

Appendix IIIa

Swale Borough Local Plan Review

Note of Infrastructure and Utilities Workshop Discussion

Council Chamber, Swale House, Tuesday 12 June 2018

Organisations Represented :

Southern Water	Environment Agency
NHS Swale CCG	Maidstone Borough Council
Swale Borough Council (Coastal Defences)	Swale Borough Council (Planning)
Peter Brett Assocs (for Swale BC) (PBA)	AECOM (for Swale BC)
Kent County Council Highways	Kent County Council (Education)
Kent County Council (Development Contributions)	
Highways England	Network Rail
Canterbury City Council	Medway City Council (Planning & Transport)

Apologies:

Stagecoach	South East Water
------------	------------------

1. Introduction

Swale BC explained the purpose of the workshop as we embark on local plan review and seek this opportunity to engage with infrastructure providers, to understand issues facing them and potentially any showstoppers. As SBC have now concluded the initial public engagement and scoping exercise for the new plan there is some new material to help inform the workshop. SBC intend that this will be a useful starting point for further engagement and discussion as the plan process progresses.

The Swale Local Plan (Bearing Fruits) was adopted in July 2017. A review has already commenced, in response to the Inspector's recommendation that a review should be adopted by mid 2022 to address infrastructure capacity in respect of the capacity of the A2 corridor between Teynham and Newington. The review will cover the period 2022-2038. The new NPPF and standard methodology for housing targets also signal a step change in the amount of housing to be provided for. For Swale (incorporating the latest population projections) this represents an increase from 776 dwellings per annum (dpa) to 1080 dpa and is 'capped' at this level as it is a 40% increase on the adopted local plan. This increase means that land for an additional 10,000 houses needs to be found over an above that allocated in Bearing Fruit (totalling some 17,000 for the new plan period) and of course, infrastructure to support them. This raises significant challenges as to whether the Bearing Fruits development strategy (which itself has changed little to that pursued for the last 20 years or so) is capable of this level of delivery.

2. Strategic Overview of Existing Infrastructure in Swale

Swale is dominated by the east – west axis of much of its infrastructure and geography. This includes comprising the M2/A2/and North Kent railway, with north –south links comprising principally the A249 and the A251. Swale has the deep water Port of Sheerness; 9 railway stations; 3 motorway junctions; two water companies and other drainage authorities; an east

west high voltage power line; high pressure gas main; and a major proposal for the Cleve Hill Solar Farm near Faversham. Social infrastructure includes 2 CCGs; 20 GP centres; 3 minor hospitals; looks to Medway or Ashford for district general hospital services; some 60 schools and other KCC social services. Some of these are not unique to Swale, but the east–west orientation of much of the infrastructure has influenced the planning process historically. Capacity issues are now emerging with existing provision and timing of improvements needed to support new development is an issue even when development contributions can be collected.

The existing settlement strategy is urban focused, Current and proposed levels of growth are now raise questions as to whether we can continue to build on existing infrastructure and services in an incremental way, or are we close to breaking point? Congestion in the A2 corridor, air quality issues, negative impacts on environmental quality at the urban fringe are a negative context for plan development and are prompting exploration of the potential for alternatives.

3. Existing Infrastructure Problems and consequences of continuing the current Swale development strategy for providers.

Infrastructure providers were invited to outline current key issues for their services and facilities and how they saw the implications of continuing with the current development strategy for the next 20 years or so.

a) Transport

Kent County Council Highways (KCCH): General perception of current issues is basically correct. Correct. Despite perceptions of A2 and A249 corridors gridlock is not yet a frequent occurrence. However, continuing the existing development strategy with increasing pressure on existing networks is seen as untenable for the future. Air quality is an issue rising up the priority list especially at Newington and Ospringe. Bus networks are reasonable for the largest settlements, but at locations beyond this struggle to achieve viability. The North Kent railway is close to capacity at peak times and Swale has significant out commuting to Medway, Maidstone and Canterbury which is likely to continue. Whilst it is acknowledged that future local plan strategies proposals will be subject to transport modelling, evidence from current development proposals are showing that Sittingbourne town centre junctions are likely to be over capacity by 2023. Incremental growth strategies are unlikely to be able to provide sufficient mitigation to the highway network as there is such limited space within the A2 corridor to provide this. Considered that car use unlikely to go down much and that contributions to large scale infrastructure would be necessary.

In considering PBA's question as to whether there are currently any underused parts of the local highway network, which could be exploited, the view was that all of it converges in the town centres. Alternative ways to focus growth, and access to the strategic road network, for example at Faversham and different ways to move traffic to the current situation should be considered – although this would certainly not solve all of the problems.

The type of traffic using the local network, eg HGV use of the historic parts of the A2, are a significant part of the problem, damaging buildings and contributing to air quality issues. Scope

for taking large lorries off the A2 and situating appropriate land uses closer to the strategic road network therefore need consideration.

Highways England (HE): Agreed that in the event of continuing existing development strategies, KCCH would need to demonstrate that individually and cumulatively, all developments have nil detriment on the strategic highway network (with mitigation). All junctions on the strategic network are stressed. Modal shift to maximise capacity within the local and strategic networks not seen as a realistic proposition in this area as the infrastructure to support that is not there. M2/J5 improvements are provided for within RIS 1 and are expected to be completed 2022-23. This junction is expected to take growth from further afield and current modelling takes account of adopted local plans, plus some headroom; but not the local plan growth which will emerge from NPPF review. HE have proposed an improved scheme for M2/J5 following the 2017 consultation, and are trying to address the funding shortfall this implies (acknowledging KCC contributions which have been made). Beyond this major planned improvement, there is little scope for further improvement at J5, due to the topography of the area.

In response to a query about what would trigger the need for widening the M2 between J5 – J7, it, HE indicated that there are set flow standards per lane. When these flows break down, they impact the whole network. Solutions to increase the capacity such as converting to smart motorways and using the hard shoulder as a running lane would be considered. There are no current plans to this with the M2. The distance between junctions is also an important consideration, due to the propensity to generate weaving movements and loss of acceleration and deceleration lanes. Provided junctions are 3km or more apart they do not impact on each other, so this is a factor in considering how new junctions can assist with capacity.

M2/J7 has very little scope at present for further improvement to those already committed from development schemes at Canterbury and Faversham. Major improvement of this junction will be considered as part of the national RIS 2 package. This is still under preparation (due 2019).

Medway City Council: Issues for the A2 corridor (Newington – Rainham) were noted. Public transport links to Medway Maritime Hospital are poor and future plans for the hospital are not yet known but transport issues arising for Swale residents likely to be considerable.

Although Medway are unlikely to be pursuing strategic scale development in the Rainham area (other than a school), they are seeking to improve station car parking – noting the potential negative amenity effect of decking it. Commuting from the east is an issue as the A2 corridor in this location is at saturation point and sensitive to growth in neighbouring areas.

Air Quality issues in this corridor were of particular concern. It was considered that although recent planning applications are showing limited impact in Swale, the impacts could be felt more in Medway, due to the network congestion there. It was acknowledged that detailed transport modelling will be needed to address this. Scope for air quality mitigation within the A2 corridor was very limited due to space for network growth. Although technological advances in cars would help in time, evidence is still in short supply. Modal shift was therefore considered to have an important role and shifting development away from air quality hotspots. Use of the railway from Faversham / Sittingbourne to Medway off peak was seen as worthy of pursuing.

Network Rail: Noted an increased workload through the need to take account of step changes in local plan growth and the need to engage with this. Sittingbourne is ranked 10th in the list of

London commuters as measured by entrance /exit passenger numbers at 2.6M per annum. Faversham has 1.5M, so massive usage of this section of the network. Queenborough's numbers have increased to 153,000 since introduction of the direct London service. Sheerness with 43,200 and Swale Halt at 4,500 suggest potential capacity there. Network Rail's focus is on whether stations have the right physical facilities – would scope for extending these stations and associated parking mean the direct services could be better used. Operator franchise results will be out in Nov 2018. The Kent Routes Study was also highlighted – this acknowledges that to date services are very much east-west focused and north south links are much poorer, as a result of geography and the focus on London to the ports routes. Examination of a Faversham – to Ashford route was dropped due to gradients. The potential for a park and ride station at Canterbury where lines cross was suggested, so as to avoid the city itself (Canterbury west noted as now taken over as the dominant use with Canterbury East now the 'branch' line). Discussion is needed on funding and development to encourage people out of cars eg to use the train to access William Harvey Hospital at Ashford.

It was noted that Sittingbourne station is not yet at capacity, but local plan growth might trigger the need for S106 contributions to improve the station, eg by extending canopies to spread platform load. Train capacities are seen as acceptable at Sittingbourne currently, but by the Rochester point on the line - no seats are available for the London commute. Swale growth may therefore not be the issue in rail terms, but would contribute to problems further downstream. Eventual links with cross rail at Abbey Wood were seen as a game changer, with through routes then becoming possible all the way to Heathrow.

b) Health - Swale CCG: The CCGs work as a group across North Kent and Medway. A key issue for them is the review of acute hospital usage over the next 15 years. Within the CCGs, GPs under considerable strain with many being lost to retirement. Milton Regis and Lakeside are problematic within Swale.

A GP' average list is approximately 1800 patients, but Swale is closer to 2500 currently.

S.106 contributions are small, although it is acknowledge that CCGs relatively late to the table on this matter. A critical issue with new development is often that a new health facility is generally unaffordable to the NHS or GPs. Public funding does not generally arrive until 3-5 years after the growth in catchment population.

Primary care is the key issue – looking at additional use of community hospitals and GP virtual hubs and extended access.

On new provision or incremental growth, it was considered that new settlements would need new facilities. Additionally, existing facilities often do not have space to expand into.

The acute hospital provision was also noted as an issue, with travel from Swale a particular concern. Ongoing engagement between the CCGs and north Kent planning authorities with the providers is noted as vital.

c) Education and Social Services:

KCC: Continuing with the current development strategy raises issues. Pressure is currently more on secondary school places; but new development may raise development back on primary schools.

Secondary school sites are an issue due to the funding gap between S106 contributions and build costs. Viability issues arise as developers negotiate very hard on giving potential

development land. Less and less public forward funding is available. New sites are preferable due to the impact secondary schools have on the road network. Although well used by students, buses are very slow on the network. Moving schools to allow them to grow does not qualify for new money. Expansion in situ or completely new schools are therefore the only options.

It is seen as critical to retain more students on Sheppey to take the pressure off transport and Sittingbourne schools; and also to improve the perception of Sheppey itself. KCC are working with DfE backing to work up detailed solutions for the island (such as academies). Major expansion in education at Sittingbourne could potentially undermine this initiative and is not seen as tenable by KCC.

DfE forward finding is focused on current need - not that arising from new development. KCC has to meet this through S106 or constant re-prioritising. Primary schools are less problematic than secondary, as this often involves additional costs and building in phases.

Swale is fairly typical of East Kent (other than the Sheppey issues). Cross boundary travel patterns with Medway are noted and increased travel patterns could result due to phasing issues, although Swale is more self contained than other Kent districts.

Schools are working to link up on the question of further education facilities.

Medway CC: Noted that a new 5fe secondary school is planned at Rainham to deal with local Medway growth. Otherwise, main pressures are expected to be in the western part of Medway.

KCC Services: Social Services pressures in respect of the ageing population were particularly highlighted. Broadband also an issue.

d) Water and Drainage

Southern Water (SW): SW serve Sittingbourne and Sheppey in respect of both water supply and waste water management. There are 5 wastewater treatment works in the area at Sittingbourne, Queenborough, Teynham, Faversham and Eastchurch. There is a duty to serve all new development. SW operate a five year cycle in planning infrastructure and are currently working on plans for 2020-2025 which involves some £65M of investment in capacity at Sittingbourne, Queenborough and Faversham.

SW consulted on their Water Resource management Plan early in 2018 and this will be finalised later in the year.

SW noted the public perception that local plan growth and suitable provision was incompatible given that Swale is in an area of water stress. To tackle this, there are other programmes. These include measures such as leakage reduction and targeting measures in new development to reduce usage to 100 litres per day per person through efficiency measures. Developers pay a flat fee for connection to water supply which can be waived if sufficient efficiency measures are built in to new developments. Economic development uses are more difficult to plan for along with increased housing growth but the former is also factored into SW planning.

SW of the view that location was the determining factor as to whether new settlements or continuation of the existing development strategy are preferable in terms of water infrastructure. It would be very difficult to find a new site for waste water treatment works. Expansion of existing facilities would be easier and continues to be the case for Sittingbourne. Much also depends on the quality of water received and technical mitigations possible eg to deal nitrates and phosphates.

Environment Agency (EA): Noted in the light of the above that there are constraints on what wastewater a receiving water course can take as under the provisions of the Water Directive Framework, water quality cannot deteriorate as a result.

In terms of whether any water services are already at capacity, SW noted that the duty to provide, solutions would be found, although timing is an issue that will need care. EA noted that large scale new developments would therefore need care as infrastructure would need to be in place before development.

e) Coastal Defences:

Environment Agency (EA) noted that large new developments close to coastal defences would need to be matter explored through the Strategic Flood Risk assessment. Climate change is also likely to put significant pressure in habitats and the Swale and Medway Shoreline Management Strategy has a key role to play in how this will be implemented. SBC noted that this is currently not funded.

4. Discussion on alternative development strategies for impact on infrastructure and opportunities for future provision.

SBC introduced the work which had been done by PBA in looking at potential ways to meet the required growth in housing targets. All areas are constrained to a degree especially in terms of infrastructure. Sheppey and the A2 corridor are the least constrained areas in terms of environmental issues, although the former has viability issues.

New settlements were looked at in term of their ability to create new sustainable communities and build in new infrastructure from the outset.

For a settlement of 5000 people, infrastructure was estimated at some £14,000 per dwelling exclusive of transport.

Potential locations and a SWAT analysis were looked at. The call for sites carried out by SBC in late 2017 did not necessarily cover these.

A prospectus has therefore been launched to gauge market appetite for new settlements (minimum size 2,500 dwellings) - albeit with a very high bar in terms of quality of development and demonstrable sustainability in infrastructure terms, at minimal cost to the public purse. Expressions of interest have been submitted and further submissions of detailed information are expected by mid August 2018. The Council will then determine whether new settlements are feasible as one of our strategic options for accommodating growth in the new local plan.

New settlements have a long lead in time to deliver development (estimated 5- 10 years for first housing) and have substantial up-front infrastructure costs. A critical consideration is whether and to what degree infrastructure provision is a deal breaker.

SBC introduced the 6 – 7 potential new settlements proposed by landowners and developers through Expressions of Interest and sought early reactions of service providers as to whether these indicated some potential; involved 'showstoppers' or whether, by comparison, continuing with the existing development strategy appeared preferable.

SBC are keen to emphasise that there is much further work to be done including further engagement with service providers. This workshop is very much to introduce the possibilities

and help scope the extent of possibilities and supporting work which will be needed, so the comments here are seen as very much the first step of the process.

a) South East Sittingbourne:

This site is for 11,000+ dwellings and expansion to the Kent Science Park; plus an A2/M2 link road (the Sittingbourne Southern Relief Road SSRR) and a new junction 5A onto the M2. It was also submitted to the 2017 call for sites when it included land to the north of A2 at Bapchild and completion for a further 1000 or so dwellings and completion of the Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road (SNRR).

Key infrastructure questions include: can we divorce the SSRR and SNRR from each other?

Would a new M2/J5A help relieve the A2 corridor in traffic and AQ terms?

How could housing be delivered in the short – medium term if a J5A were to be constructed?

Will this site impact on existing water abstraction facilities? Would it require new wastewater treatment facilities?

KCCH: Considered that the SNRR and SSRR would be inextricably linked to facilitate this scheme and satisfactorily relieve the A2 corridor and that this should be a key message back to the site promoter. They consider that there is a case for the SSRR and its use to take lorry traffic especially via the M2 to avoid the AQMA at Ospringe. A junction 5A could probably relieve the A2 corridor on either side of it.

Highways England (HE): HE generally prefer not to encourage new junctions onto the strategic road network, because of the additional 'weaving' movements to access and egress the motorway and consequent safety issues. However, at 11-12,000 dwellings such a development would be regarded as strategic in scale and confer economic benefits to the region. Modelling to demonstrate that this development could not proceed in the absence of a new junction, but hard to see how it could be feasible in its absence. Appropriate design standards for lane safety and manoeuvring between M2/ J5 and 5A would need to be demonstrated. It was not seen as a showstopper subject appropriate modelling work. The latter would need to factor in other land uses such as employment, leisure, retail and other local services and facilities to demonstrate the degree to which this was a self contained settlement.

KCCH: In terms of housing delivery and where this should start from in relation to provision of new road infrastructure, modelling would be critical. However, considered starting anywhere other than at the M2 end of the site with a new junction in situ would be likely to be very problematic in terms of impact on the A2. Provision of the SNRR, north of the A2 could assist if it was provided first. The SNRR could function independently of the SSRR, but less clear the other way around.

Provision of public transport (eg bus only links) was not seen as offering significant benefits in this scenario as buses would be caught in A2 congestion.

HE: Advised that lead in times to navigate the approvals process for a M2/J5A would be 2-3 years prior to any activity on site. Issues with providing lane on / lane off could extend that as this would not be within the developers control. Modelling would be critical to phasing of development and critical to the way forward.

Network Rail: Considered that bus links to the station from such a development would be essential. If 10% of the population were using the train, this would equate to 1000 cars for parking. This would also be equivalent to a 12 carriage train. Station capacity would be ok, but probably not in terms of train seat availability in peak hour. Significant problems could be expected closer downstream to London as the trains would fill up further out.

Medway CC: felt that such a settlement would have a significant impact on air quality and that modal shift would be needed, especially for transport to the town centre (developer funded for a period at Ebbsfleet and Dartford). Modelling again the key.

Environment Agency: Considered that a Water Cycle Study was very important and should look at all aspects of such a development including; water efficiency (to 90 litres per person per day); surface water treatment (SUDS); waste water treatment impact at Sittingbourne; and groundwater protection issues.

Southern Water: Considered that timing would be an issue. Their programme for 2020-25 is based on the adopted Local Plan population increases to 2035, although they are well aware of the implications of the new NPPF and increased development targets for much of Kent. This is strategic issue and will have big implications for their next five year plan to enable delivery. SW nevertheless considered it possible that their planning to 2035 could be 'compressed' to enable new development to come on-stream and allow headroom for the next five year plan to catch up with increased development targets.

b) Rushenden Marshes, Sheppey (Peel Ports)

This site could accommodate approximately 2,500 dwellings. It is based on a river dredgings site; abuts the Special Protected Area; and would raise SFRA flood risk concerns, which would be dealt with by land raising and hence likely to affect other shoreline management strategy issues. Access is also problematic. The site is adjacent to the Queenborough wastewater treatment works which would present amenity issues. Natural England would also be likely to have major concerns.

c) NSS Land, M2/J6 and A251, Faversham South

Capable of accommodating approx. 5,500 dwellings. Abuts, but lies outside the AONB.

d) Lees Court Estate, Faversham South – linked and lying to south of c)

Estate extends south into Ashford. Most lies within the AONB and has Historic Park and Garden status. A modest area lying outside it could take approx. 500 dwellings. Promoters looking to justify development to support AONB management.

KCCH: Expressed a number of concerns. The A2/A251 has no capacity and no room for expansion in this location. The A251 is substandard for accommodating side junctions which would be needed to serve such development – widening throughout and impacts on landscape. There is a gap in land controls which mean any alternative route could not be demonstrated. A2/A251 and M2/J6 junctions all insufficient to accommodate this scale of development. Pressure on the A251 accessing Ashford would affect the whole A251 corridor (inadequate width and alignment) and adversely affect villages within it.

HE: Considered to be a showstopper in terms of no additional capacity at M2/J6 (this would need to be completely re-designed). The knock on effects to M2/J7 would be unacceptable. J6 and J7 would have to be looked at as a complete package. It was not considered that J6 would be likely to figure in RIS 2 or indeed in a RIS review in the foreseeable future.

Network Rail (NR): Concerns insofar as Faversham station is more than the 'watershed' one hour commute to London. In this situation, driving to Ebbsfleet to park and train is generally preferred to High Speed 1 and would be likely to put even more pressure on the road network. In response to developer suggestions that Selling Station could be closed and moved closer to Faversham to create a park and ride solution, NR considered that this was unacceptable.

Environment Agency (EA): EA did not consider this scheme to be acceptable.

e) South East Faversham:

Comprises Duchy of Cornwall land between A2 and M2, capable of taking up to approx. 4000 dwellings, plus potentially other smaller landholdings to the north of the A2.

KCCH: Concerns over the capacity of the A2/ A251 junction and further Ospringe AQMA. Would new links from the area to the north of the A2 direct to the town centre be possible to avoid the A2? These would be potential walk cycle distances, but connectivities would have to be improved.

Highways England (HE): Considered that M2/J7 would not cope with this scale of development even with improvements from currently committed developments; and there is little capacity for any development beyond current commitment without significant improvement. The whole junction would need to be reviewed for any or all of these site options. It could also impact on M2 /J6. J7 was nevertheless felt to be a more achievable solution, potentially as part of the RIS2 programme. Timescales would depend on the nature of the scheme required – a major scheme with land take outside of the current highway boundary could take up to 10 years to implement subject to design and build being included within RIS2. Design only in RIS2 to 2027 would not achieve construction prior to 2027. Combining all development options in the Faversham area to achieve 11,000+ dwellings would not necessarily confer any strategic advantage in road network terms - at this scale a different junction solution would be needed. It was also noted that M2/J7 will also need to serve higher development needs arising from the much of the rest of East Kent (Canterbury, Thanet and Dover).

Network Rail (NR): NR considered that this scheme would be likely to require car parking expansion at Faversham Station. They are already looking at sale of land to facilitate this and fast bus routes to the town centre.

KCC Education: At 11,000 dwellings a new secondary school would be required.

Environment Agency: EA did not consider this scheme to be acceptable.

f) Bobbing, West of A249, Sittingbourne

This site would be capable of taking approx. 5,500 dwellings

The A249 main gas and water pipelines to Sheppey are of poor quality and would also be likely to need major upgrading.

KCCH: Concern about dependence on the A249/A2; Impact on Key St junction and M2/J5.

MedwayCC: Rainham AQMA would also be seriously impacted.

Network Rail: Issues would arise with footpath crossing over the railway. There are also issues with the Bobbing Bank embankment stabilisation.

5. Round Table – Concluding Comments

Participants were invited to make any general comments or share thoughts and plans which others may need to be aware of.

KCCH: Re-affirmed their continuing work with SBC on transport modelling to assess future development scenarios; and which would eventually feed into a Local transport strategy to support the new local plan.

Highways England: Stated that mitigations to accommodate the adopted local plan need to be bottomed out first, before moving onto the issues generated by the review.

Network Rail: Drew attention to the Kent Route Study (June 2018). Peak hour trains could be enlarged to 12 carriages to cope with demand. However, more users at Swale would impact at Medway and other stations towards London. Implementation of a theme park at Ebbsfleet, is a potential game changer and impossible to predict consequences.

KCC Education: Options for the way forward for Sheppey secondary education should be published at the end of June. Updating of the Commissioning plan will follow.

Medway CC: A2 / Rainham and AQMA remain a key concern. Initiatives aimed at behaviour change and modal shift essential eg; Apps for commuter buses to the station; clean air / emission zones; designing new estates to facilitate bus access within the estates.

Southern Water: Summarised that their currently emerging investment plan would cover the period 2020-2025 and was expected to be agreed with the Regulator in September. The next plan will be completed in 2023. Whilst this will be after the expected adoption of the Swale local plan review in 2022, SW confirmed that if population increases arising from this start to materialise sooner then contingencies are available to meet demand.

Maidstone BC: Considered that the plans would not directly affect Maidstone. They are aiming for concentration around transport hubs and 'walkable' self contained communities. A significant 'critical mass' needed to achieve this level of independence.

Canterbury CC: Local plan adopted 2017. Going forwards, increased development targets; impact on the A2 and M2/J7 are of particular interest.

Swale BC: Coastal Management /Engineering: Noted the Coastal Management Plan is not currently funded. Saw further pressure on Sittingbourne Town centre parking and on street parking issue for both existing and new developments. Supported the idea of local commuter buses to the station to alleviate parking pressures.

Swale BC: Noted the housing targets are likely to be a minimum, which have to be found or there is a risk of ad hoc applications and Appeals, which preclude proper planning for infrastructure. Average household sizes are still falling and perhaps this may need to be investigated to see if it can create some headroom for infrastructure and services. Additionally, not all of the housing target will be in new settlements, even should this strategic option be pursued. The need to maintain a 5 year housing land supply would also necessitate a pipeline of smaller sites coming forwards at least in the early years of the new local plan.

6. Next Steps

Going forwards, we anticipate consultation on Issues and Options and a Preferred Option during summer 2019, progressing to a submission version of the plan in 2020.

The new settlements work will be taken forward through following up the expressions of interest and seeking full submissions by early August 2018. Assessment will then take place and presentation of potential options to Members in the autumn. This will inform a steer on the way forward for the plan is then anticipated early 2019.

SBC noted that the work shop had been extremely useful starting point and that as work progresses on the Local Plan review we will be seeking 1 to 1 meetings with all the stakeholders and service providers, but we are grateful to hear any additional thoughts from stakeholders. Please email the team at any time.