

	Starting with Core Strategy
Question	Has it been prepared in accordance with Local Development Scheme inc. timetable etc. Apr 2011?
FR	Yes
	No comments from Government?
FR	Yes – referred to Local Government Body (CLG) but responded with no comment.
	LDS - March 2012 adoption
SP	may be doing Site Allocations DPD as Neighbourhood Plans format not yet agreed – to go to Cabinet.
Question	Will Supplementary Planning Documents be produced?
	Probably yes – programme for their delivery in LDS
Question	Any challenges to Core Strategy
	No challenges to legal requirements
Question	Has Core Strategy been subject to SA
FR	confirmed ongoing
AH	Para 3 pg 2 ref to Sustainability Appraisal Report has recommendations that will be incorporated into CS.
	Post publication changes subject to Sustainability Appraisal last month – see Addendum report
	Will be looking at consultants to look at further changes prior to adoption.
	No other challenges to SA
Question	Appropriate Assessment carried out to satisfaction of Natural England?
AH	Early 2010 screening exercise draft January final April
	Natura 2000 Sites – None in Hyndburn but some within the county which the Habitat Assessment looked at. Natural England content, no concerns
Question	National Planning Policy – Core Strategy prepared in accordance with?
FR	Yes and have undertaken self assessment of soundness.
Question	When Government offices still here looked at pre-publication Core Strategy – some concerns i.e. changes to Greenbelt. Have these been addressed?
SP	- Yes, the advice was CS should be able to justify proposals in line with National Policy

	see Greenbelt Topic papers
Question	What's Council view on Draft National Planning Policy Framework
SP	If there are areas of controversy less weight should be attributed than more substantive areas which reflect current national policy
SJP	Secretary of State issued decision Cambridgeshire - as this NPPF document is in draft and subject to change it was given little weight Inspector clarified Huncoat representors' concern over weight to be given to draft NPPF.
Question	Would you imagine Core Strategy having to be reviewed if draft NPPF is approved?
SP	Don't believe it is out of kilter - may need to look at depending on final definition of sustainable development. Content that the plan is sustainable. Certificate of conformity will be needed. Remaining LDF docs need to get on with.
Question	Draft NPPF not yet government policy Regional Spatial Strategy Conformity Regional Policy uncertain and confused in last 12 months. HBC believes Core Strategy conforms with NWRSS. Some issues raised by former Government Office. Confirmed these have been addressed. Regional Planning Body – No response in relation to conformity of Publication and revised versions but confirmed earlier version of documents conformed.
Question	Any challenges to conformity with RSS? - No Regional Spatial Strategies to be abolished. NWRSS currently part of Development Plan and Core Strategy needs to conform with it. Partial review – includes provision for Gypsies and Travellers
Question	Has partial review re gypsies and travellers been submitted as a supporting document? –

SP	<p>confirmed no. Inspector requires relevant Partial Review docs to be submitted including Panel report.</p> <p>Partial Review went to EIP and no further.</p>
SJP	<p>Not going to be progressed?</p>
SP	<p>Yes will not progress</p>
SJP	<p>Secretary of State decision in Bude – Disregarded Panel report but had regard to technical evidence insofar as it had not been superseded by more recent information.</p>
SP	<p>agreed approach</p>
Question SP	<p>Does Core Strategy align with Sustainable Community Strategy? Yes, LSP was involved throughout preparation. No challenges</p>
Question	<p>Does Core Strategy comply with Local Development Regulations? No issues , no challenges</p>
Question	<p>What happened to Local Plan</p>
SP	<p>Out of date and partially saved</p>
Question	<p>Is there sufficient reference to the Lancs. M&W DF? Will be discussed later in programme</p>
Question	<p>Published Core Strategy, received reps and then prepared revised publication version?</p> <p>Yes. Further changes proposed at submission stage - bound within Submission version - changes affected</p> <p>There are two schedules of changes:</p> <p>First set covers changes made to revised publication version and resulted in submission version.</p> <p>Second set (1st July edition) covered changes post submission needed to bring up to date and corrections. Respond to some representations made at Revised Publication stage. Published on web site, no formal consultation undertaken. Included changes to Huncoat.</p>
JM	<p>Version dated September 2011 Encompassed: all July changes;</p>

	<p>numbered; balance development strategy (issued separately previously); and details of changes not pursued. Also Includes some minor changes outstanding</p> <p>P21 of of FPCs Sept 2011 version shows yellow line – changes above that line all included previously</p> <p>Variety of changes – went through referring to document Numbering needs be synchronised.</p>
SJP	<p>Need to be careful about changes Inspector can duly make recommendations re the soundness of the plan</p> <p><u>Homework list</u> Suggest look through changes and highlight any which go further than minor changes.</p> <p>2.0 Vision and Objectives</p>
Question	Does Core strategy clearly set out vision and spatial objectives?
SP	Para 32 – 76 sets out the Vision
Question SP	<p>How did the Vision evolve? Core Strategy evolved by understanding key issues (Issues & Options Consultation) - developed more detailed options (Preferred Option) Conscious of Sustainable Community Strategy - developed in parallel with the Core Strategy - key themes of Core Strategy reflects themes of Sustainable Community Strategy</p>
Question	Does the Vision reflect local issues?
SP	Hyndburn 'Place to Be' is the starting point but recognised the need for more flesh on bones. Believe it focuses on Hyndburn but also relates to neighbouring areas and areas with similar issues.
SJP	How does the Core Strategy address "life Chances etc" reference to document page 24,
SP	Happy that Core Strategy reflects those principles and will deliver what Sustainable Community Strategy wants in spatial terms. E.g. diversity, educational achievement, whilst can assist, not directly involved. There needs to be a proportionate approach.
Question	Do cross cutting themes link with multi area agreement?
SP	Yes on a strategic level, Reference to Pennine Lancs documents throughout CS.

Question	Core Strategy contains clear and locally distinctive strategies? 6 Strategic Objectives (pg 31 – 32) could be applied anywhere?
SP	Yes. headline objectives are quite general but supplemented by sub headings which make specific to Hyndburn. Gave example of housing objectives and sub-objectives to achieve balanced housing market.
Question	How have objectives been translated to policies?
SP	There is a clear link between objectives and policy. Referred to section B of Statement, Gave example of Economy diagram Pg 35 which sets out objectives Identified 4 main themes - employment sites - sufficient employment land - Development Strategy for existing employment sites - Town Centre Pg 41 – Similar approach for housing
SJP	Referred to representation seeking a change to objectives, mentioned following: - Grimshaw re: new housing on Greenfield Sites
Question	Content objectives cover that point?
SP	Detailed matter for consideration later.
SJP	Don't talk about Greenfield at moment – content it shouldn't
SP	Yes if need to identify site on urban fringe will look at
SJP	At the moment do we have a map/plan showing areas of special restraint
SP	Yes but not a saved policy.
SJP	Requested a copy of the Local Plan Proposals Map. Need to include the SHLAA Arndale concerned about extent of primary retail area – first objective
SP	Felt what they were asking for was too detailed and is dealt with in the AAP.
SJP	Representation on behalf of Grimshaw - nothing in objectives to confirm housing provided in variety of locations. Content that Core Strategy properly acknowledges where likely locations are?

The notes of this meeting are intended as a general account of the meeting and are not a verbatim record

SP	Core Strategy does that. 3.19 gives priority to Brownfield land development, refers to specific greenfield locations but doesn't explicitly exclude other Greenfield land?
SJP	Matter will be properly addressed using Core Strategy as strategy for site selection process
SP	Yes
SJP	No proposed further changes? Apart from Para 3.16
SP	No – just minor change. Break – reconvene 2pm