

An AI(artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

1. Meeting details

- **Examination:** South Tyneside Local Plan – Stage 2 Hearings
- **Date:** Wednesday 21 January 2026
- **Location:** Hotel venue used for the hearings (with livestream and recording)
- **Inspector:** David Spencer, appointed by the Secretary of State
- **Programme Officer:** Annette Fenny (independent)

Main agenda items

1. Conclusion of discussion on Matter 9 (Climate Change & Healthy Communities)
2. Conclusion of Matter 11, Issue 3 (Plan-wide viability; developer contributions)
3. Minerals and waste (briefly)
4. Implementation, monitoring and administrative session with the Council

2. Attendance (named participants in this session)

Council and advisers

- David Spencer – Planning Inspector
- For the Council:
 - Paul Shadarevian KC – Counsel for the Council
 - Deborah Lamb – Operations Manager, Spatial Planning
 - Rachel Cooper – Senior Planning Policy Officer
 - Matt Clifford – Senior Planning Policy Officer
 - Rian Lavick – Planning Policy Officer
 - Michael Vasey – Climate Change Team
 - Samantha Jobson – Environmental Protection Operations Manager
 - Mary Fairfield – Public Health Practitioner
 - Christina Hardy – Senior Advanced Public Health Practitioner
 - Justin Lynch – senior officer supporting the team (referred to later by Inspector)
- External technical advisers:
 - David New – CP Viability (plan-wide and site viability work)

Other participants

- Chris Martin – Home Builders Federation (HBF)
- Jack Conroy – Savills (for Lick Hall Farm Ltd and Durham Cathedral)
- Cllr David Herbert – South Tyneside Green Party
- Dave Green – Save the Fellgate Green Belt Working Group

3. Climate and energy policies (Policies 5 & 6 – Matter 9)

3.1 Policy 5 – Sustainability statements and “standards”

Issue: Justification and operation of requirements for Sustainability Statements under Policy 5 (MIQ 9.8).

Council position:

- Sustainability Statements are already on the Council’s validation checklist; Policy 5 is intended to clarify expectations.
- Content is to be **proportionate** to scheme scale, with particular focus on major developments delivering significant impacts towards sustainable development and climate ambitions.
- Statements must show:
 - Adaptation to climate change
 - Carbon reduction measures
 - Water management
 - Site waste management
 - Sustainable materials use

An AI (artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

- If proposals cannot address these satisfactorily, the Council expects evidential justification.

Key concern: wording of “standards” in Part 4

- Inspector noted the policy **does not set its own standards**, yet Part 4 requires compliance with “standards”, creating ambiguity.
- Council clarified that “standards” was intended to mean the matters listed in criterion 3 (themes for the Sustainability Statement), not external numeric standards.
- Council confirmed it is **willing to change the wording** and clarify distinction between:
 - Areas where external statutory standards exist (e.g. building regulations, future homes standards, EV charging); and
 - Areas where planning judgement must be used in absence of external standards.

Council action / commitment:

- Review and modify paragraph 4 of Policy 5 to:
 - Avoid the term “standards” or clearly re-define it;
 - Distinguish between meeting external legal/regulatory minima and meeting locally expected outcomes under criterion 3;
 - Ensure developers better understand what is expected.

Validation / triggers for Sustainability Statements:

- HBF (Chris Martin) raised concerns that:
 - “Major development” captures a wide range of proposals, some not warranting a Sustainability Statement (e.g. some s.73 applications).
 - NPPF paragraph 44 requires information to be proportionate and streamlined.
- Council clarified:
 - Validation checklist specifies where Sustainability Statements are required and **does not apply** to s.73 scenarios in the way feared.
 - Council sees no need to amend Policy 5 trigger text because the validation checklist is the operational tool.

Conflict / disagreement noted:

- HBF questioned whether having both a broad policy requirement and a narrower validation checklist is potentially inconsistent; suggested policy might be unnecessary if validation list suffices.
- Council maintained that a **policy foundation is necessary**, set alongside validation procedures, and that minor wording changes (not removal) are the solution.
- Cllr Herbert argued that wording is “very vague” and that higher local expectations are needed to align with the borough’s net-zero 2045 pledge, potentially exceeding minimum national standards.

An AI (artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

3.2 Policy 6 – District heat networks and renewable/low-carbon energy

3.2.1 District heat networks (part 6, MIQ 9.9)

Council explanation:

- Policy requires new development **within 400 m** of existing or emerging district heat networks to be **designed so that it could be connected** to the network.
- Connection itself is **encouraged but not compulsory**; there is a caveat that proposals can demonstrate infeasibility, insufficient capacity, or a more sustainable/appropriate alternative energy strategy.
- Existing and emerging networks:
 - River source heat pump scheme – existing
 - Hebburn energy scheme (air source heat pump) – existing
 - West Hallburn Renewable Energy Network – **emerging**, technically feasible and found viable in design work but currently on hold due to funding; still in Council plans.
- 400 m buffer selected because efficiency drops with distance; Council judged 400 m as an appropriate viability/efficiency threshold.

Technical description of connection requirements:

- Within a dwelling: boiler replaced by a **heat exchanger**; otherwise, similar layout and power consumption.
- External works: insulated pipe connecting property to main network; main infrastructure typically at a central energy centre with occasional additional pumping stations at the edge of large housing sites.

Concerns from development interests:

- HBF (Chris Martin):
 - Supported having a method to encourage connection but considered policy **too stringent and too prioritising** district heating over other low-carbon approaches.
 - Argued that alternative technologies (including future innovations) might be equally or more sustainable and should be fully accepted, not only if “more sustainable” than heat networks.
 - Raised consumer protection concerns: lack of choice, potential exposure to higher or less regulated prices for heat network customers.

Support and broader opportunity arguments:

- Cllr Herbert:
 - Highlighted extensive **mine-water heating potential** across South Tyneside due to disused mine workings; described this as proven technology with efficient water-source heat pumps.
 - Cited past “missed opportunities”, e.g. Crown Shaft estate built around western Crown Shaft mine without district-heating-ready design, making retrofit costly.
 - Argued that “anywhere in South Tyneside” could be eligible for this kind of district heating and that requirements to design for easy conversion are justified.

An AI(artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

Council response / justification:

- Council (via Paul Shadarevian KC) emphasised:
 - This is not a forum to adjudicate technology types; policy seeks to **promote** a move toward carbon neutrality using district heating where opportunities exist.
 - There is **no compulsion** to connect; only a requirement to make developments within 400 m capable of connection.
 - Policy is justified and effective as drafted and does not, in the Council's view, require modification.

Small/windfall schemes concern:

- Inspector queried practicalities for single dwellings and small windfall schemes within 400 m:
 - Council indicated such cases would be assessed at application stage; where unreasonable, developers could rely on the feasibility/proportionality caveat.

Points of disagreement:

- HBF considered the policy **too prescriptive** and potentially damaging to innovation and consumer choice.
- Council firmly maintained the policy is **justified as is**, subject only to reliance on the existing caveat about feasibility and sustainability of alternatives.

3.2.2 Wind energy (Policy 6 part 3, MIQ 9.10)

Change triggered by 8 July 2024 Ministerial Statement:

- Council confirmed, through a Statement of Common Ground with Historic England, proposed modifications to:
 - **Delete Map 15** from the plan;
 - Amend opening sentence of Policy 6 part 3 (wind energy) and paragraph 7.29 for clarity and consistency with updated national policy.
- Inspector indicated deletion of Map 15 and wording changes will likely need to be treated as **main modifications**, subject to consultation.

General stance on renewables:

- Policy 6 part 1 supports renewable and low-carbon energy in appropriate locations, where there are no unacceptable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.

4. Healthy communities and health impact assessments (Policy 1)

4.1 Justification and threshold for HIA (MIQ 9.? / 11.?)

Council rationale:

- Policy 1 is the overarching health and wellbeing policy, informed by:
 - Council's health and wellbeing vision and strategy;
 - Evidence of **significant health inequalities** in South Tyneside.
- Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) are seen as:
 - An **efficient tool** to assess health impacts of new development;
 - A way to secure early, cross-disciplinary conversations (planning, public health, communities) to shape place for health (housing, transport, play, crime prevention etc.).

An AI (artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

- Threshold of **100 dwellings** (or 1 ha non-residential) chosen to:
 - Capture schemes with meaningful potential health impacts;
 - Avoid disproportionate burdens on smaller schemes;
 - Align with the Council's existing validation checklist.
- Council noted intra-regional consistency: Newcastle, North Tyneside and Gateshead all use a 100-dwelling HIA trigger via their validation lists.

Public health team evidence:

- 80–90% of health is driven by **wider social determinants** rather than healthcare alone; HIAs support early design choices that can reduce chronic risks and promote healthier lifestyles.
- HIAs will be supported by **Council HIA guidance**, under preparation, covering:
 - Headings/indicators to assess;
 - Process from early engagement to evaluation and follow-up.
- HIAs will be monitored to test effectiveness of the process and outcomes.

Inspector's issues:

- Sought clarification on added value of HIAs given health has already been assessed at **strategic level** through sustainability appraisal.
- Council and public health team responded that:
 - SA covers strategic, high-level issues;
 - HIAs pick up **fine-grain, site-specific effects** that are only visible once detailed schemes are designed.

Concerns from development interests (HBF):

- NPPG says HIAs are a useful tool **where significant impacts are expected**; HBF argued:
 - There is no evidence that significant effects suddenly arise at 100 dwellings exactly.
 - A more proportionate approach is to have a **screening stage** once a size threshold is reached; if screening shows likely significant effects, then a full HIA is triggered.

Council's stance on threshold and use:

- Counsel (Shadarevian) argued:
 - HIAs are about both identifying risks and **shaping positive health outcomes**, such as encouraging healthy lifestyles.
 - Policy is consistent with PPG; principal question is whether 100 is too high (i.e. should smaller schemes also need HIAs), not whether it is too low.
 - No change to policy wording is needed for soundness, but supporting text should reference emerging HIA guidance so developers know where to find more detail.
 - For schemes with Environmental Impact Assessment, health matters can be addressed as an **integrated health assessment** within the EIA rather than a separate HIA document.

Other viewpoints:

- Cllr Herbert:
 - Considered HIAs "very important" so that all dwellings are fit and healthy to live in; noted some authorities use thresholds as low as 10 or 50 dwellings.
 - Argued that even small schemes can have meaningful health impacts and HIAs for such schemes should be simple rather than onerous, not omitted.

An AI (artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

Areas of disagreement:

- HBF remained concerned about:
 - Lack of explicit **significance test** linked to PPG;
 - Justification for a hard 100-dwelling threshold without screening.
- Council maintained its approach is justified and proportionate; potential change is limited to referencing guidance, not revisiting the threshold itself.

5. Air quality (Policy 2)

5.1 Council position and policy scope

- The latest **Air Quality Status Report 2025** (Post-Sub50 on the examination website) shows **no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)** in the borough and no specific severe hotspots requiring designation.
- Policy 2 is a **borough-wide development management policy** to:
 - Ensure development does not exacerbate existing air quality issues or cause new ones;
 - Operate via the validation checklist, which sets out where air quality assessments are required.
- Policy links to broader plan ambitions:
 - SP26 sustainable transport;
 - Policy 22 green/blue infrastructure;
 - Policy 1 on healthy communities.
- Air quality and emissions were addressed in Sustainability Appraisal under **Objective 3**, covering both:
 - Distance from AQMAs;
 - Policy-level effects on air quality.

National objectives / WHO guidelines:

- Policy 2 refers generally to “national objectives” for air quality; it does not specify numeric thresholds, allowing it to remain aligned if standards change.
- Council confirmed that local air quality management uses statutory Defra limit values (e.g. 40 µg/m³ for NO₂ and PM10) even though WHO has proposed lower guideline levels.

5.2 Cllr Herbert’s extensive concerns

Cllr Herbert delivered a detailed statement highlighting:

- **Health burden of air pollution nationally and locally:**
 - Air pollution is the single biggest environmental threat to health in the UK (citing Defra/UK-wide evidence).
 - South Tyneside life expectancy is below national average; COPD emergency admissions approx. 50% higher than national.
 - Asthma hospital admissions in children 0–9 reported as 75% above national average.
 - Nationally 40,000 early deaths annually are linked to air pollution; some will be in South Tyneside.
- **WHO guideline changes since 2005:**
 - NO₂ recommended level reduced from 40 to 10 µg/m³ (1/4 of original).
 - PM2.5 guideline reduced from 10 to 5 µg/m³.
 - WHO stresses there is **no safe level**, i.e. harm continues even below guideline values.

An AI (artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

- **Local trends and hotspots:**
 - Earlier air quality assessments (pre-2025) showed **worsening NO₂ levels**, despite static population; car ownership has risen.
 - He referred to **Cleadon Lane / Cleadon village (Boker Lane area)**, where he stated pollution levels were about three times the WHO recommended NO₂ level.
- **Impacts on healthcare system and quality of life:**
 - Bradford study: a high proportion of GP attendances and A&E visits for respiratory complaints were linked to days of high air pollution.
 - Polluted air undermines Council's aims for residents to live "happy, healthy and fulfilled lives", especially for vulnerable groups (children, elderly, pregnant women, people with chronic conditions).
- **Critique of current planning approach:**
 - Existing planning assessments focus too narrowly on traffic; gas boilers can contribute up to ~12% of urban air pollution but are often overlooked.
 - Cited NPPF text (para 186/192 depending on version) requiring plan-making to:
 - Sustain and contribute to compliance with limits;
 - Consider cumulative impacts;
 - Identify opportunities to improve air quality at **plan stage**, not just at application stage.
 - Argued the Local Plan should carry out a **borough-wide air quality and traffic modelling exercise** now, considering all allocations together, instead of waiting until after adoption.
- **Implementation and delivery concerns:**
 - Past Council Air Quality Action Plan promised borough-wide modelling after the Local Plan was finalised; he argued that is "too late".
 - Noted limited evidence of mitigation conditions (e.g. street trees) being used effectively; car ownership and congestion continue to rise, public transport is worsening.
 - Air Quality Steering Group referenced in Council documents has not yet been set up.
 - Characterised the current approach as "whack-a-mole": reacting to local AQMA hotspots individually rather than taking a **strategic approach** to reduce pollution everywhere.

Council response:

- Acknowledged the importance and sensitivity of the issues raised; stressed that:
 - Policy 2 is **limited to land-use planning** matters and development-related impacts.
 - Wider air quality actions (e.g. borough-wide initiatives) are pursued through other strategies and are reported in the Air Quality Status Report.
- Confirmed:
 - Statutory limit values are set by Defra and Council must operate within that legal framework;
 - Policy's reference to "national objectives" makes it inherently flexible if national or statutory limits change in future.

Areas of unresolved tension:

- Cllr Herbert considered the Plan **insufficiently proactive** on air quality and wanted borough-wide modelling ahead of adoption and stronger direct plan-level mitigation requirements.
- Council maintained that:
 - SA and Air Quality Status Reports are adequate at plan level;
 - Policy 2, combined with transport and GI policies, is effective for development management;
 - Additional strategic actions can be addressed outside the Local Plan policy framework.

An AI (artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

6. Developer contributions, forward funding and viability (Policy 60 & Matter 11)

6.1 Policy 60 – forward-funded infrastructure (MIQ 11.10)

Key issue:

- Policy 60 part 3 allows **developer contributions to be secured retrospectively** where it has been necessary to **forward fund**. Development industry concerns were that this might conflict with the CIL Regulations / lawful tests.

Council justification:

- Sometimes it is necessary to **forward fund infrastructure** in anticipation of capacity pressures (e.g. schools, transport).
- A policy hook is needed to:
 - Allow the Council or another public body to invest upfront;
 - Then recover a **proportionate share** from developments that generate the need, at a later stage.
- The intention is:
 - To support developer cash flow (avoiding very large early outlays), particularly on phased schemes;
 - To maintain clear links to the **Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)**, which identifies what infrastructure is required to support planned growth.

Legal / drafting refinements offered:

- Council accepted that wording should improve clarity and conform to CIL tests:
 - Change “forward fund development” to “**forward fund infrastructure**” necessary to facilitate development.
 - Explicitly frame contributions as “**proportionate developer contributions**” to infrastructure required to make development acceptable.
- Council confirmed:
 - No items in the current IDP are presently flagged as requiring forward funding; this is a **flexibility provision** for potential future scenarios.
 - Any retrospective contributions would only arise from **prior agreement** (e.g. s.106) where the developer had accepted obligation to repay once viability/cash-flow allowed.

Concerns raised (Dave Green, Hebburn Green Belt Working Group):

- Highlighted large up-front infrastructure requirements associated with Policy SP8 (White Mare Pool area) and adjacent schemes, including:
 - Docks Road / Dunston Drive junction works (s.106 & s.278);
 - Victoria Road / Mill Lane junction (~£500k);
 - “White Mare Pool interim” measures before 2030, with uncertain funding;
 - Mill Lane works (~£1m – some external funding required);
 - Abingdon Way works (~£250k) to manage traffic through Felgate.
- Concerned that:
 - Development could commence (and farming businesses be displaced) before **critical off-site infrastructure** is in place;
 - Funding shortfalls or delays would leave residents bearing increased congestion and safety risks.
- Sought assurance that **funding is secured before works start**, not merely in principle.

An AI(artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

Council response:

- Reiterated that:
 - No forward-funded infrastructure is currently programmed in the IDP; any such approach would need to be mutually agreed and reflect CIL tests.
 - Policy 60 is a **borough-wide policy**; specific SP8 issues will be dealt with via IDP updates and detailed agreements.

6.2 Viability evidence and plan-wide conclusions (Matter 11, Issue 3)

Viability evidence:

- CP Viability (David New) has:
 - Prepared baseline testing and a 2023 update;
 - Assessed plan requirements and s.106 expectations at typology level.
- Only a brief extract of the viability discussion is in the provided snippet; however:
 - Inspector wanted to confirm **no fundamental viability concerns** existed that would threaten plan delivery when combined with infrastructure and policy requirements.

Key overall conclusions (from the session as captured):

- Inspector noted limited attendance by development interests at this stage, implying **no major unresolved viability objections** beyond those already discussed in earlier sessions.
- The Council maintained that:
 - The plan's policy suite, including affordable housing and infrastructure requirements, remains **viable in aggregate**.

7. Administrative and process matters

7.1 Modifications and schedules

Inspector's requirements:

- At the end of hearings, Inspector expects **three schedules**:
 - a. **Main Modifications** (MMs) – necessary for soundness;
 - b. **Additional (minor) Modifications** – factual/clarificatory, not materially altering policy;
 - c. **Policies Map changes** – including cross-references from MMs where relevant.
- Council should:
 - a. Attempt to **differentiate** MMs and additional modifications in draft;
 - b. Treat any change to operative policy and any supporting text that could affect interpretation/context as a **main modification**.

Evidence and sources of modifications:

- Main sources will be:
 - Statements of Common Ground (e.g. with Historic England, National Highways, etc.);
 - Commitments made during Stage 1 and Stage 2 hearings;
 - Inspector's own directions in his post-hearing letter.

An AI(artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

7.2 Sustainability Appraisal, HRA and IDP updates

- Main Modifications must be accompanied by:
 - **SA Addendum** – LUC has indicated capacity to undertake this work.
 - **HRA Addendum** – Footprint Ecology’s capacity is tighter; discussions ongoing on timescales.
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan:
 - To be updated, especially to reflect updated discussions with **National Highways**;
 - A schedule will be added to the IDP showing **proportionate contributions** of developments to major highway schemes (e.g. White Mare Pool).

7.3 Timetable and elections

- Inspector aims to:
 - Issue his post-Stage-2 letter (with outline main modifications) by end of January or very early February.
 - See a consolidated MM schedule from the Council approximately by the end of the following week (working draft).
 - Achieve **Main Modifications consultation** sometime in **March 2026**, running for six weeks (likely extending into mid-May).
- Pre-election period:
 - Local elections in May create a 6-week pre-election “purdah” from late March.
 - Council believes this does **not preclude** consultation on MMs, but will consider timing carefully.

7.4 Reporting and fact-check

- Subject to the above timetable:
 - Inspector’s goal is to deliver his **report by end of May or first week of June 2026**.
 - Council will receive a **fact-check version only**, not an opportunity to reopen issues; corrections will be limited to factual errors and mis-labelling.

7.5 Thanks and closure

- Inspector:
 - Thanked the Council’s officers (Lamb, Cooper, Clifford, Lavick, Routledge), legal adviser (Shadarevian), transport adviser (Trevor Male), development management witness (Geoff Horseman) and viability consultant (David New) for their professional and honest contributions.
 - Expressed strong appreciation for Programme Officer **Annette Fenny** for managing communications and logistics.
 - Confirmed he considers he now has **sufficient evidence** to assess soundness, subject to MM consultation.
- Hearings were then **formally closed**.

An AI(artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

8. Consolidated list of key actions (with responsibilities)

1. **Modify Policy 5 wording around “standards”**
 - Clarify expectations in Part 3 and revise Part 4 to:
 - Avoid ambiguity about “standards”;
 - Distinguish external statutory standards from matters assessed through planning judgement.
 - **Responsible:** Council planning policy team (R. Lavick / policy officers) with legal input from P. Shadarevian.
2. **Prepare detailed modifications to Policy 6 (wind energy) and delete Map 15**
 - Implement the changes agreed with Historic England (SoCG) to reflect July 2024 ministerial statement.
 - **Responsible:** Council planning policy team; Historic England consulted.
3. **Prepare HIA guidance document**
 - Develop guidance to support Policy 1, covering methodology, headings, process and monitoring for HIAs.
 - Reference the guidance in Policy 1 supporting text.
 - **Responsible:** Public Health team (M. Fairfield, C. Hardy) with planning policy (D. Lamb).
4. **Include reference to HIA guidance in the Local Plan text**
 - Update supporting text to Policy 1 to flag the availability of HIA guidance and clarify process (including integration with EIA where applicable).
 - **Responsible:** Council planning policy team.
5. **Clarify and, if necessary, refine Policy 60 wording on forward-funded infrastructure**
 - Amend to refer to “forward funding of infrastructure” rather than “development”;
 - Explicitly reference “proportionate developer contributions”;
 - Ensure alignment with CIL Regulation tests and IDP.
 - **Responsible:** Council planning policy team with legal advice (P. Shadarevian).
6. **Update Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)**
 - Incorporate outcomes of discussions with National Highways;
 - Add a schedule showing proportionate contributions from developments to major highway schemes, including those relating to SP8.
 - **Responsible:** Council planning policy and transport teams (incl. T. Male).
7. **Prepare and agree three modification schedules**
 - Main Modifications (policies and substantive supporting text changes);
 - Additional (minor) Modifications;
 - Policies Map changes, with cross-references from MMs.
 - **Responsible:** Council planning policy team; Inspector to advise on classification where necessary.
8. **Commission SA and HRA addenda for Main Modifications**
 - LUC to prepare SA Addendum;
 - Footprint Ecology to prepare HRA Addendum, subject to capacity and timetable.
 - **Responsible:** Council (commissioning and liaison).
9. **Run six-week Main Modifications consultation**
 - Consult all parties on MMs, SA and HRA addenda, and Policies Map changes;
 - Carefully schedule around pre-election period.
 - **Responsible:** Council, with oversight of Programme Officer (A. Fenny).

An AI(artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 11 (Plan-Wide Viability and Administrative) session on Wednesday 21 January 2026

10. Inspector's post-Stage-2 letter and final report

- Inspector to issue post-Stage-2 letter (with outline MMs and headline concerns) by late January / early February;
- After MM consultation, Inspector to prepare report, aiming for late May / early June, followed by fact-check.
- **Responsible:** Inspector (David Spencer); Planning Inspectorate admin team.

9. Summary of main disagreements / conflicts raised

- **Policy 5 – Sustainability statements:**
 - Disagreement over scope and clarity of “standards” requirement and triggers for statements (HBF vs Council).
- **Policy 6 – District heat networks:**
 - HBF considered the 400 m policy too prescriptive and overly favouring heat networks, with potential consumer detriment and constraint on innovation;
 - Council insisted the policy is justified and effective, with adequate flexibility through the feasibility caveat.
- **Policy 1 – Health Impact Assessments:**
 - HBF questioned evidence for a hard 100-dwelling threshold and sought a screening-based approach linked to “significant effects” as per PPG;
 - Council defended the threshold and rejected the need for a separate screening stage, while agreeing to signpost future guidance.
 - Cllr Herbert argued for **stronger** requirements, possibly at much lower thresholds.
- **Policy 2 – Air Quality:**
 - Cllr Herbert judged the plan insufficiently proactive, lacking borough-wide modelling and stronger mitigation at plan stage, and expressed concern over reliance on outdated limit values compared to WHO guidance;
 - Council maintained the combination of Policy 2, SA and other strategies is adequate within the statutory framework, and that national standards must be followed while policy remains flexible to any future changes.
- **Policy 60 – Forward funding:**
 - Community concern (Dave Green) about infrastructure for major allocations (e.g. SP8) not being in place when development starts;
 - Council emphasised no forward-funded schemes are currently identified, and that any retrospective contributions would be pre-agreed and proportionate.