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### Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Working on the Evidence base and supporting documents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (January 2011)</td>
<td>Somerset County, Mendip District, Sedgemoor District, South Somerset District, Taunton Deane Borough and West Somerset District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment update 2013</td>
<td>Somerset County, Mendip District, Sedgemoor District, South Somerset District, Taunton Deane Borough and West Somerset District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of England Strategic Housing Market Assessment (June 2009)</td>
<td>Strategic Housing Market Area Partnership comprising Bath and North East Somerset, Bristol, North Somerset, Mendip, South Gloucestershire and the former West Wiltshire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Levels and Moors, Severn Estuary Appropriate Assessment Scoping Report</td>
<td>Somerset County, Mendip District, Sedgemoor District, South Somerset District, Taunton Deane Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Networks</td>
<td>Somerset local authorities, Somerset County Council Joint commissioning in the development of an ecological network for Somerset and development of planning guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Projections</td>
<td>Joint working with Somerset County Council to refine a local economic model for Mendip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)</td>
<td>Joint commission through SSPC of work to identify district level housing allocations in the emerging RSS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy Examination

Hearing 17 September 2013:

The Scope of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

Statement of Mendip District Council

15 August 2013

1.1 This statement sets out Mendip District Council’s position in relation to the Inspector’s questions on the scope of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) as set out in note ID/35. The statement is confined to the overarching question (3.1) set out below but, in doing so, also more generally addresses issues raised in other questions 3.2 – 3.12:

“In the context of the Examination to date, including my preliminary conclusions on strategic matters in June 2012, does the geographic coverage of the Council’s new SHMA (CD9/H4) in relation to Housing Market Areas provide an adequate basis for the objective assessment of housing needs in accordance with the NPPF? If not, is any departure from national policy justified?”.

1.2 Whilst it is understood that this session is not intended to explore numerical aspects of B&NES’s housing requirement, the Statement also updates more widely Mendip District Council’s representations on the draft Core Strategy.

2.0 Background

2.1 In commenting on the SHMA, the District Council is concerned with the extent to which B&NES’s housing market(s) overlaps with those operating in Mendip and therefore the extent to which it is necessary for the future housing needs of the two councils’ combined areas to be considered jointly.
2.2 For the avoidance of doubt, the District Council’s comments are concerned solely with the relationship between Mendip and B&NES and makes no comment on the extent to which B&NES’s local housing market area(s) might overlap with other areas, most notably Bristol.

2.3 Clearly, the District Council’s primary concern is to ensure that neither the methodology nor the outputs from B&NES’s SHMA would lead to future under-provision of housing with resulting housing pressures on towns and villages in the northern fringes of Mendip. Such concerns have previously been articulated through formal submissions on the B&NES Core Strategy.

2.4 By way of background, Mendip District Council is aware that B&NES have commissioned ORS to prepare a SHMA for that area. The housing needs and requirement for Mendip is currently similarly being updated through an update of its SHMA by Justin Gardner Consulting. This work is expected to have been published by the time of this Examination Hearing.

3.0 B&NES as a discrete Housing Market Area

3.1 The starting point for consideration is the NPPF’s requirement for local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This should involve working with neighbouring authorities where HMAs cross administrative boundaries.

3.2 A key area for consideration, therefore, is the extent to which B&NES can be considered as a functioning housing market area (HMA) in isolation from Mendip. In this regard, it is important to acknowledge that there is no single accepted methodology for determining HMAs and, moreover, overlap with surrounding authorities in any HMA is inevitable to a greater or lesser degree. A key consideration is whether the relationships are so strong that jointly commissioned research or plan making is essential in the interests of sound plan-making.

3.3 In the case of B&NES, it is noted that ORS have reviewed CLG/CURDS research of 2010 (Housing Markets in England) which sets out a series of gold and silver standard Housing Market Areas. The gold standard HMAs show a housing market centred on Bath which extends into Mendip. However, it is notable that substantial parts of Mendip District are more closely linked to other areas away from B&NES. Generally links into Mendip District - taken as a whole - are relatively weak.

3.4 ORS also undertake more locally specific analysis, and assume a different ‘closure’ rate to the CURDS work, which suggests that the Bath HMA extends only slightly into the fringes of Mendip and excludes any market towns. The District Council notes that this is consistent with the 2001 Wells and Shepton Mallet Travel to Work Area (TTWA) which, with the exception of Frome, approximates closely to the District of Mendip.

3.5 This is also consistent with Mendip’s own more recent work on looking at housing market boundaries which suggests that Mendip can be considered as a relatively self-contained market area (albeit with links into B&NES and other areas). In this regard, whilst there are some strong cross boundary links (most notable Frome and some villages), it is worth noting that only 9% of Mendip’s residents work in B&NES whilst just 5% of Mendip’s
workforce commutes to Bath. These figures suggest a relatively weak link when considering the whole district.

3.6 Mendip District Council have also drawn on data in the 2011 Housing Needs Assessment for Mendip about household movements. This source shows that of households moving over the previous two-years into Mendip, only around 5% of all movers had previously lived in the B&NES area. This again shows a relatively weak link with B&NES.

3.7 Overall, therefore, analysis does not strongly suggest that the whole of Mendip should for analytical (and SHMA) purposes be merged with B&NES. It certainly does not point to a need for objectively assessed housing needs to be commissioned jointly between the two authorities.

3.8 Clearly, however, ongoing liaison between B&NES and Mendip will be needed and will continue. In this regard, Mendip are currently updating the evidence base with regard to housing requirements using a broadly similar methodology employed by ORS for B&NES. In ensuring comparable outputs for both areas, a consistent and co-ordinated approach to the wider HMA can be demonstrated.

4.0 Housing Requirements

4.1 Whilst the consideration of housing requirements is beyond the scope of this Hearing session, it is worth noting that B&NES’s current position is to provide 12,700 additional homes over the period from 2011 to 2029 (around 700 per annum). The latest ORS work on demographic change and identifying an objectively assessed level of need puts this figure towards the top end of the range of scenarios developed (in the recent Addendum 1a).

4.2 Having now been able to review the methodology, Mendip District Council is satisfied that it appears to be soundly based and takes account of new data that has become available over the past few months (including a full set of consolidated mid-year population estimates and the latest CLG household projections). On this basis, the Council’s housing figure appears to be of the right order and reflects a reasonable assessment of the need for housing taking into account migration and demographic change.

4.3 Mendip’s own update of the evidence base with regard to housing requirements is using the same broad methodology as employed by B&NES in the SHMA. In this regard, discussions have been held with B&NES about the assumptions used by ORS and will ensure that comparable outputs are available for both areas. The outputs for Mendip will be likely to cover the period to 2029 to be consistent with the emerging Plan in B&NES.

4.4 Although a report looking at objective housing requirements for Mendip has not yet been published, the outputs from the scenarios run suggest that Mendip will be able to meet its objective need within the District boundary. Equally, it is accepted that this is also the case for B&NES.

5.0 Conclusions

5.1 Mendip District Council is content that the analysis of housing market areas is consistent with good practice and that the outputs can broadly be seen to reflect a functioning HMA
for B&NES. Mendip District also appears to have a significant level of self-containment and can be considered as a reasonable proxy for a HMA.

5.2 It is therefore concluded that the respective assessments for the two councils provide a reasonable and co-ordinated basis for understanding and addressing cross boundary housing market issues. Ongoing liaison between the two councils will ensure planning for housing at the local level will ensure any cross boundary issues (such as Frome) will be taken into account by both councils.

5.3 The housing requirements coming out of the SHMA and ultimately through Council decisions also appear to be sufficient to meet the objective level of need in the District with no requirement for this to be met in other locations. Mendip is similarly in the position of being able to meet its own needs with the District boundary.
Appendix 3

Mendip District Local Plan Part I (December 2013)

Para 4.7 referring to Co-operation at site allocations stage on the Bath/Mendip boundary.

The towns of Radstock and Midsomer Norton lie on the northern fringe of Mendip district. The main built extent of these towns lie in Bath and North East Somerset but some built development exists within Mendip. This Local Plan, whilst remaining flexible about development opportunities on land abutting the towns, does not make any planned provision for development, particularly for housing. However, Mendip District Council will work with Bath and North East Somerset Council to consider the development needs of the towns. Where the specific development needs of the Radstock or Midsomer Norton urban area may be best met on land in Mendip District Council's administrative area (in light of robust consideration of all available development options available) the council may consider making allocations of land as part of its Site Allocations process.
Appendix 4

WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY

EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

As agreed between Wiltshire Council and Mendip District Council concerning the relationship between the Mendip District Local Plan and the Wiltshire Core Strategy

1 This Statement of Common Ground is provided in respect of the relationship of the emerging Mendip District Local Plan and the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. This statement is structured to provide the Inspector with a summary of the areas of agreement.

Housing requirements

Strategic relationships

2 There exist significant commuting flows between the two authorities. Indeed, the 2001 Census identified circa 3,000 individuals that commuted from Mendip to Wiltshire, and 1,300 that commuted from Wiltshire to Mendip. This results in net commuting flows from Wiltshire to Mendip of 1,700 persons.

3 The provision of housing or employment in either authority will affect the market and therefore delivery in the other authority. Furthermore, any delivery will impact upon the resultant commuting relationships experienced between the two authorities.

4 There are therefore, planning issues which cross administrative boundaries and paragraphs 178 to 181 of the NPPF apply.

Joint working

5 The former Wiltshire County Council and the district authorities worked closely with Mendip to address cross-border issues. In respect of housing requirements, both Wiltshire County Council and West Wiltshire District Council sat on the working party that delivered the West of England Strategic Housing Market Assessment (STU/02) from 2007 until 2009. Chapter 2 of this report examines the cross-border relationships. This document does not specifically recognise the commuting relationships between these authorities as these are not significant in a sub-regional context. It is clear that Mendip lies in a separate travel to work area (maps 2.3 and 2.4, pages 15-16) and that West Wiltshire’s inclusion in the West of England Housing Market Area was not certain (paragraph 2.1.4, page 9).

6 Mendip are invitees to the Wiltshire and Swindon Housing Market Partnership, established in 2009 and they maintain a watching brief on policy and evidence developments.
Wiltshire and Mendip have continued to work together to identify and address cross-border issues in accordance with the duty to co-operate. A brief summary of this work is included in Wiltshire Council’s Statement on the Duty to Co-operate (WCS/07).

Furthermore, meetings are held between planning officers of the two authorities to review emerging evidence and develop consistent policy responses. A meeting has been held since the publication of the Statement on the Duty to Co-operate on 14th August 2012.

Consultation responses

Each authority has actively participated and responded to the various rounds of consultation on the emerging plans of the other.

Both authorities have previously identified that further account of cross-border relationships needs to be made, but these have been resolved through continuous dialogue. Each authority is supportive of the housing requirement in the others emerging development plan.

The objectives of the housing requirement

Both authorities have developed a housing requirement in conformity with the NPPF (paragraphs 47, 159 and 178 to 181). Each housing requirement aligns to the strategic objectives of the plan to which they relate. The resulting housing requirements are considered compatible.

The housing requirements for both authorities, individually and also in combination are generated utilising population and household projections which allow for migration and population change in conformity with the first bullet point of paragraph 159 of the NPPF.

The housing requirements for both authorities consider the requirement arising from a specific level of projected job growth that is robust.

The housing requirement for both authorities, individually and so also in combination meet the full, objectively assessed need for housing and so place no additional demand for housing on neighbouring authorities in conformity with the third bullet point of paragraph 159 of the NPPF.

Both authorities have a robust Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment in conformity with paragraph 159 of the NPPF.

The assumptions underlying the housing requirement

Both housing requirements are robust, relying on sound evidence.

The housing requirement for Wiltshire is based on robust evidence available at the time of submission (10th July 2012) including the 2008 based population projections (ONS) and household projections (DCLG).

The housing requirement and its distribution
The housing requirements have been distributed in accordance with the role and function of individual settlements, and relationships to neighbouring settlements.

In summary the housing requirements, individually and in conjunction are compatible with one another and in accordance with the NPPF.

**Plan, Monitor, Manage**

It is agreed that the authorities need to continue to work together to consider emerging evidence including that contained in the 2011 Census and the updated DCLG household projections (due March 2013), and flexibly and rapidly respond to this evidence through policy reviews as appropriate.

**Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)**

The policy approach to development that impinges on the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB is broadly consistent in the adopted/emerging development plan of each authority. The local authorities will continue to cooperate on cross-boundary issues which might potentially impact upon the landscape through the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Partnership.

**Conclusion**

Mendip District Council and Wiltshire Council have fully discharged the duty to cooperate.
## Appendix 5

### Duty to Co-operate Meetings (DTC) with Neighbouring Authorities and relevant Notes

For brevity, only selected meeting notes have been included in this appendix as examples of cooperation or where points are directly relevant to agreement or discussion of DTC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Key points of Discussion</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Duty to Co-operate meeting (Members and Officers)</td>
<td>9th November 2012 Innovation Centre, Yeovil</td>
<td>Joint evidence base work (confirmation of outcome), Consideration of a new SHMA for Somerset, County wide Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment update and prospective county wide Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation DPD. Transport matters (county wide), Strategic planning matters (county wide - confirming level of growth and key elements of growth that can be delivered taking into account transport matters et al). Eco initiatives (outcomes), Somerset Levels and Moors, Hinkley Point, Housing Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17th April 2013 Innovation Centre, Yeovil</td>
<td>Progress on SHMAs, GTAA update, Transport - major schemes, Minerals &amp; Waste Planning, Econet project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6th September 2013 County Hall, Taunton</td>
<td>Future DTC arrangements Links to LEP/Growth Strategy Transport, Housing, Environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath NES-West of England Authorities – Mendip – Wiltshire DTC meeting</td>
<td>29th May 2012</td>
<td>Strategic and Local Issues DTC Action Plan Gypsy and Travellers sites.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Strategic Planning Officers Group</td>
<td>30th May 2012 County Hall, Taunton</td>
<td>Duty to Co-operate – Joint evidence base, county wide strategic planning and transport matters, housing strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th June 2013 County Hall, Taunton</td>
<td>Duty to Co-operate – Joint evidence base, county wide strategic planning and transport matters, housing strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11th September 2013 County Hall, Taunton</td>
<td>Duty to Co-operate – Joint evidence base, county wide strategic planning and transport matters, housing strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11th December 2013 County Hall, Taunton</td>
<td>Duty to Co-operate – Joint evidence base, county wide strategic planning and transport matters, housing strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Somerset – Mendip – Sedgemoor DTC meeting</td>
<td>7th September 2011 Mendip Council Offices</td>
<td>Duty to Co-operate Respective housing numbers Potential joint issues Key Housing sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes 1

Duty to cooperate meeting, 9.30am - Friday 9th November, Innovation Centre, Yeovil -

Present: Cllr. Tim Carroll, Martin Woods, Andy Foyne & Jo Manley (SSDC)
Cllr. David Hall, Stephen Walford & Guy Robinson (SCC)
Cllr. Keith Turner & Martin Wilsher (WSDC)
Cllr. Nigel Woolcombe-Adams & John Meeker (MDC)
Cllr. Mark Edwards & Roger Mitchinson (TDBC)
Nick Tait (SDC)
Ruth McArthur (ENP)

Joint evidence base work
- AF recited a list of previous joint evidence base working that presents a clear record of positive past engagement, and evidence of joint working.

SHMA
- The possibilities of undertaking a new joint SHMA were raised. It was concluded that there was no merit in producing a joint SHMA for a number of reasons:
  o Mendip is in a different Housing Market Area and looks to West of England, therefore difficult to find areas of communality and not appropriate to undertake joint working.
  o West Somerset relates to the Northern Peninsular, and has already commissioned Housing Vision who undertook Torridge and North Devon’s SHMA to do their update, therefore not appropriate.
  o Exmoor National Park also relates to the Northern Peninsula and has commissioned their own evidence gathering, therefore not appropriate. Given the special statutory purpose, looking to identify estimated need, rather than requirement.
  o Sedgemoor has very recently committed to reviewing their SHMA. Required urgently due to the potential Hinkley effect so there is a need to commission the work immediately and therefore due to timing and localised imperative, joint working is not appropriate.
  o Taunton Deane had not envisaged updating SHMA until 2014 as existing is fit for purpose. Will continue dialogue with Sedgemoor because of the shared Housing Market Area.
  o South Somerset is looking to commence their own SHMA in latter half of 2013 following examination. Existing SHMA considered fit for purpose for Local Plan examination.
• Agreed that various methodologies should be shared and that all would 'observe' what others are doing and this meeting or successor would be an appropriate forum

Action: - Martin Wilsher and Nick Tait to distribute methodologies to group.

GTAA & GTA DPD
• Agreement that the GTAA needed updating and that it should be done at a countywide level using previous consultants (De Montfort University with Jo Richardson leading for the University). Clear merits in using existing consultants who should be able to update existing GTAA relatively quickly/cheaply. AF informed meeting that an early approach to Jo Richardson indicated an Easter 2013 start would be earliest they could do and an indication of cost was not possible at this stage
• Potential timing issue for Taunton Deane but would be ok if consultants could deliver 3 to 6 months thereafter. Issue of competitive tender process was raised. It was considered that SSDC could appoint as they appointed previously under their rules of procurement as long as a special case could be made.

Action: - AF to establish definitive start date (Easter 2013), establish length of time update will take and establish procurement rules to ensure that there is no requirement to go out to competitive tender.

• Less appetite for a countywide GTA DPD. Majority of authorities have a minimal requirement and feel that they have a 5 year land supply. Agreed to discuss this further at a subsequent meeting but potential to go individual ways on this issue for operational and resource issues.

Action: - matter of joint GTA DPD to be brought to a future meeting.

Transport matters (county wide)
• SW (SCC) updated the meeting on progress on the Somerset, Devon and Wiltshire A303 economic impact assessment study priority. Final study being prepared to be signed off next week. Then onto the Minister. Opportunity to lobby for capital and revenue funding.
• Districts have identified countywide strategic priorities for SCC to consider for post 2015 funding - no new money before then. Priorities will to go into new body, the Local Transport Board, who will have a separate funding allocation, to look at priorities across the Local Enterprise Partnership area. There will be more freedom than in the past, each LTB will have an allocation and will need to establish how to spend it. Potentially £15-16m a year across the authorities comprising the LEP, in other words one major scheme per authority a year. SW thanked authorities for indicating their priorities (although some hadn't) and promised to forward a recent report on the priorities to AF for distribution to the group.

Action: - SW to forward recent priority paper to AF to circulate to the meeting members.

• Regional Growth Fund and Growing Places - £5m threshold dropped, so smaller schemes enabling housing and economic development, could come through this pot.

Strategic planning matters
• There was general confirmation and acceptance of neighbours' scale and level of growth and that they were mutually consistent. West Somerset and Exmoor National Park were in discussion over levels of growth and their location. Mendip in discussion with BANES.
Eco initiatives (outcome of work undertaken)
- SSDC are awaiting confirmation of the urban extension location for Yeovil before applying the energy and waste reports via the future masterplan for the urban extension.
- Taunton Deane in a similar position. Their studies have confirmed that District Heating schemes not viable for them.

Somerset Moors and Levels
- All Councils happy with the outcomes of the Econet project. Taunton Deane and Sedgemoor have SPD’s on biodiversity based on Larry Burrows work at County and SSDC are looking to incorporate into their emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy. General support
- Larry Burrows (SCC) looking to pursue further SPD work on back of the Econet project which will require consideration and co-ordination. Should this be a County wide SPD or will it be picked up separately by Councils. This to be a matter for a future meeting - is there any merit in going beyond the Econet?

Action: - matter of a County wide Biodiversity SPD to be brought to a future meeting.

Hinkley Point
- DH (SCC) indicated that currently considerable work ongoing on the section 106 agreement funds and their distribution. Others wondered how to access such funds.
- General concern on labour and skill impacts and need to ensure through tertiary education sector amongst others that skill shortages for Hinckley and general labour market do not occur.
- DH indicated their intention to set up a Hinckley Point Strategic Delivery Forum and there was general support for this and the SCC intention to involve the other Councils of Somerset within it.

Action: - SW to inform his colleagues and other Councils to be involved in Strategic Delivery Forum once inaugurated.

Housing Strategy
- Co-ordination of housing strategy being proceeded by Somerset Strategic Housing Partnership and this needs to be co-ordinated with Councils’ SHMAs and other documents.

Action:- AF to inform Somerset Strategic Housing Partnership of imminent SHMA programmes and to seek in return programme of Housing Strategy for further consideration.

AOB
- There was agreement that the meeting had been useful and that further meetings should proceed on Duty to Co-operate matters on a 6 monthly basis (or ad hoc if an issue arose). It was agreed that SSDC should act as secretariat for the 1st year and convene a second meeting and then the secretarial duties would pass to another Council.
- There was some discussion about make up of the meeting. General agreement that it should be portfolio holder and Key officer and the same Councils (and ENP) as were at the meeting. There was also discussion that it should be widened to include strategically important stakeholders such as Environment Agency. On the one hand this was all inclusive but on other the Council’s power to act and commonality of interests would be weakened.
After a discussion on this no agreement was reached and it was left to SSDC to investigate out of the meeting with others to gain their individual views

**Action:** - AF to explore wider membership of next meeting with each organisation.

Finally there was a round up of Councils’ Plans progress for information:

---

**Notes - 2**

**Duty to cooperate meeting, 2pm- 8th May 2013, Mendip District Council**

**Present:** M Reep (N Somerset )
Ian Bowen, Andre Sestini (Mendip)
Nick Tait (Sedgmoor)
Sarah Winfield (Somerset CC)

1. **Duty to Co-operate: current activities/information sharing on best practice**

SW no longer has a formal strategic planning role – now a minerals planning officer.

Reference made to recent South Somerset DTC meeting. Somerset authorities considering better structures to address county vacuum. Suggestion that LEP has a greater involvement. It may be that cross-boundary issues are less critical for Somerset authorities? Need to be able to screen out key issues where there is potential for joint working. Joint working on evidence e.g. SHMA, G&T can reduce costs. Key is openness – avoid neighbouring authorities being surprised.

Discussion over role of this group – how useful was it; could it be subsumed within SSPC? Agreed that while greater than local issues were not significant, bi-annual meetings were not onerous in terms of time spent and it was a useful forum for understanding issues affecting neighbouring areas and considering joint responses.

MR mentioned recent RTPI course on co-operating across boundaries at Plymouth – examples now coming through of significance of DTC in the context of development plan examinations. North London Waste Plan and Coventry Core Strategy both found to have failed the statutory test (papers can be viewed at: [http://www.rtpi.org.uk/the-rtpi-near-you/rtpi-south-west/](http://www.rtpi.org.uk/the-rtpi-near-you/rtpi-south-west/)).

2. **West of England DTC schedule**

MR introduced the document which is the first step in identifying the cross-border issues. Test of its effectiveness will be in prioritising issues, identifying actions needed and capturing outcomes. Issues raised at this group have been fed through into the document. Cross border issues identified are strategic housing (SHMA and Core Strategy issues), waste, Mendip AONB, G&T, Severn Barrage, Hinkley Point/National Grid and water supply (Cheddar reservoir).
3. Update on Local Plan progress

North Somerset

Core Strategy subject to successful high court challenge – Inspector found to have failed to provide ‘adequate or intelligible reasons’ for his conclusion that the 14,000 housing target made sufficient allowance for latent demand. As a consequence Policy CS13 is remitted back to the Planning Inspectorate for re-examination. In order to provide the new inspector with the tools to adjust the spatial strategy should the housing requirement increase, nine other policies were also remitted – but the Judge was clear that these were not found to be unlawful per se and can still carry appropriate weight. Re-examination likely to take place late 2013 with re-adoption early 2014.

Progress on Sites and Policies Plan (Consultation Draft February 2013) and CIL (Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule November 2012) will be delayed pending Core Strategy re-examination. Uncertainty over the spatial strategy also likely also to delay the two Neighbourhood Plans at Backwell and Long Ashton which are located on the edge and within the Green Belt respectively.

Mendip DC

Core Strategy pre-submission consultation closed. Will need to reconsider the housing figure with submission late summer and examination in the autumn. It includes the spatial strategy and some DM policies. Work on part 2 local site allocations document to start next year. Intention to introduce CIL, but no timetable yet, although some viability testing undertaken.

Sedgemoor DC

Not working on a site allocations document until after the 2016 Core Strategy review. Recent appeal tested the enabling Core Strategy policy which allowed mixed tenure sites to come forward adjacent to settlement boundaries - appeal dismissed as developer-led rather than community-led (NT to circulate copy). Draft CIL charging schedule being consulted upon.

Somerset CC

Waste Core Strategy adopted. Minerals Core Strategy – consultation finished; working to submit by end 2013. Peat working will potentially be one area of contention.

4. Update on cross-boundary issues

Mendip have responded to B&NES Core Strategy changes expressing concerns about housing numbers and spatial strategy – meeting being arranged.

North Somerset pressure for more housing – what about opportunities to south of Weston in Sedgemoor? Should this be considered?

Planning permission granted for Hinkley Point but a significant delay in project delivery likely – strike price not agreed with government.
Severn Barrage – being promoted by a consortium through a hybrid bill.

Fracking – Somerset and North Somerset share the blocks.

SHMA – Mendip to decide on whether they are still part of WoE HMA.

G&T – Somerset districts are reviewing the evidence base.

Mendip AONB guidance – opportunity for joint working on SPDs. North Somerset concerned about status of the revised SPDs but Sedgemoor consulted on them as part of a package of SPDs and adopted.

Issue of flooding on the levels – political pressure. Does adding growth to towns affect flooding?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Notes – 3
Bath and North East Somerset/Mendip/West of England/ Wiltshire
Duty to Co-operate meeting - Agreed list of issues following meeting of 29th May 2012

Strategic issues

- Links and relationship with West of England Partnership
- General approach to housing supply and economic growth
- Commuting and transport infrastructure
- Traveller policy and provision of traveller sites

Locally significant issues

- Infrastructure planning – CIL, IDP and Reg 123
- Bradford on Avon bats SAC
- Approach to flood management in Bath
- Setting of Bath World Heritage Site
- Green Infrastructure
- Development impact Westbury/Warminster/Frome triangle
- Influence of Bath on Bradford on Avon, Corsham and Trowbridge
- Western Wiltshire Green Belt
- Freshford and Limpley Stoke neighbourhood plan

Issues raised through consultation on Wiltshire core strategy

- Interaction between west Wiltshire towns and Frome (M2011)
- Recognition of neighbouring plans and strategies (M2011)
- Improve cross boundary public transport links between Trowbridge and Frome (M2011, 2012)
• Support employment led growth in Trowbridge, Warminster and Westbury (M2012)
• Support Wiltshire’s proposed housing numbers (B2012) as concerned previously that proposed growth was too high and would not be supported by available infrastructure (B2009)
• Rail network through Trowbridge will need capacity to support growth in trips from development proposals (B2012)
• Green infrastructure policy consistent with BANES draft policy (B2012)
• Traveller policy noted (B2012)
• Sought clarification on the scale of growth proposed at Colerne (B2009)
• Sought clarification on the scale and nature of employment growth proposed at Bradford on Avon (B2009)
• Wiltshire should consider lower GVA given economic circumstances and to relate to BANES proposals (B2009)
• Support approach to employment led growth in Trowbridge, Chippenham and Salisbury and phasing housing to align with jobs (B2011)