good morning everyone before we start

can everybody hear me

yes okay thank you uh do do let me know

uh if you can't at any stage during the

proceedings

um good morning ladies and gentlemen and

welcome to the hearings element of the

examination into the soundness of the

northwest leicestershire

local plan partial review my name is

louise gibbons i am the inspector

appointed by the secretary of state

to examine the plan

you will no doubt have had contact at

some stage with

carmel edwards the programme officer

carmel

is always your main point of contact

if you need to speak to her today or at

any point during this

proceedings please email her

but before i go any further i do want to

say uh

my my huge thanks to carmel and the team

at northwest leicestershire for making

this

virtual event possible we've had some

teething problems on the way but

hopefully we've

got through those enough so that we can

have a fruitful set of hearings

uh just to note that due to the nature

of the the virtual hearing

sometimes you may see me look at another

screen

particularly if documentation is

referred to during the proceedings

and i also may look down to take some

notes

but please be aware that i will continue

to pay

attention to the discussion

um i have a list of attendees who are

participating today

can all of you who are actually going to

speak today please turn on your cameras

and could everyone else who's just

observing please turn them off

okay

thank you um to start with i i it will

help me if i

um go through your names now so i get

used to the

the faces on the screen and even if you

change places hopefully i'll

recognize who you are um so for each of

you in turn

uh when i go through through the names

could you please confirm your name

um how you would like to be addressed

and

your organisation if that's relevant and

then mute your microphone again

i'll start with northwest leicestershire

council

i have ian nelson rob thornhill and hugh

richards is that correct

uh we'll start with mr nelson first yeah

so ian nelson planning policy team

manager at northwest western district

council

um mr thornhill is yes he is on the call

now

uh as his christmas to elston

okay thank you thank you thank you

instructed by uh northwest

leicestershire district council

okay thank you mr richards sorry did you

say mr elson

elston as well mr nelson

yes okay thank you

um next i'll turn to uh leicester city

council

um i have a ripple gupta and fabian de

costa is that correct

yeah fabian de costa planning policy

team at leicester city council okay

senior planning officer at leicester

city council thank you

okay thank you um

helen hallam land management uh and

others

uh representatives of

mr lee's yep uh it's gary lee's

uh from uh pegasus group um

yep gary or mr lee's is fine madam thank

you

okay thank you and uh davidson

developments

hello my name is chloe french i'm

representing davidson's and i work for

bidwell

okay thank you

um we also have a number of observers

as well who won't actually be taking

part in the proceedings does anybody

else intend to speak today

okay okay thank you

um i have already circulated a guidance

note oh

sorry yes um sorry i did miss um

homebuilders federation

uh sue green sorry sorry sue

you're right in the middle of my screen

as well

yes no problem um yes sue green from the

home builders federation

um but i would only be participating in

the first part um issue one questions

one a and

what one and one a okay

thank you

okay thank you and i have already

circulated a guidance note and also a

virtual hearings guidance note with an

updated version of that

that set out a number of administrative

matters

concerning the examination here and

hearings

i don't intend to go through these in

detail

but in summary i will lead the hearings

introduce each topic

and ask specific questions of the

participants

although the hearings will be a

structured discussion and responses

should always be directed to me

i will allow a more informal approach

than other local plan

hearings you may have seen or

participated in

particularly the virtual ones for this

examination i do intend to allow

participants to be visible at all times

except during breaks when you should

turn your cameras

and microphones off and your microphone

should

only be turned on if you are speaking if

you leave

your microphones on sometimes background

noise can can get into

into the discussion uh

please use the raise hand facility is

everybody familiar that with that with

teams

have you all used that before if you

haven't

uh it's there is a small bar at the

bottom of your screen with three dots

and just to the right of that

is a ray's hand please use that

but also please lower your hand when you

have finished speaking otherwise i will

keep having to come back to you to check

whether you've got

anything else to say i will give you all

the opportunity to speak but only one of

you may do so

at a time uh please keep responses brief

and focused

i will ask the council for their

comments on points raised

and we'll also ask questions of them

directly

i will end the discussion on any topic

when i have enough information

each session will be no longer than an

hour and 30 minutes

we may have some very short breaks in

the intervening periods of wet as well

particularly where we need to change to

another matter or

question if you need to get information

out to refer

to new topics um during the breaks

please stay logged on um but remember to

turn your cameras

and microphones off as others may be

able to see

and hear you so i will i will turn my

microphone and camera off when we

adjourn for a break first

and then everybody else can do so but

just just be aware i'm sure carmel's

already advised you that

um because of the way this team system

works

i will be able to hear and see anything

that that goes on

during the breaks uh the event

will be recorded uh we're actually

recording now as i understand is that

correct carmel

i think so um the recordings will be

uh available on the council's website at

a later date

it's not appropriate to show anything on

the screen and all material

already produced should be on the

examination website

new documentation should only be

submitted following specific agreement

by me to do so during the hearings

this should then be done through an

email contact with carmel

we will not be using the chat function

in teams

if you have any queries that are not

related to today's event

please contact carmel separately

so as set out in the guidance note the

examination will be based on the local

plan

partial review public consultation

document november

2019 to be sound

the local plan should be positively

prepared effective

justified and consistent with national

policy

i need to consider whether it is sound

if not why not

and what can be done to make it sound in

order for the council to adopt the plan

i can only recommend main modifications

if as to do so

by the council main modifications

comprise any changes to the policy

or to the supporting texts which have a

significant bearing

on the interpretation of the policy

i have set out subjects for

consideration in my matters issues and

questions

and daily agendas have been circulated

can i just check that everybody who's

participating has a copy of today's

agenda

can you raise your hand if you don't

yeah

okay thank you uh and i will be moving

on to that

shortly um i i have

though uh first i have received a copy

of the council's opening

mr nelson would you like to read that

out before we move on

it's actually mr elston who's going to

read out that okay

thank you mr elston would you like to go

ahead and read that out for me now

please

of course

the adopted northwest leicestershire

local plan document was adopted in

november 2017

following the publication of the

examining inspectors report

which subject to main modifications

found it sound and legally compliant

main modifications included in summary a

commitment to an early review of the

plan by policy s1 on future housing

and economic development needs to

accommodate any unmet needs

identified by agreement within the

housing market area

according to the future strategic growth

plan and to reconsider the adequacy of

land supply for housing and employment

those main modifications were necessary

because at the time of examination

the reasons explained in the ir the

quantum of unmet

housing and employment need in the hma

and fema

leicester leicester and leicestershire

was not finalized

and the same applied to where such an

unmet need would be met

therefore the council proposed and the

inspector agreed to defer consideration

of accommodating any unmet needs from

other hma authorities

to an early review of the plan depending

on whether and to what extent this

proved to be necessary policy s1

therefore

included a commitment to work

collaboratively with other authorities

in the hma

to establish the scale and distribution

of unmet need and includes the following

tail piece the district council will

commence a review of

this local plan defined as being

publication of an invitation to make

representations

in accordance with regulation 18 by the

end of january 2018

or within three months of the adoption

of this local plan whichever is

the plan review will be submitted for

examination within two years from the

commencement of the review

in the event that the review plan is not

submitted within two years

then this local plan will deem to be out

of date

no one seriously contends that the

council has failed to meet the milestone

we are now the examination stage of the

review what some

representatives complain about is the

nature of the review

and or the terms proposed in the review

are not sound

the council proposes deleting the tail

piece all together

and adding a sentence to the previous

paragraph in policy s1

which commits to submitting

a replacement local plan for independent

examination within 18 months of it being

agreed with the other hma authorities

that the redistribution of any unmet

need is to be

the formula is proposed in these terms

because the amount of unmet need from

leicester

although clarified was not yet agreed at

the time of submission

and nor was its redistribution it was

therefore not sensible to put forward a

specific date for the submission of the

review

it is still not finally agreed it was

necessary however

to submit a review for examination

otherwise the adopted local plan would

have been deemed to be out of date

by virtue of the provisions of poly s1

as adopted

with adverse and unsound consequences

for development management in the

district

the development management system is

plan lead this means that planning

applications are determined

in accordance with the development plan

unless other material considerations

indicate otherwise

the mppf is one such material

consideration

the 2019 version includes the

presumption of favor sustainable

development which can

include so far as decision making's

concerned approving

development proposals that are called

with an up-to-date development plan

without delay

or that where there are no relevant

planning policies

or the policies which are most important

for determining applications are out of

date

granted permission unless as far as

paragraph 11

c and d are concerned a plan or a most

important plan policy

that on its face is deemed to be out of

date is likely to be determinative that

the plan is not up to date

and the policy is out of date in this

effect the tailpiece to adopt a

policy s1 if it was to remain in place

take away the planning judgment

that a decision taker would otherwise

apply in paragraph 11 of the mppf

the adopted plan submitted on the 4th of

october 2016

was examined against policies in the

2012 edition of the mppf

the equivalent policy was at paragraph

14. since the plan was examined the

courts have confirmed that whether or

not policies are up to date is a matter

of planning judgment

unless the deemed provision in the mp

mppf apply

the inspector examining the now adopted

local plan knew full well the

consequences of the deemed provision in

policy s1 he found

sound that is not surprising given the

evidence base at the time included that

determination of the amount of unmet

need was imminent

it was also sound to hold the council's

feet to the fire when it came to

agreeing that what

fair share northwest leicestershire

should provide for and submitting a

local plan review to meet it however

even the best late plans can be derailed

as the council explains in the

introductory text

to the partial review document submitted

as one of the representatives accepts in

its issue two-step

statement in hindsight the wording of

the final paragraph of policy s1 in the

adopted northwest leicester

leicestershire local plan is perhaps

unfortunate and unduly onerous

the proposed changes to poly s1 will not

mean that in considering planning

applications

a decision taker will inevitably

conclude that all policies

or at least the most important policies

relevant to the determination of the

planning application

are up to date that will still be a

matter of planning judgment applying the

usual principles

but it will ensure that not all of them

are deemed to be out of date

planning applications will therefore be

determined in the normal way

it has been suggested that a backstop

date for the agreement

of a statement of common ground ought to

be inserted in the proposed wording for

policy s1

this is not sound the statement of

common ground will be agreed when it's

agreed

if there is a new unreasonable delay it

will be open to decision makers to take

this into account

in deciding whether as a matter of

planning judgment certain policies in

the plan

should be regarded as being out of date

the council is not delayed in carrying

out a substantive review of the adopted

plan in parallel with this partial

review the substantive review of a

replacement local plan has

proceed at the pace the replacement tail

piece is a sound approach

in that context if the council delays

then it will be open to a decision taker

as a matter of planning judgment to

consider that in the context of whether

the most important policies are up to

date

this opening statement sets the context

for the remainder of the examination

thank you madden uh thank you mr elston

yeah

there are a number of uh matters raised

in that that we will actually cover

during

uh the examination hearing so i don't

intend to

ask any questions of that um

before we move on to the agenda did

anybody else

uh have any questions about the

proceedings and the way the

examination will run procedurally

no okay thank you

um right um i wanted to

to to move on to um uh

issue issue one and questions one and

one a but before i do um

i just wanted to make everybody away

that yesterday

i was provided with a a number of uh

documents in relation to uh the

leicester

city plan and also um

a joint position statement and i just

wondered whether everybody was

aware of those they are on the

examination website

has everybody at least seen that there

have been some new documents published

for the examination

okay thank you mr nelson it might be

helpful

um to me and to others if you could just

explain

all of those that uh i'll come on to the

statement of common ground in relation

to the triggers in a in a moment but if

you could just

explain the documentation that was

produced yesterday

yes thank you madam uh yeah the

leicester city local plan which

you may have picked up from information

that was in various people's statements

was due to go out consultation around

march

april of this year but because of the

impact of covid

19 uh that was postponed uh and the

consultation on that

uh plan started yesterday um

and as part of the preparation for that

plan

uh all of the leicestershire authorities

agreed that it'd be useful to publish

a joint statement uh on on housing and

employment

to explain you know what the current

situation is uh

leicester city have declared an unmet

need in terms of housing

and so what that note does is sort of

try to provide a bit more context

and so that was pulled together through

the uh through the joint strategic

planning manager

uh robert rob thornhill who is part of

the examination today

the uh housing trajectory was something

that

uh the district council have submitted

it is based on

a trajectory of appendix one i believe

it is of the draft

uh city of leicester local plan that was

published yesterday

it is slightly different in that the

four rows at the bottom are ones which

i have added to look at the issue of the

cumulative supply versus cumulative

uh requirement and the reason for

submitting

that is that a number of representatives

um

i've stated that the unmet need is is

now

is immediate and needs to be addressed

now um

what that um trajectory shows is that

actually you know the

the need doesn't apply until the late

2020s

um now that situation may change

because it is only a draft local plan

and i'm aware certainly the city

council are still working on on issues

around housing need

so it is a statement as it stands at the

moment so that that may well change

okay thank you um i mean given uh

given that these have only just been

published it

has has everybody had a chance to look

at i mean obviously the the

the leicester city plan in a way doesn't

directly uh

affect the discussions here it does a it

does have an

indirect uh impact um but it's everybody

had chance to look at

the material in any detail

uh yes mr lee's you've got your hand up

and then i'll come to the others yeah

yeah we just had a chance to have a

very brief a very brief look at it but i

don't think it uh

significantly changes uh the position

of where we're at particularly in the

context of the statement of common

ground

uh and i think in terms of actually

housing numbers and so on and so forth

that's probably something we'll address

tomorrow so i don't think it impacts on

on um

[Music]

uh the the agenda today um adversely

okay thank you um sue green

thank you mom um i was aware of the

documents

but um i was actually on holiday

yesterday so i haven't had opportunity

to study them in any detail um

but i think as mr lees has just said um

it perhaps

impacts more on tomorrow's discussion

than than today's

and i will go through them this

afternoon

thank you yes sir that that that those

were my thoughts

and did leicester city council want to

add anything to

to what mr nelson said i think it would

just be helpful to

understand the context a little bit and

to know how long the consultation period

lasts as well

thank you mr decosta thank you madam

inspector no it's just really

i mean the ian's covered mr nelson's

covered quite a bit a bit we've started

consultation yesterday

um as mentioned it's only a reg 18 draft

plan at this stage we're running for 12

weeks

until december um

and uh the only the only thing to

mention in addition to sort of the unmet

housing need which we declared

um actually we declared it back in 2017

but quantified it as part of this plan

we've also got unmet employment need as

well and that's

that and the housing forms part of our

discussions on the statement of common

ground

um that we're discussing within the hma

okay thank you and um just just to set

some context has there have

have there been any changes from the

amount of unmet

need that you identified uh earlier this

year

uh both in relation to housing and

employment requirements

no the the plan the plan that we were

due to go out in march is exactly the

same plan that we're going out with at

the moment

um as mentioned the only delay was down

to covid

the only the only changes or the only

additions are some additional evidence

that we're putting out

um in parallel with the draft plan

that's a local housing needs study

a water cycle study

so other than that everything's the same

as what we were intending to go out with

in march

okay thank you so just to clarify that

was around seven

just it was over seven thousand uh homes

wasn't it and

is it 23 hectares of employment that's

right yeah that's right

okay thank you uh you can lower your

hand now unless you've

had anything else to say um

anybody else want to to make any

comments on that i mean

i i yes i i agree it's uh that i think

the issues raised particularly in the

joint position statement

uh are probably more relevant for uh

tomorrow's discussion

so we'll we'll hold hold that till then

okay thank you um and just before we

move on

as well um i have a number of statements

of common ground so i just want to

clarify

how i intend to um uh call each one

so i have a statement of common ground

for the partial review which was

published in uh 2019

uh with the authorities in solely in

relation to the partial review

i intend to call that the partial review

statement to common ground that makes

more sense

when we discuss the um the housing

market

area and with all the other authorities

i will refer to that as the wider

statement of common ground

and then just recently

sent to me by by the council and other

parties

uh some of whom are here i've also got

what i'm going to call the triggers

statement of common ground so that's a

comparison of triggers

just be clear on the terminology

and correct me if i start to get them

muddled up but hopefully we should

we should be okay on that is everybody

clear

with that

okay any any final comments before we

move on to the agenda itself

no okay um i don't anticipate

that these proceedings will take that

long today but

i will um keep an eye on the clock and

uh if we need a break

say at 11 o'clock we we will do that

um so uh the agenda for day one

covers issue one and uh the relevant

procedural

and legal requirements uh including the

duty to cooperate

and the first question uh in respect of

the duty to corporate have the council

engaged constructively

actively and on an ongoing basis in the

preparation of the partial review

and question 1a what are the key

outcomes from cooperation with

neighbouring authorities i'd like to

focus

on this part of the agenda in relation

to question one

uh on whether constructive engagement

has taken place a number of parties

have picked up on that as the main issue

i don't think that

there has been any queries really in

relation to

whether the council had been active and

been engaged in an ongoing basis so i'd

just like to focus on

on whether it's been constructive

engagement

i will turn to the council first mr

nelson if you could um

explain why you consider that the

engagement has been constructive

that you've had with the neighbouring

authorities

thank you madam uh obviously we've set

out our

a detailed response um

in response to the question that you set

earlier on this year

so i don't intend to go through that in

in any great detail it's all there for

everybody to see

um i think the the main thing to note is

the words you know constructive

engagement

and what a number of representers have

focused on

is the fact that to date there is not an

agreement amongst the leicestershire

authorities

about how the unmet need initially from

housing but

more lately from employment is going to

be redistributed amongst the local

authorities

um that doesn't mean that the engagement

that has taken place

by northwest leicester district council

but also by all of the legislators

hasn't been constructive

we are working together to address that

those particular issues

of redistribution um to some extent the

the state treatment that we uh submitted

yesterday

in connection with the leicestershire

with the leicester city local plan

that we just discussed uh provides more

detail

on that um and we are still working

collaboratively things have moved on

considerably

in the intervening period since since

the original dates

in may for for the examination were put

on hold due to covid

we've engaged consultants to

undertake a sustainability appraisal of

alternatives

uh looking for both housing and

employment

and mr thornhill might be able to give

you some more information about that

later on if you require it

but that work is now moving forward at

quite a pace

so the work is it is happening we are

engaging we have done so for since

certainly

uh even before the current local plan

was adopted in in the run-up to that

examination

um it's just taken longer um

i don't think there's any of us who took

part in that examination

and what three and a half years ago now

thought that it wasn't

that it was likely that we'd end up

where we are um

but we are where we are uh and we are

still

engaging on a constructed basis uh and

we

we will get there very shortly

thank you um coming to um

uh home builders federation uh sue

you you uh were one of the parties that

picked up on the issue of constructive

uh engagement can you just explain why

you think

that the council haven't met that part

of the

duty to cooperate

yes thank you mom um yes our issue

really

about the constructive engagement is

that we feel that

constructive engagement should really

result

in a positive outcome um and i suppose

that we're feeling extremely frustrated

with

not not only north west leicestershire

council but the leicestershire councils

in general

that they have been um

engaged in this process for for in

excess of

three years and there doesn't seem to be

a great deal of

sort of forward movement um the

uh statements of common ground seem to

be

suggest putting forward that they will

continue to work together

um but there's no sort of constructive

outcome

in the sense that we we just still know

wiser

as to how they are going to redistribute

the unmet need

which we've been aware of on that need

for as i say in excess of three years

so our issue really is that

um this engagement isn't constructive

because we're not

really coming to any conclusive

outcome um and we don't feel that that

is a

um a sound basis for the plan making

thank you thank you uh mr lees

i see you had your hand raised yeah

thank you madam um

i think just just before i go into

um seek to answer the question directly

just i guess

a little bit of context um firstly

it's it's just worth noting um

the reason for the review in policy s1

um so the inspector

in examining the local plan um was

quite clear of the need for the review

i'll just i'll just um

quote what um what the inspector said

commitment to early review in the plan

by policy s1 and future housing and

economic development needs

to accommodate any unmet needs

identified by

agreement within the house in market

area according to the future student

growth plan

and to reconsider the adequacy of land

supply for housing

and employment so um

there's two sort of factors there that

were the if you like the potential

triggers

um for for the review of policy s1

neither of those uh um really has has

occurred

um and this is the problem that that

we're facing and this is the problem

that northwest leicestershire has faced

as mr

uh faces mr elston set out in his

in his opening uh statement um

and the problem with that is you know

what have we now

got um so the objective from what the

previous inspector

and what the mppf requires us is you

know to ensure the plans positively

prepared

and to ensure that future housing needs

are going to be met

the problem then in terms of as as

the screen as has just alluded to with

this

with this delay which has been going on

for a substantial period of time

this was at the time of the the last

examination

of of understanding that leicester has

an unmet need but nobody knowing what it

is so it isn't possible

for the plans to adequately

have a housing figure that takes account

of any unmet need and this has been the

problem for various

um authorities throughout leicestershire

for a for a few years now

but the problem that we have

now with the position here is that

obviously we've got a legal legal

requirement under the duty to cooperate

section 33a of the

planning and compulsory purchase act

we've got paragraph 27 of the mppf

obviously required effective

constructive engagement

and what we've got in the statement of

common ground

because the paragraph 27 of the mppf

says that

to demonstrate effective and ongoing

joint working

you should prepare and maintain one or

more statements of common ground so it's

a statement of common ground that gives

you

the evidence of that constructive and

effective ongoing engagement and

nobody's saying

that there isn't ongoing engagement it's

very clear

over the years that there is ongoing

engagement between the

the authorities but how it's clearly the

question we have today is how

constructive and effective that

engagement is

we've now got a statement of common

ground

november 2019 so they've had

plenty of time to update this in light

of the understanding of where leicester

cities act

with its plan and obviously a big delay

has been

with leicester city in in progressing

its local plan

um but obviously it was earlier this

year

um when when we uh penned our

submissions um to the pre-submission

um leicester had um

obviously released its committee reports

detailing

um its potential amount of unmet needs

so they have had some time

over the course of the this year to

to to to get that statement of common

ground to a more progressive

constructive and effective state as to

how it's going to address

the unmet need all we've got in the

statement of common ground that i can

see

is section 5

which talks about the governance

arrangements

members advisory group the planning

offices forum the development plans

forum

so they have these groups in place which

is fine

but then in terms of the key issues

on on strategic matters what we have is

a statement that says a redistribution

of unmet housing need from leicester

city

or any other authority will be agreed

through the established joint working

mechanism

outlined at section 5 above

in terms of what the if you like what

the practice guidance

says you should expect really from a

statement of common ground and um

paragraph uh 20 under the uh the plan

making

section says if all the information

required is not available

authorities can use the statements to

identify the outstanding matters

which need to be addressed at the

process of reaching the agreement

and if possible indicate when the

statement is likely to be updated

so we've still got no no understanding

of precisely the process or a potential

timetable

which i think is the most critical

matter here

what is uh mr nelson just said we're

nearly there

well they've been saying that for two or

three years to be frank

and without any indication of a of a

timetable

um i don't believe that they've met the

um the duty to cooperate in having a

constructive

and effective uh um cooperation with

with their um neighboring partners

so that that that's my concern um and

when you look at the

the proposed change to policy s1

without a timetable in the statement of

common ground

there is no trigger at the moment for

when that statement of common ground is

going to be reached

yeah that's that's that's that's

yeah i i i there is quite a bit of

discussion that we will have in relation

to

the triggers particularly tomorrow

that's going to be probably one of the

main

focus for for um uh discussion

i i just wanted to check so so in effect

what what you're suggesting is that the

uh november 2019 statement of common

ground

could have been updated to reflect um

a a more uh detailed position

in terms of where we are now is that

what you're suggesting

rather than um because there's this

this statement of common ground the

partial review one and the wider one

so are you indicating you think that

there there was some role for

for a more wider um uh consideration in

in the partial

yeah i guess there's two points i think

it would have been very helpful

for the statement of common ground to

have included a potential

draft of the statement of common ground

that's envisaged in policy s1

so uh you know in terms of actually

undertaking what what that might look

like so we've got some understanding of

what this statement of common ground

might look like in terms of how it might

deal with the on that need and

redistribution of it

more detail about the process of how

it's going to get there and most

importantly a timetable

um of of of when they envisage that

happening

so so that's what i believe is um

is absent um and it's the lack of that

further information and clarification

that leads to them failing

um failing that particular test madam in

in my view

okay thank you uh mr thornhill did you

want to

to add something there

um yeah just just very quickly just to

update on uh

on on some of the points raised really

it seems to be presented that this

process has been going on for

for many many years clearly as a as a

group of authorities and one of the key

roles of my job is to

is to deal with this unmet need issue

for the hma

this is quite simple that we can't

redistribute an unmet need

if we don't know what it is so um so

that's the reason why

it's been going on for so long we knew

there was an unmet need

three and a half years ago but we didn't

know what it was

and when you think about it in the

context of the hma as a whole and

leicester and leicestershire as a whole

leicester city is the most sustainable

location

in the in the housing market area um

it's got obviously higher order retail

leisure cultural facilities

is absolutely critical and brownfield

land opportunities as well

which is which are which are more

limited in the wider hma so

it's absolutely critical that leicester

does its analysis um

identifies its capacity that it can that

it could reasonably

um deliver because otherwise we're going

to end up redistributing

a need to less sustainable locations

in the districts so it's absolutely

critical for the state

sustainability of the hma as a whole

that leicester's able to carry out that

work now i think we'd all agree that's

taken

longer um than we would have liked

we got the the initial indication uh

towards the back end of 2019

um through their committee papers um

but the authorities

the the evidence associated with that

the full package of evidence including

that the new bits of evidence that mr

decosta

spoke about earlier were only published

yesterday

it's absolutely right and proper that

all the authorities have the opportunity

to

to see that evidence and respond to it

so we're doing everything as quickly as

we can and we've got everything lined up

to to progress

um but obviously that the process as

it's unfolded

has meant that we can't we couldn't go

any faster

than we are now in terms of getting to

the point of having leicester's of that

need

dealt with okay thank you i i will

um i will just come back to the the kind

of time frame that might be helpful to

to to lesser to explain uh

what the process has been uh been for

them and

you know clarify why it has taken so

long um

chloe french did you you wanted you had

your hand up i'll come to you mr nelson

in a moment

uh you've got your microphone on that

off still

thank you man and i just wanted to uh

sort of add in here that

i don't disagree with what's been said i

i can understand that it's very

difficult

to get so many authorities working

together and identifying the unlimited

need but i think as um

as gary said that we really need to have

that time frame there

so that everybody can be working towards

that same time frame

and and provide some clarity of what is

going to be provided

when and we now know those lesser

numbers and work needs to progress

quickly on how that's going to be

distributed to

throughout leicestershire otherwise all

of the local plans are going to be in

exactly the same position

okay thank you uh mr nelson

yeah i was just going to come back on a

couple of points

i mean some things i was actually going

to say mr thornhill's uh

covered anyway but in terms of the issue

of unmet need yes we've known for

three three and a half years that there

is an unmet need

but the problem was it it wasn't

quantified um

you also have to see that in the context

context of

we've got a a a new headner in place

in the early part of 2017 um

but then along comes the government with

changes to

uh how we identify housing requirements

and the standard method and everything

that

that goes with that and that's that's

all set out in in particular in our

topic paper

around the uncertainties associated with

with that particular aspect

um i'd also refer you to the uh topic

paper that we

submitted uh lp12 um

and section five there does actually

give quite a bit more information about

the sort of process

for agreeing uh the redistribution of a

met need

and how it is intended uh to

to be undertaken um

and finally just uh in terms of mr

lisa's point

uh about the planning practice guidance

and the the part that he actually

referred to

himself makes it clear that there there

may well be

issues where it is not known what what

the

sort of answer is as it were um and

therefore

as long as it's highlighted what those

issues are

that's as much as you can do in the

state of the common ground and that's

what the

uh make sure i get my terminology right

the partial review statement common

ground

that's what it does it highlights there

is an unmet need it's going to be dealt

with

through the authorities working together

thank you

uh thank you just just to come back to

that so the the section you referred to

is the future planning of

northwest leicestershire is that right

in the um topic paper

so that highlights yeah highlights the

role of the

strategic planning group um

and the task and finish group is that

correct

yeah and it and it's that task and

finish group that mr thornhill is now

chairing

and that has been working you know for

some considerable time but for

a large part of it or at least the early

part of that we were still uh very much

in the dark

but you know things have advanced quite

quite uh

significantly in the last few months

okay

i'll come back to the task and finish

group uh in a moment

i think it'd be helpful to to know what

what their role is and and what work

they've

they've been doing in relation to uh

unmet need so i'll come back to you

in a moment mr thornhill uh mr decosta

you uh have your hands raised

uh thank you madam inspector just a

quick sort of um response really

um i know we are where we are with the

leicester plan uh putting aside covid

we on the advice of pins we wanted to

exhaust all our options in terms of

where growth would go in the city

and you know we've done extensive work

evidence work to back this up and that's

now

viewable as part of our consultation at

reg 18

and that includes our brand fill sites

as well we've done a lot of work on our

brand full

size and this this has taken a while uh

we accept that

but i think it hopefully gives some

comfort and some

sort of certainty in terms of our our

numbers our supply numbers

and the way forward in terms of um

redistribution of our unmet need

um it's unfortunate that it's taken a

while as i said we couldn't we couldn't

help with kobe

would yet we were due to go out in march

um but we are now out of consultation

and we

will continue to work constructively

with with other districts

hma to on the statement of common ground

in relation to our

need on housing and employment okay

thank you uh mr lee's uh just before i

move back to mr solon hill yeah

thank you madam uh just just um just my

final point really i guess

uh just coming back to what we should

expect from a statement of common ground

practice guidance is clear that you

should set out the process for reaching

agreement

and if possible indicate when the

statement is likely to be updated a key

key issue in terms of process um

if we are going to have a redistribution

of leicester's housing need we don't

know where we're going to get to with

the new standard methodology

um which might say which might change

all of this

um in in due course but going on the

evidence that we've got in front of us

at the moment

um if we are looking at redistributing

leicester's unmet needs and and i i

fully accept what mr decosta's saying

that you know clearly

you need to try and look at uh

maximizing

uh growth potential within within uh

within the city

um that's going to go through the

process it's got to be tested through

the

through through through their

examination process but

if if we are left with an unmet need

um which is what this is all about which

is what we're uh

potentially anticipating have been

anticipating then there is still

a need to have regard to the

environmental assessment of plans and

programs regulations of 2004

and a sustainability appraisal is

necessary so

you can't just have a a debate that says

well

north west going to have a thousand

childhoods going to have a thousand

you've got to go through a proper

sustainability appraisal to understand

the implications of the redistribution

consider it against reasonable

alternatives to understand you've got a

sustainable approach

as possible as mr thornhill alluded to

earlier

so there's quite a bit of process

to go through which which is absent from

the statement of common ground or

a potential timetable for it and i would

have expected

the statements of common ground to have

set out that process far more clearly

and a potential timetable for it thank

you

okay thank you uh mr thornhill i just

wanted to come back to you to

see if you could help explain that the

role of the task and finish group

and um whereabouts you are in the in the

process

uh yeah of course um the the role of the

task and finish group really is to

progress

the the sustainability appraisal um

associated with with any statement of

common ground

so um we've been working on

data collection which is incredibly

complex

uh as i'm sure you could imagine across

um sort of eight

local authorities uh collecting uh

housing and employment data in a

consistent way

um so that we can give that data to acom

who we've appointed

to carry out the sustainability

appraisal so so that was happening

uh initially pre-covered then obviously

covid hit

and we had redeployment of planning

officers

all over the place to be honest um so uh

understandably that hit the buffers

because there were there were uh other

other local authority priorities if you

like but that's been reconvened now for

the last

couple of months so the data collections

taken place we're currently in the

process

of agreeing reasonable options with acom

about the options to be tested for for

the redistribution of leicester's unmet

need and then aecom will carry out the

sustainability appraisal

uh well starting in autumn uh we ain't

waiting to have it finished within this

calendar year the sustainability

appraisal

um so that will test reasonable options

for the redistribution of leicester's

unmet need

and provide the evidence that we need

to to underpin the statement of common

ground which will deal specifically with

unmet housing and employment need

from leicester so it will be quite a

specific statement of common ground

uh on on those two um on those two

particular issues

okay thank you and and are all the

authorities in

involved in in that work then is there

is a link with the with every authority

in the area

yeah absolutely yeah so the statement of

common ground

uh task and finnish group has got a

representative from all authorities

in the area including the county council

as well who's

who aren't a local player authority but

obviously uh

subject to the duty as well so all uh

all technical officers

are represented on that on that group

it's absolutely imperative that

that's the case obviously when you're

dealing with an issue that that affects

um all authorities okay so apart from

the

the the um the effect of covid that

the work has been um undertaken for some

time when when

did you start with the the task and

finish group just

the task and finish week was first set

up um

i think it was around august last year

um and that was before um

obviously before leicester uh well we

were expecting leicester to be uh to be

having a consultation possibly towards

the end of the year at that point

um so it was set up knowing that that

was coming

so that we could get out everything in

place um to deal with it once the uh

once the unmet need came out obviously

there was an issue with

delays with leicester and uh and

obviously the consultation was only

launched

yesterday which is an entirely

understandable given what's happened we

covered

thank you uh you can lower your hands uh

now mr thornhill

thank you uh mr nelson you wanted to add

to that

all right you've got your microphone off

still

the choice yeah you had to do that at

least once

yeah i was just going to refer you again

to the topic paper lp 12. excuse me

paragraph 5.3

uh it notes that it was in june 2019

that the strategic planning group set up

the task and finished group

uh and then as mr thornhill just said it

had been anticipated there would be a

draft leicester local plan

in the autumn of 2019

okay thank you and um could you just

comment on

um whether you think that the statement

the partial review statement of common

ground could have

could have been updated to uh reflect

i suppose the evolving position because

it was submitted in

november 2019 wasn't it so i just

wondered whether you

i'd like you to comment on uh mr lee's

suggestion that

there was prob possibly scope to update

that

it it it was it was prepared uh

the same the the uh partial review state

of common ground was prepared in the

autumn of last year

and was agreed i think it was the early

part of november at least at office

level

what we then had to do was go through

individual sign off by all of the local

authorities

and if you look at the uh statement to

the state of the common ground it has

actually got the date on which each

authority

agreed um agreed to that

and that ran from sort of november

through until sort of february time

obviously the the partial review was

submitted

on i think it was the 18th of february

um

and at that point in time the statement

of common ground represented that the

best understanding of where we were at

um so no i don't think that certainly at

that

point either we were any further forward

in terms of having information about the

the likely

sort of time scales etc um

i don't think it needs to go into the uh

a significant amount of detail about the

process

as long as it's clear that there is a

commitment uh and the the statement of

common ground has set out that there is

the member advisor group there is

strategic planning group

so there's enough information in there

to know

what the process is at least in outline

form if not going

say to the nth degree obviously we are

now nearly 12 months on from when that

statement of common ground

was first prepared uh we are on a very

different world in

so many different ways uh so yes you

know it could be updated now

uh but in terms of uh what we knew at

that point in time know it

it reflected the best

okay thank you so and in terms of the

statement of common ground i think we'll

probably come on to this in a bit more

detail

tomorrow but because the work on the

sustainability appraisal

is moving forward does that does does

that give the potential for a

a clearer timetable for the statement of

common ground itself

um would would you agree

mr thornhill does that then

move things forward and i i don't know

whether leicester wants to

add anything to that

um yeah happy to uh to to

to move on that i mean in the in the

statement um

the the the wider statement of common

ground the the wider one that was agreed

uh that was that was only submitted uh

yesterday

uh we're aiming to get the the statement

of common ground

completed in early basically early 2021

the reason for that is we need this well

the sustainability appraisal to be

completed

um this calendar year and then that will

then form

the the key basis for um for the

redistribution of the unmet need

in terms of the drafting of the

statement of common ground itself

that is um that's quite a simple task

because it

it would be quite a simple statement of

common ground with a couple of tables in

there that set the

the uh the figures for for for each

authority

um but it's the sustainability appraisal

evidence that's the

that is what takes the time and uh and

that's the key to it really okay thank

you

so the the joint position statement

relating to

the how leicester's housing and

employment needs is that a step

a step in the direction of a statement

to common ground as well will that

help inform and form that

um yes it will yeah it sets out the

context

and sets out that we're doing a

sustainability appraisal and envisage

completing the statement of common

ground in in early 2021

okay and then mr nelson you mentioned

the member advisory group

alongside the task and finish group has

the member advisory

group continue to meet through as far as

possible obviously with with covert 19

have they continued

to meet and be involved

yeah it's my understanding i don't i

don't personally get involved in the

member advisory group but

i'm sure mr london will correct me if

i'm wrong but yes they have

still been meeting albeit virtually um

as has the strategic planning group

which is the

uh basically the the most senior uh

planning officers from uh

across the county yeah that's correct

yeah that they have been meeting

and and will continue to to meet

okay thank you um we have to some extent

uh covered the key outcomes from

cooperation uh we've covered the

statement

the partial review statement of common

ground uh

and i suppose with the with the

discussion on the task and finish group

and the essay we've also covered uh some

of the other things

did anybody want to add anything else in

relation to

um the duty to cooperate

or key outcomes

nobody got any points other points that

they wish to

raise

okay

um did the council want to add anything

at

all in terms of that this particular

agenda item

no no other than obviously you know

as just said things have moved on quite

considerably

uh even since the original dates for the

examination in may uh caused it you know

because of covet

caused it to be postponed and certainly

say last three four months

a lot of work has been accomplished to

this state that we can now

uh or are actually passing information

to acom to do the necessary assessment

for the sustainability appraisal

okay thank you um in that case then

uh we will take a

15 minute break now i i need a

comfort break um next

the topics will be relating to the

sustainability appraisal and the

statement

of community involvement um are some of

you going to stay

on for that

okay miss green we were you going to do

that you said you were only involved

wanting to be involved in the first bit

but did you want to sit in and listen to

the other

sessions okay all right in that

case we will take a a break um we'll

return that

uh 11 15

and i will turn my microphone

and camera off first but if i could just

remind everybody to

to do the same as well because we will

be able to hear

and see you if you if you don't do that

okay so we'll return

at 11 15. thank you

hello everybody welcome back

uh for those who took part this morning

i'm happy if you

um put your cameras on again

okay

so um moving on to

uh question two under issue one in terms

of the procedural

um requirements uh this refers to the

sustainability

appraisal of the partial review and

whether it's suitably comprehensive

and uh evaluated sufficiently evaluated

uh reasonable alternatives

no none of the parties here have

actually

commented uh negatively upon the

sustainability appraisal process as far

as i can understand

um if you did want to say anything no in

response to the council then i

i will uh take comments as long as

they're addressed

uh through me uh but i i'll come to the

council to

um explain the the process in terms of

the

sustainability appraisal what

what you took into account um

in the sustainability appraisal work for

the partial review

and what alternatives

were considered and why so

mr nelson are you going to to deal with

that

yes i can deal with that madam um again

i'll refer you to

our um our statement in response to this

particular question which obviously goes

into quite a bit of detail

and also the sustainability appraisal

report itself

um the sustainability

appraisal was was undertaken by our

external consultants

clear lead they had originally been

appointed

to do the sustainability appraisal for

what became the substantive review

um but because of the the issues that

sort of been touching on

uh earlier on about the delays to the

identification of unmet need and what

that might mean for the local plan

and decision to go down the route of

doing a

potentially doing a partial review we

asked them to do a

a revised sustainability appraisal

and that's the report that was submitted

as lp

06a in all

uh five alternative options we're

considered well just to say that that

sustainability appraisal report

went through all the normal

sustainability appraisal processes of

looking at plans programs projects

looking at all the various baseline

indicators you know what

are the sustainability issues affecting

northwest leicestershire

and also doing a sustainability

appraisal framework and it was that

framework that was then used to assess

the five alternatives which were

identified for

as reasonable alternatives or at least

initially

and they are set out at table 6.1 of the

sustainability appraisal report

ultimately it was decided option one of

doing nothing

wasn't really a reasonable alternative

for this very simple fact it would have

meant that the

local plan became out of date and

obviously that's something that the

district council could not

countenance and isn't really in

anybody's interest to do that

the other four options uh which were

options two

three four and five um

were very very similar um but the

the options basically went it provided

more detail as you went through such

that option five then

is the policy wording that which we um

ended up with having the most detail

giving the most certainty

as i say the options were then assessed

against the sustainability approach um

and section seven

of the um sustainability appraisal

report

goes into detail about that um

and in particular table 7.1 provides a

very useful

uh visual summary shall we say of the

results of that and

you know what you can see from that is

actually there's virtually nothing

between

what were options two to five the ones

that were assessed

um the only real difference was option

five which was felt to be a bit more

positive

um in terms of uh sustainability of

uh sa3 from the sa framework uh which

was about helping create conditions for

communities to

uh thrive um so we we believe that that

that has been a thorough assessment

and we don't believe there are any other

reasonable alternatives

okay so yeah that the option five

just uh just shows a positive symbol

whereas the the other three in relation

to sa3 the other

uh three options just show a a question

mark why

why is that a question mark is it just

in terms of the more detailed wording

of option five that that's my

understanding certainly

okay thank you um

uh mr lees i see your hand is raised did

you want to

say something i i again i understand

nobody's uh

come up with any uh negative comments in

terms of the essay but did you did you

just want to add something

yeah if i'm a madam i was it was just i

was just wondering

um okay just the process of um

why we're here really uh um in in

undertaking this very

very focused partial review and

the sustainability appraisal section 71

says that the do-nothing option

was considered not to be a reasonable

alternative and

i get i guess from my point of view i

was i'm just interesting to understand

why the do nothing option was was not

considered to be a reasonable

alternative

um the policy s1 is

very clear the the the reference to the

plan being reviewed

is is under policy s1 and

and and and it follows if you like the

reason

why it would be reviewed which is

regarding

um redistribution of uh um

development needs uh um

obviously neither of those have happened

and and and and this

this partial review is uh an attempt to

try and remedy that but

my question i guess is does it need

remedying in a in a certain sense and

and it was just why the sa thought that

was not a reasonable alternative um

just because that policy there says says

the plans out of date

doesn't mean the plan's out of date of

course uh um

uh the the um i mean the high court

appeal investments north limited against

secretary of state august 2019 mr

justice

dove gave quite a comprehensive

uh um decision on

uh when policies are out of date and so

forth

and and clearly everything has to be

looked at in the context

of paragraph two one three of the

framework

of whether it's out of date and and also

um

you know whether whether circumstances

have changed and the passage of time

means that the policy is actually out of

date and because

we haven't had any detail of a region

a redistribution of housing need um

is that going to make that policy in the

plan actually out of date

um so it was just it was just trying to

understand

i guess why why the option wasn't really

considered a reasonable alternative

i i i will come to you miss mr richards

because i'd

probably be useful to to hear from you

mr lee's you you referred to a

a a a high court decision can you just

uh read that out to me slowly or is it

referred to in your

it isn't referred to no no

yeah which is versus secretary of state

and salford city council

and it was um august 2019

and it was uh uh mr justice dove who who

handed that down it's a high court

case okay thank you

and um uh well okay i'll ask

mr richards can you come in with some

assistance in terms of the

the high court case please yes good

morning madam

um mr at least is right

uh mr justice dove did look at um the

whole question of when policies are out

of date

and um he was very recently upheld

within the last month in the court of

appeal we have a court of appeal

judgment in peel investments

saying substantially the same thing but

what that case was about was in the

context of

uh paragraph 11d of the framework

how do you decide when the most

important

policies for determining a planning

application

are out of date and what the court said

was

well that's a matter of planning

judgment

unless they are deemed to be out of date

and you will know that in the nppf

uh housing policies for example

are deemed to be out of date

when there are difficulties over the

five-year supply or the housing delivery

test for example

but what the court of appeal and mr

justice staff have said

is that when there is not

a deeming provision then it's a matter

of planning judgment

now what there is in policy s1

stands is a deeming provision

it's a deeming provision on the face of

the plan

which therefore takes away any matter of

or any issue of planning judgment

and what removing the tailpiece is

intending to do

is to put back that question of planning

judgment

that's why it's not a reasonable

alternative to leave it in

now it may be on a on an individual

planning application

that the housing policies as a matter of

planning judgment

are still regarded as being not up to

date or out of date

but it but they will not be deemed to be

out of date

the decision taker the council um

committee the council officers are

exercising delegated powers

planning inspectors on appeal will apply

their planning judgment

in what we now regard as being the

normal way

so the the removal of the tail piece

doesn't necessarily make the council's

job

or task any easier

if housing policies are as a matter of

date uh

sorry as a matter of planning judgment

out of date they will still be out of

date

it's just that they won't be deemed to

be out of date

so so mr richard's just coming back to

you then so

um would this have been the case uh when

the plan was adopted have

have has this judgment um had

some impact and bearing on whether

whether it's deemed out of date or not

um

i don't think so because it was really

addressing a different question it was

addressing the question

in paragraph 11d how do you how do you

identify

whether or not a relevant policy or a

most

important policy is out of date the

difference

is is that as i think we'll and i'm sure

we'll come back tomorrow at the time the

previous inspector examined the plan

um all parties were saying

we know there's an unmet need because

the then hedner said there's an

unmet need and we are all

confident that within 18 months we will

know

what the distribution of the unmet need

is to be

uh and therefore the inspector adopted

the tail piece that he adopted

as we said in opening in order to hold

the council's feet to the fire

but of course what the inspector didn't

know

was that as a result of the standard

method

the hedner database was going to

was not going to be the database that

everybody used

for local planning going forward

and what the inspector didn't know was

that the mpp

that the government was going to

introduce this new thing called the

standard method

that was going to throw that timetable

that everybody agreed was a reasonable

timetable

out of kilter and that's why with the

benefit of hindsight

i agree with mr lease when he said in

his hearing statement

um in terms in hindsight

um the the the wording of the

tailpiece in policy s1 is um

quote unfortunate he's right about that

if the inspector was um examining um

this plan or any inspector we say

examining this plan

as we will discuss tomorrow needs to be

very careful before a deeming provision

it

is included in another plan but we'll

come back to that tomorrow

but i hope that's helpful uh yes thank

you

thank you mr richard uh mr lee's did you

just want to to

come back so your hand is up and then

i'll come to mr nelson

yeah thank you madam i i think

we are in a slightly unfortunate

position with the wording

of uh policy s1

and how that final paragraph is worded i

agree

however we're still going to be into

planning judgment

we we have no timetable

for this statement of common ground

being agreed

we have a commitment to

the local plan to be submitted within 18

months of that

but once the statement of common ground

has been agreed

and there is a redistribution

and before the new local plan is adopted

you're in terms of looking at the

up-to-date evidence

there's a planning judgment to be made

about

the policies that are contained in in

the plan

so we're still in the realms of

of um planning judgment and

and if this policy were to stay as it is

presently worded

um at the moment you know the evidence

is we have no redistribution

so in terms of understanding whether

that is out of date

there's nothing that has come forward

once a statement of common ground

is signed and agreed that is that's the

trigger

um for that um for that position to

to potentially change which will be

based on them which will be based on

on planning judgment until we have a new

plan that takes account

of the most up-to-date housing

requirements for

um for north west leicestershire i i

think um

that there are some parties um not here

today who would probably want to be

involved in a discussion about

um the out of date nature of of the

that part of policy s1 uh

mr richard you still got your hand up

did you want to say anything else

no okay i've taken it down again okay

thank you

uh mr lee's could you could you lower

your hand as well please

um mr nelson uh you might want to say

some things but i

i i wanted to to um i suppose understand

taking away the the

planning judgment side of uh things and

the the

the uh discussion that we've just had

whether there are any

kind of other uh implications that you

considered in terms of uh

discounting uh that do nothing option

uh there there were a few references in

your statement and topic paper i think

so it would be helpful if you cover

those

yes yes that's what i was uh

trying to come back to i suppose the

original question that mr

lee's posed why why wasn't it a

reasonable uh alternative

uh for the very simple fact really that

we you know we are in a plan led system

and the wording of policy s1 is

absolutely clear there can be no doubt

that if we didn't submit that review by

as it happened february 2020

then the plan's out of date it means we

have nothing upon

which we can make informed planning

decisions

other than national policies that is not

in anybody's interest

it is not sustainable development it

can't be

and so that was the reason why it was

considered to not be

a reasonable alternative

okay thank you um i think it would be

helpful whether

with uh small parties who i think would

be interested

in the continuing this this discussion

it would be

helpful uh to me mr uh mr richards are

you

available tomorrow as well

uh yes and thursday

okay thank you that's just in case any

kind of legal

uh any more legal aspects come up and it

might be helpful to to repeat some of

the

the points that you have raised because

i think it will probably come up

again tomorrow yes i'll make sure i

re-read

peel investments in the court of appeal

tonight uh

thank you yes um and um it may

if we continue to discuss it it may be

helpful for for me to

to to have those judgments as well in in

the library as if they

they've been referred to did you say

that it had been to the court of appeal

so there was a

an additional judgment as well yes that

that's right i i can i can undertake to

get those to the program officer

um if not this afternoon then certainly

overnight

uh yes if you could please yes thank you

um

i have i have no further questions on

the sustainability appraisal mr nelson

you've still got your hand up did you

want to say anything else

apologies that's right

it takes a bit of getting used to all of

this

um uh anybody else wanted to say

anything before i

move on thank you

okay just finally uh under other matters

i just wanted to come to the uh

statement

of community involvement and

consultation in the light of

the pandemic mr nelson you've just

the council of just published a new

statement of community involvement

is that correct and if so could you tell

me the reasons for doing that

uh we have indeed and we have um we have

submitted that

to to the examination library i believe

it was done because of the impact of

covid19 there are a number of provisions

within the previous statement of

community

involvement that basically uh

rely upon people being able to see hard

copies of documents

the council offices are now open

in a very very limited way

but essentially it's much harder for

people to be able to view

documents um as hard copies

the government uh published some

guidance

in the early part of the summer which

basically applies local authorities

that they should look at reviewing and

revising their statement of community

involvement

to deal with this particular issue so

that's that's what we've done

and it was taken to our cabinet and i

believe it was july

i can check on that um and it's

basically it's an addendum that sets out

how we

not just in terms of kobe but actually

did raise some issues about what happens

if

um something else that nobody sort of

foresaw happened

i know lost at the council building for

some reason

uh so it actually gives an opportunity

to just think a little bit more about

how we would

make sure people have an opportunity to

to view hard copies

in particular recognizing that not

everybody has access to the internet

okay thank you and you've made uh

arrangements that

people can contact by phone um

and other other means of of getting

information should they need it

yes uh yeah and if it

say a lot of it is around hard copies

and if people need that

we will we'll do whatever is necessary

we have also

put up a notice board now outside the

council officers where we can do things

like

put up notices so for example we had to

do that for the uh for this examination

um because we didn't previously have

that facility

everybody had to come into the building

are the offices still closed at the

moment

yeah it's limited it's it's basically by

appointment but it's really only for

uh urgent matters okay so so the notice

board has

been put up in in place of what people

might normally see in the reception or

something like that

for notes okay and i actually looked

when i came in this morning the notice

is still there for the examination

okay good okay yeah i have no

further comments to raises um anybody

have

any matters to raise in terms of the

statements of community involvement or

anything else

uh for today um

i have i have no further questions for

the council today i

i anticipate that we will need the

afternoon session for

tomorrow i think there's a there's a lot

more to to

to get through um so if everybody

can be prompt turning up uh we will

start again

at 10 o'clock tomorrow i'd like to thank

you all for your contributions i hope

you found

uh participating in a in a virtual

hearing uh both interesting and

uh hopefully helpful for you so um thank

you for all

uh your patience and for helping out

just being

quiet and not chatting whilst uh

whilst logging on so thank you very much

and thanks everybody for taking part

uh we'll resume tomorrow at 10 o'clock

okay thank you goodbye