

**THE LONDON BOROUGH
OF SOUTHWARK**

Miss Leonna Staple
Programme Officer

Tel. 0207 525 4954 ext 54954
Fax. 020 7525 4916
Eip@southwark.gov.uk

Meeting Title: Southwark Core Strategy Pre-Hearing

Date: 26th May 2010
Time: 10am – 12.30pm

Place: Southwark Town Hall, Peckham, SE5 8UB

Attendees:	Leonna Staple	London Borough of Southwark
	Simon Bevan	London Borough of Southwark
	Alison Squires	London Borough of Southwark
	Julie Seymour	London Borough of Southwark
	Tim Cutts	London Borough of Southwark
	Barbara-Ann Overwater	London Borough of Southwark
	Michael Carnuccio	London Borough of Southwark
	Jeremy Gill	London Borough of Southwark
	Sandra Warren	London Borough of Southwark
	Ben Sztainbok	London Borough of Southwark
	Rumi Bose	London Borough of Southwark
	Celestina Cann-Adaidoo	London Borough of Southwark
	Jessie Lea	London Borough of Southwark
	Paul Winter	
	Tim Gould	
	Alison Fairhurst	Government Office for London
	Peter Frost	Government Office for London
	Aileen Carlisle	Government Office for London
	Kate Pasquale	TFL
	Camilla Ween	TFL
	Alison Coster	Iceni Projects
	Alan Vinall	
	Matthew Nicholson	GL Hearn
	Neil Chester	TFL
	Neil Kedar	TFL
	Natalie Thompson	Gerald Eve LLP
	Judith Dameell	
	David Watkinson	Greater London Authority
	Vally Wilson	Resident Objector
	Donnachadh Mcathy	Burgess Park Action Group (BPAG)
	Stephanie Lodge	Southwark Pension Forum (SPF)
	Jennifer Quinton-Chelley	Southwark Disability Forum (SPDF)
	Caroline Hewit	Indigo Planning
	Liliana Dmitrovit	Peoples Republic of Southwark (PRS)
	Ari Henry	Peoples Republic of Southwark (PRS)
	Luke Miller	Friends of Nursery Row Park (FNRP)
	Richard Lee	Resident Objector
	Celia Cronin	Friends of Nursery Row Park (FNRP)

Vally Wilson
Rory McManus
Mark Mihajlovic
Mathew Brewer
Victor Ferreino
Samantha Coster
Felicia Onabanjo
Councillor Stephen Grovier
Julienne Chen
Jerry Hewitt
Steven Fidgett
Sofia Roupacia

Resident Objector
DP9
Camberwell New Road Regeneration
Crushman Waterfield

English Heritage
Willowbrook
LBS

Hawkstone TRA
Resident
Resident

Apologies:

David Hammond
Rose Freeman
Carmelle Bell
Jeremy Leach
Alistar Willis
Alex Trouton
Alun Evans
Amandeep Kellay
Amy Jones
Andrew Tong
Bernard Bourdillon
Carly Bowles
Cllr Caroline Pidgeon
Christine Beavon
Claire Treanor
Claire Dickinson
David Hammond
David Jassby
David Morris
Eileen Conn
Emma Rodley
Fiona Colley
Gabriel Brown
Giulia Bunting
Greg King
Jerry Flynn
J Mark Dodds
Jack Widdup
Jacqui Andrews
Jane Gleeson
Janet Laban
Jonathan Shelton
Jonny France
Julian Carter
Lawrence Quail
Lucas Hollweg
Lucy Owen
Marie McKeogh
Maria Budgen
Martin Harradine
Nenu Prashar
Nick Cuff
Olatunji Adebayo
Patrick Blake
Patrick Grincell
Pauline Adenwalla
Peter Garwood-Gowers

Natural England
The Theatres Trust
Thames Water
Southwark Living Streets
Signet Planning

CGMS Consulting
Turley Associates
DPP
Metaphorm Limited
London Gypsy and Traveller Unit
Thames Water Utilites
London Borough of Southwark
P&ES Ltd
DP9
Peacock & Smith
Natural England
Woodland Views Ltd
DP9

DP9
Nunhead & Peckham Rye Community Council

Drivers Jonas
Sustrans

Berkeley Group
Howard Sharp & Partners
Firstplan
City of London
Workplace Plc
SE5 Forum
GVA Grimley Ltd
JB Planning Associates Limited

Port of London Authority
RPS Planning & Development
Borough Market
Urban Studio Ltd
DP9
C B Richard Ellis
TA Property Consultants
Highways Agency
Savills

Resident Objector

Peter Jennings
Rachel Lucus
Richard Lemon
Richard Ward
Sean Tickle
Steve Swain
Stuart Blakley
Tom Leighton
Vicky Woolett

No named attendee
No named attendee
No named attendee
No named attendee
No named attendee
No named attendee
No named attendee
No named attendee
No named attendee
No named attendee

Distribution All of those above.

Inspector: Mr Andrew Seaman, BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

National Lichfield and Partners
Roger Tym and Partners
DP9
Rolfe Judd Planing
Environment Agency
Bartonwillmore

Staffordshire Homes UK
British Telecommunications Grp Plc
London Development Agency
Department of Communities
Thames Water Property Services
Great Minister House
Lambeth Council
Bromley Council
Corporation of London
Government Office for London
Lewisham Council

Item

1.

Introductions

The Inspector introduced himself as a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute and the independent Inspector appointed by the S of S to conduct the Examination into the Soundness of the Southwark Core Strategy (CS). He explained he was also appointed to undertake an examination into the Canada Water Area Action Plan in the autumn.

The Inspector also introduced **Leonna Staple** as the Programme Officer (PO).

Attendees were reminded to sign the attendance list.

2.a

Inspector and Programme Officer

The Inspector explained that his role is to consider the soundness of the Core Strategy. In so doing he would consider the representations made by others to the Plan AND any other matters, irrespective of whether any representations have been made, which could indicate that the Plan is unsound.

Following the close of the Examination he will report to the Council with conclusions and any changes required to the Plan. He will not review in detail the content of individual representations but will concentrate on the main issues, which they raise with regard to soundness. The aim is to ensure that the CS provides a sound strategic basis for the future planning of Southwark Borough. The report and its conclusions will be binding on the Council if it decides to formally adopt the document.

The Inspector explained that the scope for making changes to the document is limited. Without suspending the process it is difficult to make changes to the Core Strategy, which would affect its substance, and/or prejudice the Sustainability Appraisal or public consultation, which has already taken place. The Council could make minor changes, but if it does so it needs to publish and update a schedule of all changes, which it may invite the Inspector to recommend.

The PO acts as the main point of contact between the Inspector, the Representors, and the Council. She will maintain the reference library of Examination Documents, which inform the hearing sessions, and an updated documents list on the Council's web pages. Any Representor can use the hard copies available at the Tooley Street offices, preferably by prior appointment. Many of the key documents are available via the Council's web site. The PO will also keep the hearings programme up to date and is the person to whom all documents and submissions connected with the hearings should be sent. She will also be the person sending out the hearing session agenda papers and any additional papers for use by people actively participating in the public hearing sessions. She will help resolve queries about the process in general, or representations in particular. Her contact details are:

Tel: 0207 525 4954

Email - Eip@southwark.gov.uk

The Council's Planning Team introduced themselves:

1. Mr Simon Bevan, **Head of Planning and Transport**
2. Ms Julie Seymour, **Planning Policy & Research Manager**
3. Ms Alison Squires, **Planning Policy Team Leader**
4. Ms Barbara-Ann Overwater, **Senior Planning Policy Officer**
5. Mr Tim Cutts, **Planning Policy Team Leader**
6. Mr Michael Carnuccio, **Planning Policy Team Leader**

2.b

Purpose of PHM

It was explained that the PHM was an opportunity for procedural and administrative matters to be explained and discussed, together with the form and likely content of the programme of hearings. The substance or merits of the Core Strategy itself was not discussed.

2.c Purpose and Scope of the Examination

It was explained that the purpose of the Examination is to examine the soundness of the Core Strategy. The examination process is intended to be quick and efficient, concentrating on the soundness of the document, having regard to the representations. The Inspector's starting point is that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound document and that such soundness is clear from its evidence base. Others must be able to show that this is not the case by evidence presented either in writing or at the hearings. Those seeking changes to the Core Strategy have to demonstrate why the document is not sound and how the suggested changes would make it sound.

The tests of soundness broadly focus on three main areas:

- Firstly, Procedural: whether the Core Strategy has been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme & Statement of Community Involvement, whether the relevant Regulations have been followed, and whether it has been subject to sustainability appraisal;
- Secondly, Conformity: whether the Core Strategy is a spatial plan consistent with national planning policy and in conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy, having regard to relevant plans and strategies of adjoining areas and the Council's Community Strategy;
- Thirdly, Coherence, consistency and effectiveness: whether the strategies and policies are coherent and consistent and the most appropriate in the circumstances, having considered relevant alternatives; whether they are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, with clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring and whether the plan is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances.

It was explained that those seeking changes must demonstrate why the CS is unsound by reference to one or more of the tests of soundness and say what they think should be done to make it sound. PPS12 offers further guidance.

The Inspector explained that his final report does not have to deal with each and every point made in each and every objection – but will focus upon matters which go to the fundamental questions of soundness.

2.d. Hearings Procedure and Examination Programme

The Hearing sessions of the Examination into the CS are scheduled to commence at 10.00am on Tuesday 20 July 2010 and a draft programme is in circulation. They will take place in the Council offices at Tooley Street:

- The hearing format provides an informal setting for dealing, by discussion, with a range of 'matters and issues' identified by the Inspector.
- Only those parties seeking specific changes to the Core Strategy are entitled to attend the hearing sessions.
- There is no need for those supporting or merely making comments on the Core Strategy to attend.
- There should be no need for people pursuing their cases in writing to expand on their original representations because these should have identified the ways in which the Core Strategy is considered to be unsound and what changes are suggested to make it sound.
- Where participants relying on written representations feel that it is necessary for them to put in further material and respond to the Matters and Issues, this must be submitted to the Programme Officer in accordance with the timetable below.
- The Council will not be asked to respond to each and every representation.
- Representations made orally or in writing carry the same weight and equal regard will be had to each.
- Attendance at the hearings will only be helpful if participants wish to contribute to the debate constructively.
- Participants may bring professional advisers but space around the table will often be limited. There is no formal presentation of evidence or cross-examination and, as the discussion is focussed on the issues identified in the agenda, it is important that the person able to make the most useful contribution should sit forward.
- Relevant parties will be drawn into the discussion to enable representors to air and

explain the nature of their concerns and to help the Inspector gain the information necessary to come to a conclusion on the matter/issue.

- If participants find that other people have raised the same issues as themselves, they are encouraged to join forces and appoint a spokesperson. This can save time at the Hearings, by avoiding repetition of arguments, and can result in a more forceful presentation of evidence.
- The Programme Officer will provide name boards for each participant which should be stood on end to indicate a wish to speak. In that way contributions can be invited as the discussion unfolds.

A revised hearings programme is attached.

It will be the responsibility of individual participants to check the progress of the Examination, either on the website or with the PO, and to ensure that they are present at the correct time.

The morning hearings sessions will normally start at 10.00am and the afternoon sessions at 2.00pm. A short break will be taken mid morning and mid afternoon. Lunch will be taken about 1.00pm. It is currently anticipated that there will be 6 sitting days spread over two weeks.

2.e Representations and the submission of further information

In making their submissions, representors should have already indicated whether they wish to attend the hearings to discuss their representations or to have their views considered in written form. **Both methods carry the same weight.** Attendance at a hearing session will only be useful if representors wish and need to participate in a debate. If you change your mind about your preferred method of pursuing your representations you must confirm this in writing or by email to the Programme Officer explaining your reasons.

It was explained that due to a need to double check the Council's database the allocation of participants to hearing sessions is ongoing. It will be complete shortly. Those identified on the draft Hearing Programme (v1) were asked if, having seen the draft programme, they continue to wish to pursue a duly made representation at one of more of the scheduled sessions to confirm this in writing or by email with the PO by June 2nd so that the numbers for each session can be finalised and practical arrangements made.

If a representor had previously expressed a wish to appear at a hearing session but had not been listed as a participant on the draft hearing programme, they were advised to contact the PO as to which session they would like to attend.

Agents/individuals representing more than one party/client and who may be invited or wish to attend various hearing sessions were asked to advise the PO which sessions they would wish to appear at and the organisation they would be representing.

The Inspector explained that he would be focussing on the Matters that he considered to be the most significant as set out in his schedule of Matters & Issues. The hearing sessions will follow an inquisitorial, rather than adversarial, approach. The original representations made on the Submission Document will largely be taken as read.

It was explained that as the CS is not site-specific the Examination would concentrate on strategic issues rather than particular sites or particular developments. However, on occasions it will be necessary to touch on specific sites, for example as relates to open space and preferred industrial sites.

The Examination Hearings are not the place to explore concerns with the Council other than relate to the soundness of the document.

A further version of the Matters and Issues for debate is attached, changes are *italicised*. These should give every Representor a 'hook' on which to hang the main thrust of their concerns about the CS. If you consider that an essential point has been overlooked or omitted please alert the Programme officer in writing or email ASAP and the Inspector will try to work in the point if there isn't already an obvious place for it in the schedule.

A final agenda for each hearing session will be issued approximately 10 days before that session commences. At the start of each hearing session the Inspector will make brief-opening comments before inviting individuals to make their contribution in response to the questions posed. People will be drawn into the discussion to enable matters to be clarified and so that

firm conclusions can be drawn. There will normally be an opportunity to ask questions of the other side.

Representors have the opportunity to amplify their representations in response to the Matter and Issues identified. If this is to be done in writing, brevity is essential. The tests of soundness are key and representors should be clear about what should be changed in the document and how.

The right to appear and be heard at the Hearings applies specifically to those who have made representations that the Core Strategy is in some way "Unsound". Supporters of the plan have no statutory right to be heard but, if considered helpful on a particular topic, the Council may choose to include them as part of their team to explain how and why they support the Council's approach.

Any further statements need to explain:

- Which particular part of the Core Strategy is unsound?
- Which soundness test(s) does it fail?
- Why does it fail?
- How can the Core Strategy be made sound?
- What is the precise change/wording that is being sought?

Relevant statutory and other key bodies been actively engaged in the LDF process. The Council confirmed that it did not intend to call any such body to attend the relevant hearing sessions. The Inspector indicated that he would extend invitations as necessary.

The Inspector requested that English Heritage be present at the hearing session on Design, tall buildings and heritage, if possible. The Inspector may personally invite such bodies and their attendance will be appreciated, to be able to rely on these organisations for professional input at the relevant moment so that he can understand the constraints, opportunities and technicalities of the borough.

The Council confirmed that their have been 81 objectors raising 787 representations. As this differed with figures contained in the submitted Consultation Statement and Submission Report, the Inspector asked for the figures to be rechecked. – Southwark Council

The Council indicated that its intended approach to the Hearing sessions would be to assess the Matters and Issues against the evidence base and thereby focus on areas where further submissions were required.

(Q) Mr McCarthy, BPAG: The council has now changed political leadership but the new administration opposes the significant amount of the current document, where does that lead to the process of the council's approach to the strategy to the core strategy examination in public

(R) Council's summary response (Julie Seymour): The council voted through the Core Strategy unanimously. The Lead Member has been briefed and the Council is pursuing the submitted document.

The Inspector noted the comments and advised that the Examination process would continue as envisaged in lieu of any change in Council stance or legislative amendments.

The Council confirmed it was working to agree matters relating to student housing with the GLA and an outstanding issue with TfL – to be complete by June 8th.

Following receipt of the Representations, the Council is proposing Changes to the Submission Document. These are shown in the Table of Changes (Doc Ref CDGS17).

(Q) Mr Ari Henry, PRS: Can representations can be made to the changes tabled in the Tables of Changes documents.

(R) The Inspector indicated that further, predominantly minor, changes can be made subject to limitations.

(Q) Richard Lee, Resident Objector: How we would raise the point that these changes are in fact major, what would the process be?

(R) The inspector advised that the relevant hearing session would be the forum to explore such

matters.

The Council indicated that no other changes are proposed or being contemplated at present.

Hearing Statements from the Council and from representors and any amplified written representations also responding to the M & I Schedule, should be submitted to the PO by close of business on:

For Week 1 hearings – Tuesday 29 June

For Week 2 hearings – Friday 2 July

There is no need for representors to wait for any statements the Council may submit. All Hearing Statements and amplified written representations should address the identified Matters and Issues for Examination. None of the statements should exceed 3,000 words plus essential appendices (3000 words per matter). Any submissions longer than this will be returned for editing. It is intended that all submissions will be available on the Council's web pages and form part of the Examination Library. Information for email.

Nothing should arise at the Hearings which has not been raised in the previous consultations except, possibly, insofar as new national and regional policy or other unforeseen/unfolding events are concerned.

There is no need to prepare a further statement on matters/issues if all the points are already covered in the original representation. Participants were asked to notify the PO if they do not intend to submit any further statements so it is clear their original representation represents their views.

It was explained that Statements of Common Ground can be useful in focusing on the issues in dispute and should be submitted within the timescale set out at the PHM. Agreement should be sought on factual matters and statistics even if differing conclusions were drawn thereafter.

The Inspector explained that the hearing statements, amplified written representations and any statements of common ground could enable him to refine and revise the questions to be dealt with at the hearings. Such changes will be kept to a minimum to avoid confusion and would be circulated in the hearing session agendas.

The smooth running of the Examination is dependent on everyone sticking to the deadlines set.

Document Copies and Referencing

The following advice applies:

- A4 portrait format
- An electronic copy of the document in 'Word' format
- 4 copies (unless demonstrably impractical/unreasonable)
- Punched with 2 holes and no wire or comb bindings;
- no more than 3,000 words per Matter;
- identified on top RH corner with:
 - Matter No / Hearing Session title & date
 - Personal Objector Reference No
 - Representation No
 - Send to email

Changes proposed to the CS to make it sound need to be spelt out.

2.f Core Documents

The Council has produced a number of key documents most of which are available on the Council's website. These are known as Core Documents and a list is available.

An Examination Library has also been created containing a range of such documents including:

- the development plan
- national policy statements
- any background and topic papers
- supporting core documents

- Council's evidence base documents
- representations made at submission stage

2.g Site visits

The Inspector indicated that he has already visited some parts of the Borough in order to acquaint himself with the area and the issues it faces. He indicated that he will carry out further visits prior, during and after the hearing sessions and that most, if not all, such site visits will be unaccompanied. If, exceptionally, there are areas of private land which representors consider the Inspector needs to see to understand their representations, then details must be sent to the PO to allow suitable arrangements to be made.

2.h Close of the Examination and submission of Inspector's Report

The Examination formally opened when the Core Strategy was submitted (end of March 2010) and will not formally be closed until the Inspector completes his report – likely to be in October. This will allow further information to be sought if necessary. Further representations or evidence will not be accepted after the hearing sessions have finished unless specifically requested. Any late or unsolicited material is likely to be returned

3 Procedural Questions for the Council

The Council answered a series of procedural questions:

- *It confirmed that the Core Strategy (CS) has been prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures of the 2004 Act and the associated regulations, including in respect of publication and availability of documents, advertisements and notification.*
- *It confirmed that the CS has been prepared in accordance with the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) – the latter of which has been revised.*
- *It confirmed that the CS has been prepared in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and met the minimum requirements of the relevant regulations in terms of consultation and publicity.*
- *It confirmed that the CS has meet the Regulations 31 (D) and (E), discharged by the Consultation report CDCS 16.*

(Q) Mr McCarthy BPAG: The consultations on this document and the complexities of the LDF process and its implications for public engagement. Mr McCarthy stated that only 23 local objectors and no local amenity societies have made any submissions, and they would have had a massive amount of input to be offered to the process. The LDF has now multiplied into 90 different documents and multiple different time lines, which has made it very confusing for local community groups.

(R) The Inspector noted the comment and that the matter of engagement be explored further at the hearing sessions.

- *It confirmed that the CS has been subject to sustainability appraisal with a final report of the findings.*
- *It confirmed that CS is in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy and that this has been confirmed by the Regional Planning Body. The council responded (Julie Seymour): The agreed position was that there is general conformity except for one issue with regards to the proposed changes to the local student issue if this was not resolved it would be taken forward for discussion at the Examination in Public for the ?????, in order to find common ground. The Inspector will like to examine this issue further at the hearing sessions.*
- *It confirmed that the CS has been screened for likely significant effects on any European Wildlife (Natural 2000) sites within and near the plan area and that an appropriate assessment been carried out.*
- *It confirmed that the CS will contain a list of superseded saved policies as necessary (the UDP policies have not yet been saved). Awaiting agreement by the GOL which will be done before the public hearings in July.*
- *It confirmed that the CS does take account of the Council's other plans, including the adopted UDP and the Sustainable Community Strategy.*
- *It confirmed that the CS does take account of the plans of adjoining local authorities and the Mayor of London including any relevant transport plan.*
- *The programme for the preparation of other DPDs is being met.*
- *The Council was unaware of any fundamental procedural shortcomings.*

- *The Council confirmed that the Regulations have been discharged.*
- *The Council advised it was seeking to resolve issues pertaining to student accommodation with the GLA. Additional work is being undertaken which aims to incorporate a Statement of Common Ground on this matter.*

4

Questions

A number of questions were raised, summarised below:

1. Ms Alison Fairhurst, GLA (point of clarification): Monitoring of general conformity of the existing and draft London Plan, should there be any issues with the draft London plan, will/could this be picked up as part of the Council's monitoring process?

(R): The Inspector confirmed that his Matters and Issues relating to the general conformity of the CS with the draft London Plan were intended to enable a discussion to be had in relation to flexibility.

2. Mr Lee, Resident objector: raised a question on community participation in hearing sessions, as several of the community groups have made representations and they have not been invited to speak; would this be possible, and would it also be possible to send out a message to encourage representors to appear and speak?

(R): The inspector stated that representors were asked to indicate whether they wanted to speak at the hearing in the representation submission process and many did not make this indication. However the allocation process is still on going and any requests to speak must be made via the Programme Officer. The final programme for the hearing will be sent to all those who have made representations so that they can make a decision as to their next actions/attendance.

3. Mr Ari Henry, PPS: raised a question on the notification period and the difficulty that the community may have in making arrangements for attending, and the requests for editable format as we have been asked to submit editable formats. Mr Henry has requested editable documents.

(R): The Inspector responded on the point of the notification period. He stated that in essence the notification is a sufficient amount of time for statements to be made. Any further concerns to be submitted to the PO. Julie Seymour stated that they do not wish to provide the documents in an editable form, to avoid confusion of versions. She informed that if anyone needs particular extracts then this can be discussed further.

4. Ms Jennifer Quinton-Chelley, SPDF: Will there be a gallery at the main hearing at Tooley Street, Microphones and speakers, which enable people to hear more clearly? Question to the room, could objectors contact details be made public so that objectors can join together and work together?

Question on Open Spaces and Community Facilities, the present paper does not include Community Facilities. This is a problem, as the hearings do not include this for discussion.

(R): There will be space made at the Hearings for observers who have informed the PO of their attendance and microphones and speakers for voice projection will also be arranged, to enable everyone to hear the discussions better. With regards to sharing details, participating objectors in the room could gain benefit from working alongside anyone, they should make contact with each other. The PO will coordinate where possible. However, this will be pending confirmation from the requested party, so we comply with data protection.

5. Mr Jerry Hewitt, Hawkstone TRA: raised the issue of confusion and over exhaustion on consultation. He requested clarity of relationship with the Core Strategy and CW AAP.

(R): The inspector noted My Hewitt's points. He indicated the importance of the time lines and that this is a crucial time for community residents to indicate, with regard to their original representations, which session they would like to attend.

6. Mr Neil Kendar, TFL: Question on their representation over-lapping several hearings, which one would be the most appropriate to attend.

(R): The Inspector advised to consult with the PO.

7. The Inspector was invited to consider whether a range of issues were covered by his indicative list of Matters and Issues including those involving cycling, food and faith. The Inspector would consider the need for any changes to the Matters and Issues.
8. A discussion was had on the ability of Representors to bring expert advisors to the hearing sessions – the Inspector confirmed that this was, in general terms, acceptable. It should not be used as an opportunity for individuals to attend who had not submitted a duly made representation.
9. It was agreed that a list of further evidence documents would be produced to support the core documents listed by the Council – details of such additional documents to be forwarded to the PO.
10. Mr Lee raised the point of the number of copies required when submitting written statements, he asked whether it would be possible for the Council to make these copies in particular for the representors not representing an organisation.

(R): The Inspector informed Mr Lee that he is not in a position to commit resources on behalf of the Council, Mr Lee will have to ask the Council directly as to see if this a reasonable request which they can action.

Mr Lee also raised: Matter 2 '*Sustainability, equality, proposals map and general presentation*', which he considered to be currently unclear as to whether it would encompass a discussion around the issue of 'equalities'; Matter 3 – questions on growth options for Southwark, it's not clear how the issues around deprivation can be discussed; Matter 6 – shopping centre and entertainments, land for food issues, demands on open space and future of street markets, its not currently obvious as to whether these will be included in the discussion.

(R): The Inspector advised that such concerns should be raised in the first instance with the PO and he would liaise in response.

11. The Inspector stated that there would be an opportunity to discuss the production of the revised proposals map in the planned Hearing Session 1.
12. It was agreed by the Council that the Fact Check report from the Inspector would not be publicised in advance of his final report.
13. Mr Steven Fidgett, Alliance Planning: raised the point of file details, if possible could the Council ensure that there is sufficient information on the file names as to when it was uploaded and the version number. Also as documents are issued, can they be sent out in good time?

(R): The Inspector noted these points and stated that endeavours will be made to ensure that info is sent out in good time.

14. Mr Mark Mihajlovic, CNRR: question on evidence, if they can identify policies in place over the last 10 – 15 year, and can identify failure in Southwark, can this add extra weight to the representations?

(R): The Inspector was unable to confirm what weight he would attribute to different types of evidence; such matters would be dependent on the robustness of any submissions and the outcome of possible discussions as to its content.

15. The Inspector identified that he could not compel individuals to attend hearing sessions. Therefore, he would not directly invite identified individuals who had made relevant representations to attend the relevant hearing sessions. Nonetheless, all objectors would receive copies of the PHM note, which explains the next steps of the Examination process, including the hearings programme and the methods by which further necessary evidence could be submitted (which could include a request to attend the hearings).
16. The Inspector agreed, subject to time constraints and other considerations, to consider holding a short review session of the examination hearings and the possibility of producing a short report thereafter.

The Council raised a few points:

- Website reorganisation may find it difficult to find document, which are on there, please contact, the PO or the Planning policy team for assistance.
- Willowbrook who represent community groups and individuals who help with planning advice and making representations have altered the manner in which they can assist. Please contact the PO or the Planning Policy team, to ensure you get the advice and information required.
 - Southwark Council Planning Policy Team:
Tel: 0207 525 5403
Email: Planningpolicy@southwark.gov.uk

Summary

The Inspector identified five summary points:

- Equal regard will be had to views put orally or in writing
- Be succinct
- Meet the target dates
- Focus on the Matters for Examination and the tests of soundness
- Be clear in saying how you think the DPD should be changed

The Inspector thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 12.30.