

Let's Talk
PLAN SELBY

ANSWERS

TOWN	FACILITATOR/PARTICIPANT
TADCASTER	SPAWFORTHS
DATE OF ENGAGEMENT WORKSHOP: 1 ST JULY 2015	

7th July 2015 Revision C

Introduction

This Answers Booklet provide a record of the issues raised in response to the questions as discussed with invited representatives at both the Community and Technical Workshops that were held at the start of the focused engagement (Round 1). They are the views of the attendees and not views of the Council or Spawforth who have been appointed as facilitators and engagement consultants. They are the groups' views and not attributed to individuals. The answers will feed into the wider PLAN Selby process and will form the basis of developing key objectives for the Towns for discussion at follow up workshops for invited representatives (Round 2). The answers to the questions posed for the Community Workshops are at the front, followed by the ones from the Technical Workshop. The questions for the Round 2 workshops, where both groups will get together into a single discussion forum are placed at the back of this booklet.

Round I

Community Group Answers

Community Group: First Session

DISCUSSION GROUP DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 2	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Are the town's existing deficiencies (i.e. areas where services and/or facilities have been identified as possibly lacking) as shown in the Fact Sheets for this session recognised by the group?

- Yes, but with the caveats set out below

Are there any deficiencies that are not regarded as deficiencies by the group or missing?

- None identified

Are there any that are not identified that ought to be added?

- There is a lack of choice of stores in the town and many of the stores lack "depth" in the goods they stock
- No children's equipped play areas within the town centre
- The town does not have sufficient diversity in its shops and services to act as a destination
- It was suggested that the lack of new family housing in the town was resulting in diminishing demand for school places in the local primary schools and concerns were expressed that if more family housing is not built, there could be serious implications for the long term sustainability of the primary schools (this needs further investigation)
- Local people were finding it increasingly hard to stay in Tadcaster as there were either no appropriate houses available or house prices in the town were no longer affordable for many people
- Older people in Tadcaster are struggling to find appropriate accommodation in the town to downsize into resulting in larger properties with low occupancy, that could otherwise be made available for families
- Younger people are struggling to find houses/accommodation in the town and are having to move out of Tadcaster and there was concern about the implications this may have over the longer term
- The group wished to stress that "There is a deficit of housing across the spectrum"

Are the identified needs for the town over the next 15 years as shown on the Fact Sheets, recognised by the group?

- Yes, but with caveats set out below

Are any of the identified “needs” being challenged by the group and what are their concerns?

- The “need” for a new convenience store was qualified by the group who regarded the lack of depth and choice as more significant than the overall amount of floorspace that is currently available
- The “need” for housing should include providing housing in the right locations for the intended occupants. It was suggested that the older persons’ bungalows to the west of the town were too far from the town centre to walk in, and that any housing designed for older people should be closer/within the town centre

Which (if any) of the Renaissance Projects identified in the Fact Sheet are still supported by the community? Are there any additional projects that the group believe ought to be added to the list for further exploration and discussion?

- A bandstand was suggested as a way of providing a community focus/meeting place and attracting events and activities that would appeal to people from outside the town
- Initiatives to encourage a greater range of high quality, independent traders with local sourcing of food to differentiate the convenience food “offer” from that of other towns or that of the major supermarkets
- Initiatives to change the current atmosphere in the town centre which was described by various members of the group as “depressing”, “frustrating” and with a sense of “lack of [community] control”. Others articulated a “sense of loss” and “grieving” for what Tadcaster once was and would like to create initiatives that draw the community back into the town
- Public realm investment to encourage greater sense of community/landlord ownership/care of the town centre environment
- To create a role and identity for the town that allows it to compete/perform alongside other similar towns in the region such as Wetherby

Community Group: First Session

FEEDBACK SESSION DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 17	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Where are the areas of general agreement?

- A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single group

Are there any areas of significant disagreement?

- A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single group

Are there any key actions or investigations required before the Round 2 engagement?

- Assessment of projected primary school places for the town to verify/challenge the assertion that the lack of new housing was starting to have an impact on education provision in the town

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP SPATIAL TECHNICAL ISSUES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 8	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Are the technical constraints shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The technical constraints were discussed and the terminology was explained and clarified. The difference between “green belt” and “green field” was also clarified.

Are there any technical constraints that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- All the constraints were regarded as being significant although less weight/importance were given to the green belt to the north of Tadcaster by some members of the group

Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- No additional constraints were added by the group.

Are any of the identified “edges” such as major highways, rivers and/or railway embankments regarded as being more/less significant than the others? Should these edges be regarded as defining the extent of the settlement forever or in what circumstances could crossing this edge” be regarded as being acceptable?

- The general view was that the southern bypass to the town formed a natural boundary to the settlement and there was little enthusiasm to expand beyond it. Specific concerns were raised about how connectivity to the town centre could be achieved across the bypass and this lack of connectivity would make any housing to the south a “commuter” location for Leeds and York and would be unlikely to have a positive impact on the town centre
- The river was regarded as being a significant edge and the lack of crossings and the substandard width of the paths on the main bridge were identified as key considerations when identifying potential housing developments that could have a positive impact on the town centre

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP SPATIAL OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 17	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Where should the identified growth be located given the known technical issues?

- It was recognised that there were no “easy” options and there was some discussion regarding which areas of green belt the town could expand into as well as a discussion of possible town centre sites
- The area of green belt to the north of the town was recognised as being in walking distance of the town centre and adjacent to a primary school. It was confirmed at the earlier “technical” group meeting that the site was available (i.e. the landowner was prepared to sell it) and there was significant market interest from housing developers who wished to develop it for a range of housing
- The area of land to the north east of the town that that lies outside the green belt was also discussed but it was not clear that the landowner wished to make it available for development. It was also suggested that this location was somewhat remote from the town centre, the “wrong side” of the bridge and may bring limited benefits to the town centre. The landowners or their representatives did not attend either workshop and their views were not presented to the group.
- The central car park was discussed as a possible location for new housing. There was some discussion about the suitability about this location for older person’s accommodation and it was generally felt that older people would be more inclined to use the town centre shops and services during the day. It was confirmed that Selby District Council own the site and it could be made available for housing if alternative provision for the existing parking could be made. There was some concern however about where the alternative parking could be located as it is well used by the community.
- The land to the rear of Sainsbury’s was briefly discussed but it was unclear if there is any landowner willingness to make the site available or if there is any developer interest in purchasing the site and developing it at the densities that are being suggested for this location. No comments were made by the landowner’s agent who attended the meeting.
- The allocated employment site to the south west of the town was regarded as a good location for employment uses but there was concern that if this was developed for housing it would appeal to Leeds commuters. It was not clear who owned the site and whether the land was available for development for either employment or housing uses.

If landowners do not make their land available during the plan period, how can the identified growth be accommodated and what are the implications for the rest of the Selby District?

- The only significant site that is currently being promoted in Tadcaster where there is confirmation of landowner willingness to sell plus evidence of developer interest is the land to the north of Tadcaster which currently lies within the green belt. It is understood that this site is potentially large enough to meet a significant proportion of Tadcaster's identified housing needs but its green belt location is a significant issue that would need to be addressed.
- If an alternative location for public parking cannot be identified, then the central car park may not be available for housing development
- It was recognised by the group that if Tadcaster did not identify sufficient housing land, then other settlements would need to make up any shortfall

What are the implications of the growth options on say infrastructure and local existing services and facilities?

- It was suggested that the land to the north of Tadcaster could support the local primary school that is adjacent to the site and provide improvements to pupil drop-off and collection arrangements. It was recognised that there would be impacts on local junctions within the town and that these would need to be assessed. It was also suggested that development in this location would be able to use/support town centre shops and services
- It was recognised that the land to the north east of the town could also support local schools but the distance to the town centre was more significant and this may discourage residents in this location from using the shops and services to the west of the bridge

Are there any potential benefits of developing in a particular location

- It was recognised that all the suggested/proposed sites had their challenges but that Tadcaster needed to find land for new homes to allow it to retain/attract a wide range of age groups and families. Were it not for its green belt designation this area was emerging as the preferred location given its links/proximity with the town centre and school

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP TOWN CENTRE TECHNICAL ISSUES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 11	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The technical issues shown on the drawings and in the fact sheets were recognised by the group. Some verbal explanation was provided regarding some of the terminology used in the key.

Are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- All the technical issues shown on the drawings and in the accompanying fact sheets were regarded as being relevant by the group

Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- No additional technical constraints were added by the group although concern was raised about the limited number of land and property owners in the town and it was suggested that this was limiting the opportunities for new and/or expanding businesses

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP TOWN CENTRE OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 20	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues discussion and the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town centre should be contracted or expanded?

- The suggested expansion of the town centre boundary to the east of the town around the existing bus station was discussed and the issue of pedestrian connectivity to the west of the town was raised again. There were no strong views for or against this proposed change

What are the consequences of a “do nothing option”?

- The general sentiment was that the “do nothing” option was “not an option” as the lack of development and growth over many years was having an adverse impact on the town centre

Based on the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, where might new town centre businesses be encouraged to locate and what might be preventing them from currently being attracted to these locations?

- There was concern about the quality of the public realm and shop fronts. It was felt that there were enough vacant shops in the town to accommodate future growth and that future growth ought to be focused on the existing historic town centre

Based on the observations and experiences of the group members, what may be done to make the town centre more attractive to customers, increase footfall and town centre prosperity?

- A new “Millennium” bridge to link the east and west of the town
- Development of Robin Hoods Yard
- Creation of a bandstand and a “green lung” next to the vicarage
- Investment in public realm, shop fronts and initiatives to encourage more independent traders to locate their businesses in Tadcaster

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP NATURAL & BUILT ENVIRONMENT TECHNICAL ISSUES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 14	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The technical issues shown on the drawings and in the fact sheets were recognised by the group. Some verbal explanation was provided regarding some of the terminology used in the key. The distinction between green belt and green field was explained to some members of the group and the flood zone classifications were discussed along with their implications

Are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- All the technical issues shown on the drawings and fact sheets were regarded as still being relevant.

Are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- No additional constraints or issues were added by the group

Community Group: Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUP NATURAL & HERITAGE ENVIRONMENT OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 23	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION

Taking into account the earlier technical issues and subsequent discussion as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town could be expanded without adversely impacting on the built and natural environment?

- It was recognised that all the potential housing sites at the periphery of the town would start to encroach into either greenbelt and/or previously undeveloped land. It was also recognised that there were limited opportunities to meet all the identified housing need for Tadcaster within the urban area unless more landowners were to make it available and it was to be built to higher densities e.g. apartments

If there needs to be expansion into the previously undeveloped land within and to the perimeter of the town, are there any areas where the impacts can be minimised, i.e. which are more acceptable than others? What might the implications be of developing in these areas?

- No additional comments were made

Are there any areas of the natural environment that are of lesser quality that may be enhanced or positively transformed through enabling development on or near these areas?

- No additional comments were made

Are there any areas within the built environment, where new development could be sensitively accommodated and the land is available and not technically constrained?

If these are within the conservation areas or near listed buildings, are the sites appropriate of sufficient scale to accommodate that type of development?

- The land to the rear of Sainsbury's (Mill Lane) and the central car park were both referred to. Confirmation of landowner willingness to sell, market interest in developing the sites and the need to identify replacement car parking locations were all discussed

Community Groups: Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION ALL GROUPS TECHNICAL ISSUES / OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS
--

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 26	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single group
Are there any areas of significant disagreement?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single group
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the Round 2 engagement?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Calculation of maximum development potential of the identified safeguarded sites

Round I

Technical Group Questions

Technical Group First Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT	SESSION
OUT 30	Tadcaster	Technical	Round 1	Deficits Needs and Aspirations

QUESTION

The group comprised representatives of one of the large sites currently being promoted and an agent for another major landowner that was attending in an observational capacity only and did not wish to pass any comments. Consequently there were only limited views expressed about Tadcasters deficits needs and aspirations.

Are the town's existing deficiencies as shown in the Fact Sheet for this session recognised by the group?

- Yes (see caveat above)

Are there any deficiencies that are not regarded as deficiencies by the group?

- None identified

Are there any deficiencies that are not identified that ought to be added?

- None identified

Are the identified needs for the town over the next 15 years as shown on the Fact Sheet, recognised by the group?

- Yes

Are any of the identified "needs" being challenged by the group and what are their concerns?

- It was suggested that there is an additional "need" to bring the existing vacant town centre buildings back into commercial use

QUESTION

Are there any aspirations beyond the identified deficiencies and needs?

- It was suggested a linear park running north and south of the bridge had been discussed by some members of the community and would help attract people to the town

Technical Groups First Session

**FEEDBACK SESSION
ALL GROUPS
DEFICITS NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS**

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 33	Tadcaster	Technical	Round 1

- A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single group

Technical Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS TECHNICAL ISSUES – ALL THREE THEMES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 36	Tadcaster	Technical	Round 1

QUESTION

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are the technical issues shown in the Fact Sheet and drawing recognised and understood by the group?

- The attendees did not require any clarification on the land use designations, facts sheet content or drawing annotations

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are there any technical issues that the group does not believe to be particularly relevant?

- None identified

Referring to the baseline information provided as well as their own information prepared to support their own sites or assessment work, are there any technical issues that are not identified on the list that the group believes to be relevant and given further consideration?

- The suitability of town centre buildings to be economically developed to new forms of housing/apartments etc. was questioned
- The “market appeal” of the town centre to businesses and developers was questioned and there was concern that the town had now reached a point where it may no longer be “marketable”
- One of the attendees asked for clarification regarding what work had been done to assess the existing housing stock in the town

Are any of the identified “edges” such as major highways, rivers and/or railway embankments regarded as being more/less significant than the others? Should these edges be regarded as defining the extent of the settlement forever or in what circumstances could crossing this edge” be regarded as being acceptable?

- The bypass was regarded as forming an appropriate southern boundary to the town, although the expansion of the existing grade separated interchange with the A162 to allow additional access and egress onto the A64 was suggested as a way of creating better access to the town

Technical Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS – ALL THREE THEMES

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 45	Tadcaster	Technical	Round 1

Spatial Theme

QUESTION
<p>Where should the identified growth be located given the known technical issues?</p> <p>The only input into this session was from the agent and owner of the land to the north of Tadcaster who identified the following reasons for expansion into this part of the town:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Good pedestrian links into the town centre along the river• Ability to support the adjacent primary school with the construction of new family housing• Ability to provide drop-off and collection area for the school and improve the current arrangements• Ability to deliver around 550 new homes in a variety of tenures and housing types• Significant market interest in developing the site from major house builders
<p>If landowners do not make their land available during the plan period, how can the identified growth be accommodated and what are the implications for the rest of the Selby District?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It was noted that if Tadcaster did not identify sufficient land to meet its housing needs, either other settlements would need to increase their provision of housing and/or this could strengthen the case for the proposed new settlement at Headley Hall to the west of Tadcaster
<p>What are the implications of the growth options identified earlier in the discussion, on say infrastructure and local existing services and facilities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• None identified
<p>Are there any potential benefits of developing in a particular location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please refer to earlier response to first question from the landowner/promoter

Town Centre

QUESTION
<p>Taking into account the earlier technical issues discussion and the findings of the retail study as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town centre should be contracted or expanded?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There was no representation from town centre developers and promoters and landowners therefore there was no specific feedback at this session other than a general query as to what the rationale was for the bus station area now proposed for inclusion in the new town centre boundary as recommended by GVA Grimley in the Retail & Leisure Study (May 2015). Please also refer to Community feedback in earlier notes as this was more comprehensively covered at that workshop
<p>Based on the observations and experiences of the group members, what may be done to make the town centre more attractive to customers, increase footfall and town centre prosperity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A public park or town green was suggested

Natural and Built Environment

QUESTION
<p>Taking into account the earlier technical issues and subsequent discussion as well as the observations and experiences of the group members, are there any obvious areas where the town could be expanded without adversely impacting on the built and natural environment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• None identified
<p>If there needs to be expansion into the previously undeveloped land within and to the perimeter of the town, are there any areas where the impacts can be minimised, i.e. which are more acceptable than others? What might the implications be of developing in these areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No additional matters were raised
<p>Are there any areas of the natural environment that are of lesser quality that may be enhanced or positively transformed through enabling development on or near these areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• None identified
<p>Are there any areas of the natural environment that are highly valued and/or well used by the community that they would wish to see retained and potentially enhanced going forwards?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• None identified

QUESTION

Are there any areas within the built environment, where new development could be sensitively accommodated and the land is available and not technically constrained?

- None identified

If these are within the conservation areas or near listed buildings, are the sites appropriate of sufficient scale to accommodate that type of development?

- Further work is required to understand the capacity of the central car park

Technical Groups Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION TECHNICAL ISSUES / OPTIONS & IMPLICATIONS

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 54	Tadcaster	Community	Round 1

- A feedback session was not required due to the workshops being run as a single larger group

Round 2

Combined Technical & Community Groups Answers

Combined Groups First Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS REVIEW OF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES

Up to six separate working groups of around 10 people per group

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 60 OUT 61 OUT 62	Selby Tadcaster Sherburn	Community and Technical	Round 2

QUESTION

SPATIAL

Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any “deficits, needs and aspirations” need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

TOWN CENTRE

Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any “deficits, needs and aspirations” need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

QUESTION

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Does the summary of issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any “deficits, needs and aspirations” need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

Do the objectives relating to the towns existing deficits reflect the discussions of the community and technical meetings?

Do the objectives relating to the towns future needs reflect the discussions of the community and technical meetings?

QUESTION

Are the aspirational objectives reflective of the Round One discussions? Are they too aspirational or not ambitious enough?

Is there any additional community or technical feedback on the original Round One questions that has not been captured during the Round Two debate that requires further consideration?

Combined Groups First Session

FEEDBACK SESSION REVIEW OF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES

All groups come together for a general feedback session

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 63 OUT 64 OUT 65	Selby Tadcaster Sherburn	Community	Round 2

QUESTION

Where are the areas of general agreement?

Are there any areas of significant disagreement?

Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year?

Combined Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS REVIEW OF TECHNICAL ISSUES

Up to six separate working groups of around 10 people per group

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 66 OUT 67 OUT 68	Selby Tadcaster Sherburn	Community and Technical	Round 2

QUESTION

SPATIAL

Does the summary of **TECHNICAL** issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

TOWN CENTRE

Does the summary of **TECHNICAL** issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Does the summary of **TECHNICAL** issues as raised at the Round One meetings reflect the points made by the attendees? Are there any changes needed or do any technical matters need adding that were either missed or were not mentioned at the Round One meetings?

Combined Group Second Session

DISCUSSION GROUPS REVIEW OF OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Up to six separate working groups of around 10 people per group

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 69 OUT 70 OUT 71	Selby Tadcaster Sherburn	Community and Technical	Round 2

QUESTION

SPATIAL

Do the spatial options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?

TOWN CENTRE

Do the town centre options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?

NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Do the Natural and Built Environment options set out in the summary document reflect the groups' discussions and concerns from Round One and are there any areas that have been missed or require amendment?

Combined Groups Second Session

FEEDBACK SESSION TECHNICAL ISSUES PLUS OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

All groups come together for a general feedback session

REFERENCE	TOWN	GROUP	EVENT
OUT 72 OUT 73 OUT 74	Selby Tadcaster Sherburn	Community	Round 1

Technical Issues

QUESTION
Where are the areas of general agreement?
Are there any areas of significant disagreement?
Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year?

Options and Implications

QUESTION

Where are the areas of general agreement?

Are there any areas of significant disagreement?

Are there any new Options that have been raised by the groups that were not previously considered in the earlier sessions?

Are there any key actions or investigations required before the next round of consultation later in the year?

