term contracts. All posts were under review and staff would be involved in issues around workloads and priorities.

With regard to the board itself, Mr Hardman explained that it was set up 3 years ago, but was due to be reviewed. A number of board members were from the private sector and Mr Hardman believed that it was important to maintain the links with the private sector as well as other public organisations such as the County Council and the NWDA.

*Funding is a major concern and there may be difficulties with the potential disbanding of the NWDA.*

Mr Hardman explained that there were possible links with the proposed new Local Enterprise Partnerships. With regard to the economic growth within the country in general Mr Hardman expected the Government to produce a White Paper later in the year. Recent announcements from the Government had made special mention of help being given to the North West of the country by the current NWDA. Mr Hardman believed that Carlisle Renaissance had benefitted the city in terms of work and investment brought in and that the City Council would not want to lose that.

*With the changes being proposed would the Panel have access to the new Action Plan? And what were the proposed timescales involved?*

Mr Hardman confirmed that the Action Plan would be part of the City Council and its work. With regard to timescales Mr Hardman believed that the work was ongoing but that he would brief the Panel on what was happening between meetings when necessary. The Economic Development Portfolio Holder (Councillor Mrs Bowman) believed it was important that the Action Plan was fit for purpose and that the Council could deliver it. Mr Hardman explained that the Executive had approved the transformation proposals in principle but accepted that there was still a lot of work to be done.

*One of the concerns with Carlisle Renaissance in the past was that it was difficult for Members to get involved in what they were doing and that it became too big to scrutinise. How could Members get involved in setting priorities?*

Councillor Mrs Bowman advised that members would be included at all levels and Mr Hardman confirmed that he would be reporting the new priorities and Action Plan to the Panel and that they would be able to monitor any activity. He was not able to give timescales but assured Members that he would when there was some indication of the workloads involved.

*The report refers to £8m of new regional and national public sector investment over the last 5 years. How the money been spent?*

Mr Hardman stated that although he did not have the detailed information to hand all the money had been accounted for.

*The report also referred to investment being brought into the City. Which properties had benefitted from that investment?*

Mr Hardman explained that the money had been used for a variety of properties including some in Rickergate and Durranshill, but added that the future of the project was ongoing.

*There was no mention in the report of the Botchergate proposal.*

Mr Hardman explained that the work would be included in the Action Plan and brought to the Panel at a later date via the work of the Local Development Framework. Discussions and negotiations were also taking place around work within the public realm.

*There was some concern that Carlisle Renaissance was taking the credit for events organised by the Carlisle Tourism Partnership.*

Mr Hardman explained that Carlisle Renaissance had contributed financially to the events mentioned within the appendix to the Report.

RESOLVED –1) That the Panel agreed the proposals contained within the report in principle

2.) That it was acknowledged that further work was required and that the Panel would wish to be involved where required

3.) The subsequent Action Plans produced would be subject to scrutiny by this Panel

## **EEOSP.46/10      ENERGY EFFICIENCY – DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) (Mr Hardman) submitted report ED.07/10 that set out a draft Energy Efficiency Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The draft document was being considered for consultation.

Mr Hardman explained that the Executive had considered report DS.10/10 that set out a draft of a new Supplementary Planning document that related to energy efficiency in new development. The appendix to the Executive's report had been amended to take account of the comments made and to make the document easier to understand by including information on biomass options and diagrams such as the heating and electricity decision trees. Comments made by the Panel would be reported to the Executive who would then give further consideration prior to referring the report to Council for approval to consult.

One thing missing from the report was the sustainability check list. That was based on the North West appraisal toolkit and would develop a score that planning applications could be marked against. It was intended that the sustainability check would be incorporated into the document at some point.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

*Council were starting to get applications regarding anaerobic digestion. These should become a 'hard sell'.*

Mr Hardman believed there was and would be a lot of controversy around such issues but that the Council would look at, and include, those issues as they became more viable.

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder (Councillor Bloxham) advised that at a recent meeting with Government Office North West the Government were looking toward using anaerobic digestors with regard to farm and food waste. There was one in Silloth and a couple of others have recently started and he believed that the Council should be looking at encouraging farmers/hotels/caterers to use them as an alternative way to get rid of food waste. If it was possible to include anaerobic digestors in the planning document it would be helpful.

*The document referred to the causes of climate change being influenced by human influences.*

Mr Hardman believed that there were different opinions about the matter.

*What was the source of the information with regard to wooden window frames being more environmentally friendly than plastic?*

Mr Hardman advised that he was not sure of the source but would find out. He confirmed that the information was stating that wooden window frames were more sustainable and at the end of their 'life' they would rot down while plastic would not.

*The document was very interesting and readable. Who will it be going to? Will developers have access to it?*

Mr Hardman advised that ultimately it would be available to developers and the general public and that requests are made for the document when projects are under way.

With regard to climate change Mr Hardman advised that there was an Action Plan for the county and that the report would form part of that.

*Is there anything the City Council can use with regard to existing buildings?*

Mr Hardman explained that officers were doing a great job and looking at existing buildings to improve energy and repairs. They also give advice to village halls, etc. Councillor Mrs Bowman advised that a village hall survey was carried out every 5 years and that it was a useful document that covered so many areas.

*Would the document be going to estate agents?*

Councillor Bloxham believed that the document was a good document and that it should be available to all development services and Members for comment and all Portfolio Holders.

*How much of the document was enforceable? Housing Associations had to comply with level 4 on new builds.*

Mr Hardman advised that from 2016 level 4 would be across the board and that the Government was looking at bringing it in sooner. Restrictions can be enforced as part of the planning process. There was discussion about including the document within building regulations as it was believed that was the best way to get it in place. Although development costs would increase used in conjunction with the sustainability check list it could be incorporated into the system.

*Was there anything that could bring kudos to developers for using the documents? An award of some kind?*

Mr Hardman stated that the City Council did not have an award but they would be happy to publicise a developer who had used the scheme. There was a national programme and planning awards that officers could promote.

Councillor Bloxham stated that the development at the racecourse would achieve level 4 and that it should have been publicised. He believed that if housing associations had to achieve level 4 then private developers should too.

In response to a question regarding the estimated cost of achieving level 4 as opposed to level 3 Councillor Bloxham advised that the cost per unit was approximately £4,000 – £5,000.

The Chair thanked Mr Hardman and officers for the report and stated that it was easy to read and believed that the public would find it clear too. While the Panel recognised that the document was not enforceable they believed it would be helpful if officers could find a way to encourage developers to raise their standards if some kudos could be given.

RESOLVED – 1) That the consultation should be extended to include all Members

2.) That further work is undertaken regarding anaerobic digestion.

## **EEOSP.47/10 FORMER GARLANDS HOSPITAL SITE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF**

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) (Mr Hardman) submitted report ED.06/10 that set out the process that had been undertaken in the production of the Former Garlands Hospital Site Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) including the comments expressed by Members at the Overview and Scrutiny Panel workshop held on 24 March 2009 and the amendments made to the document in light of the comments. A schedule of responses received to the public consultation and the proposed changes to be made to the SPD in response to the comments received was also included.

Mr Hardman informed Members that Councillor Allison had arranged a special session through the Neighbourhood Forum. The session had been well attended and was found very useful. Comments from the session had also been included.

One outstanding issue had been biodiversity and Mr Hardman advised that officers had carried out an assessment and consulted Natural England but there had been no feedback on the results to date. Until that information was received the report could not be completed.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

The officer advised that the issues around drainage had been picked up.

*There was concern about the lack of shops and that there was only one way onto and off the site. As there was no bus stop people would have to use cars for their activities.*

Mr Hardman explained that there needed to be a critical mass before bus companies could be persuaded to provide a bus route or amend a route to incorporate the site.

A site had been identified for possible development of a shop but the officer advised that there had been some objection raised by the landowner and that it could not be guaranteed that the site would be available for shopping.

*When would work start on the site?*

Mr Hardman advised that it was in the hands of the landowners and they may be waiting to see the final land value. The land had been up for sale but Mr Hardman was uncertain what the outcome was and since that time the economic climate had changed. Any decisions were now up to the Trust.

RESOLVED - 1) That the report be noted.

## **EEOSP.48/10            CORE STRATEGY, LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK AND PLANNING POLICY**

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) (Mr Hardman) submitted report ED.10/10 that set out the current work programme for the Local Development Framework, the planning policy issues that the Council needed to address and the potential changes to the system.

Mr Hardman informed the Panel that the Local Development Framework (LDF) was a comprehensive system for planning policy within Councils. It consisted of a number of documents some of which were statutory and others remained local choice depending on circumstances.

Mr Hardman advised that the City Council had already prepared a number of documents that were contained within the LDF but that it was a crucial time for the

development of key policy direction. To date the Council had an adopted Local Plan providing not only many development control policies but also the spatial strategy to give the direction for development. The most significant challenge was that the planning policy system had changed and there was a need to move towards a fully compliant LDF system.

Mr Hardman explained that the context of the report was in the context of announcements from Central Government on the future of the planning system and the abolition of Regional Strategies. While the Council was being pressed to move towards a Core Strategy as part of the LDF, the system may change. Officers were keen to move forward to ensure the planning policies were robust and could deliver the Council's Economic and Housing Strategies. The report set out more detail on the current position and raised a number of issues for consideration by the Panel.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

*Was the paper regarding Lifetime Homes had been discussed at a Joint Scrutiny meeting with Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel something that the core strategy could include?*

Mr Hardman advised that reference was made to the document in the overarching policy but there were some issues regarding existing policies. Mr Hardman believed that there should not be an overload or re-write of policies but they would factor in how the Government saw how the Council were achieving.

*How many of the issues highlighted in the report would remain?*

Mr Hardman advised that there was no indication at present and that the majority were new under the new system. The Local Development Scheme that informs what documents were being produced would be in the same format but Supplementary Planning Documents would be changed slightly. Officers were being encouraged to use Area Action Plans. Development Planning Documents would be used for certain matters but Mr Hardman was not sure whether they would change.

Mr Hardman explained that the system was not yet embedded and that it may change back but the Council needed to prepare for the new Core Strategy. Consultation was needed and officers needed to progress work.

RESOLVED: That Members noted the current position on the development of the strategy and look forward to being involved in scrutinising the policies as they are progressed.

A member of the public was concerned that the workshop had not been advertised and that it should have been on the agenda as a private – Part B – item. The Chair advised the individual that workshops were internal information meetings and were not advertised.

[The meeting ended at 12:00pm]