

Examination of the South Worcestershire Development Plan

Inspector: Roger Clews BA MSc DipEd DipTP MRTPI

Programme Officer: Helen Wilson BA(Hons)

32 Pennyford Close, Brockhill, Redditch,
Worcestershire B97 6TW

Tel: 01527 65741

E mail: progofficer@aol.com

STAGE 2a OF THE EXAMINATION HEARINGS

INSPECTOR'S MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

The invited participants should use these Matters, Issues and Questions as the basis for preparing their hearing statements.

Apart from the Councils, there is no obligation on participants to address every question in their hearing statements. You need only address those questions relevant to your representation(s). Please remember there is a 3,000 word limit per matter (excluding appendices). See the Inspector's Guidance Note for further information.

If you have nothing to add to your original representations, you may rely on them without submitting a further statement. Please advise the Programme Officer by 4 February 2015 if this is what you intend to do.

All references to policy sections below are to the original Proposed Submission Document (CD001), not the track-change version (CD002). References to Proposed Modifications (PMs) are to the PMs published for public consultation in October and November 2014.

TUESDAY 24 FEBRUARY 2015 AM, beginning at 0930

Matter A1: Development Strategy & Settlement Hierarchy (SWDP 2, Annex D, PM2-5 – excluding SWDP 2 I)

Main issues:

Whether or not policy SWDP 2 A-H and the Proposed Modifications to it set out an appropriate development strategy for the area.

Whether or not the specific provisions in the policy and the PMs are justified and consistent with national policy.

Whether or not the settlement hierarchy at Table 2 and Annex D is correctly identified.

Questions

1.
 - (a) Do SWDP 2 A(iii) & C and PM4 set out an appropriate basis to guide development in the countryside and are their provisions in respect of development boundaries justified?
 - (b) Are SWDP 2 A(iv) & G justified in the priority they give to the development of brownfield land?
 - (c) Is the approach of SWDP 2 A(v) & D to Significant Gaps justified?
 - (d) Do SWDP 2 A(v) & E set out an appropriate basis to control development in the Green Belt?
 - (e) Should additions be made to the Table 3 list of sites regarded as Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt?
 - (f) Are the provisions of SWDP 2 A(vii) & F and PM3 & 5 justified?
 - (g) Are the policy (excluding part I), PM2-5 and the strategy they set out sound in all other respects?
- 2) Is there evidence to support changes to the Settlement Hierarchy contained in Table 2 & Annex D?

TUESDAY 24 FEBRUARY 2015, PM, beginning at 1400

Matter A2: Vision & Objectives, Spatial Context & Overarching Sustainable Development Principles (Introduction, Vision & Objectives, Spatial Context, A New Plan for South Worcestershire, SWDP 1)

Main issues:

Whether or not the Plan sets out an appropriate vision and identifies the key issues and challenges for the area over the Plan period.

Whether or not policy SWDP 1 is necessary and justified.

Questions:

- 1) Does the Plan set out an appropriate vision for South Worcestershire?
- 2) Are the Key Issues and Challenges correctly identified?
- 3) Is policy SWDP 1 necessary?
- 4) If so, is it fully justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

WEDNESDAY 25 FEBRUARY 2015, AM & PM, beginning at 0930

Matter B: Development Requirements & Delivery (SWDP 3, SWDP 2 I, Annex E, PM1, 6-40 & 240 – excluding discussion of individual sites and of matters that were resolved at Stage 1 of the examination)

Main issues: *Whether or not the development requirements set out in the Plan, as amended by the PMs, are appropriate and justified, particularly with regard to their spatial distribution.*

Whether or not the process undertaken by the Councils to identify the additional sites contained in the PMs was appropriate and effective.

Whether or not the Plan contains adequate mechanisms to ensure that the proposed development requirements are achieved.

Questions:

- 1) Is the distribution of the additional housing set out in PM9, Table 4b adequately justified, including by sustainability appraisal [SA]?
- 2) Has there been adequate assessment, including SA and water cycle/flood risk assessment, of the additional site allocations proposed in the PMs?
- 3) Should there be a further review of the capacity of the Green Belt to accommodate development?
- 4) Are the housing delivery trajectories set out in Annex E, as amended by PM240, appropriate and justified by evidence?
- 5) Should the Plan allocate reserve sites in the event that housing does not come forward as expected?
- 6) Are the mechanisms set out in PM6, 7, 36 & 37 for ensuring a 5-year supply of housing land in the different parts of the area throughout the Plan period justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
- 7) Are the provisions of SWDP 2 I, including the Plan review referenced at footnote 8, and PM1 adequate to deal with any additional development needs arising outside the Plan area?
- 8) Are the provisions of SWDP 3, as amended by the PMs, justified and effective in all other respects?

THURSDAY 26 FEBRUARY 2015 AM & PM, beginning at 0930

Matter C: Transport and infrastructure (SWDP 4, 7, Annex I, PM241)

Main issue: Do these elements of the Plan provide a sound basis to secure the infrastructure that is necessary to support the level of development proposed?

Questions:

Policy SWDP 4

- 1) Are there additional transport measures that should be included in policy SWDP 4 to support the level of development proposed in the Plan?
- 2) Does policy SWDP 4 set out adequate mechanisms to secure the provision of the transport infrastructure listed in the policy?
- 3) Are the requirements of SWDP 4 A & F justified and consistent with national policy?
- 4) Are SWDP 4 C, K & L unsound in referring to documents that are not published, are unexamined or may become superseded, or in omitting relevant documents?
- 5) Is the terminology in SWDP4, particularly the references in G, H & M to “major” and “strategic” schemes, clear and consistent?
- 6) Is SWDP 4 I correct to say that the planned growth at Worcester is dependent on implementation of the Local Transport Plan 3 Worcester Transport Strategy?
- 7) Is there justification for the requirements for contributions to which D & M refers?
- 8) Is the reference to parking hubs in para 24 of the Reasoned Justification supported by evidence?
- 9) Is policy SWDP 4 sound in all other respects?

Policy SWDP 7 and Annex I

- 10) Do policy SWDP 7 and Annex I, as amended by PM241, set out adequate mechanisms to secure the provision of the infrastructure needed to support the development that is proposed in the Plan?
- 11) Is policy SWDP 7 C fully consistent with national policy in respect of flexibility and ensuring the viability of development?
- 12) Should SWDP 7 A, B, E & F form part of the policy or the Reasoned Justification?
- 13) Are policy SWDP 7 and Annex I sound in all other respects?

TUESDAY 3 MARCH 2015 AM & PM, beginning at 0930

Matter D: Green infrastructure and the historic environment (SWDP 5, 6)

Main issue: *Are the requirements of these policies justified and consistent with national policy?*

Questions:

Policy SWDP 5

- 1) Are the requirements of SWDP 5 A & B supported by clear evidence and consistent with national policy, including in respect of viability?
- 2) Is the requirement in SWDP 5 C(i) for local community backing justified?
- 3) Is SWDP 5 E sufficiently clear as to what constitutes “qualifying development”?
- 4) Is policy SWDP 5 sound in all other respects?

Policy SWDP 6

- 5) Does policy SWDP 6 adequately reflect the national policy requirement for a proportionate approach to heritage assets taking account of their relative significance?
- 6) Is the requirement in SWDP 6 B for development proposals to “conserve and enhance ...” justified and consistent with national policy?
- 7) Is it appropriate for policy SWDP 6 to include reference to landscape?
- 8) Is policy SWDP 6 otherwise consistent with national planning policy, including in respect of enabling development (NPPF para 55), the exceptions listed at paragraph 133 of the NPPF and the reference to local lists?
- 9) Is policy SWDP 6 sound in all other respects?

WEDNESDAY 4 MARCH AM & PM & THURSDAY 5 MARCH 2015 AM, beginning at 0930 on both days

Matter E: Directions for growth outside Worcester City Boundary (SWDP 45 & PM89-149)

Main issues: Whether or not the site allocations contained in the policy and PMs are justified and deliverable.

Whether or not the specific requirements of the policy and PMs are justified and consistent with national policy.

Questions:

The questions below apply to each of the sites proposed for allocation by policy SWDP 45, as amended by the PMs. The sites will be dealt with in turn, in the order listed here:

SWDP 45/1 – Broomhall Community and Norton Barracks Community (Worcester South urban extension)

SWDP 45/2 – Temple Laugherne (Worcester West urban extension)

SWDP 45/4 – Gwillam's Farm (Worcester North urban extension)

SWDP 45/5 – Worcester Technology Park

SWDP 45/3 – Kilbury Drive (Worcester East urban extension)

SWDP 45* – Land at Swinesherd Way

- 1) Are the site allocation and the amount of development proposed for each site justified, having regard to the likely impacts of the development and the provision of necessary infrastructure?
- 2) Is the development proposed for each site deliverable in the timescales set out in Table 18?
- 3) Are the specific requirements of each policy justified and consistent with national policy?

THURSDAY 5 MARCH 2015 PM, beginning at 1400

Matter F: Development at North-East Malvern (SWDP 56 & PMs 176-180)

Main issues: Whether or not the site allocation is justified and deliverable.

Whether or not the specific requirements of the policy and PMs are justified and consistent with national policy.

Questions:

- 1) Are the site allocation and the amount of development proposed for the site justified, having regard to the likely impacts of the development and the provision of necessary infrastructure?
- 2) Is the development proposed for the site deliverable in the timescales set out in Part D?
- 3) Are the specific requirements of the policy justified and consistent with national policy?

15 January 2015