

	<p>5 - Regional Strategy</p> <p><i>PM</i></p> <p>6 - Green Belt</p>	<p>James Fennell - NLP for Cribbs Mall Nominee 1&2 & J T Baylis David Lander - Boyer Planning Dominic Lawson – Dominic Lawson Bespoke Peter Roberts - Barton Wilmore Simon Fitton - RPS</p> <p>Regional Strategy Peter Roberts - Barton Wilmore Jacqueline Mulliner - Terence O'Rourke Peter Stacey - Turley Associates James Fennell - NLP for Cribbs Mall Nominee 1&2 & J T Baylis</p> <p>Green Belt Jill Kempshall - CPRE Jacqueline Mulliner - Terence O'Rourke John Baker - Peter Brett Associates Dave Redgewell - SWTN Graham Parker - P J Planning Jeremy Cahill QC for PJ Planning Ian Jewson Planning Ltd Jon Adams - Tetlow King Chris Willmore - Yate Town Council Peter Stacey - Turley Associates David Lander - Boyer Planning Simon Fitton - RPS Liz Summers – GVA Grimley Tim Roberts – DLP Planning Ltd Colin Chapman – Bristol City Council Jonathan Porter – Barton Willmore Ann Bartaby – Terence O'Rourke</p>
<p>Day 2</p> <p>Wed 20 June</p> <p>KCC</p>	<p><i>AM/PM</i></p> <p>7 - Spatial Strategy and Location of Development</p> <p>8 –Provision and Distribution of Housing</p>	<p>Spatial Strategy (Chpt 4) & Location of Development (CS5) Ian Mellor - Barton Wilmore Dave Redgewell - (SWTN) Graham Parker - PJ Planning Jeremy Cahill QC for PJ Planning Ian Jewson Planning Ltd – John Baker – Peter Brett Associates Chris Willmore - Yate Town Council Peter Stacey - Turley Associates Keith Sullivan - Oldbury Parish Council Ann Bartaby – Terence O'Rourke Jacqueline Mulliner – Terence O'Rourke David Lander - Boyer Planning Kevin Gibbs – Chair of the Bristol Chamber of Commerce Planning Committee Simon Fitton - RPS Graham Lanfear (Chpt 4)</p> <p>Provision and Distribution of Housing (CS15) David Lander - Boyer Planning Graham Parker - PJ Planning Jeremy Cahill QC for PJ Planning Ian Jewson Planning Ltd Jacqueline Mulliner – Terence O'Rourke Jeff Richards - WYG Planning John Baker – Peter Brett Associates Chris Willmore - Yate Town Council Peter Stacey - Turley Associates Rob Duff - Pegasus Planning</p>

Date	Matters	Participants
<p>Day 9 Wed 11 July KCC</p>	<p><i>AM/PM</i></p> <p>22 – Communities of the North Fringe</p>	<p>Communities of the North Fringe (CS25, CS26, CS27 & CS28) Peter Stacey - Turley Associates Paul Kentish – Paul Kentish & Co Dave Redgewell Ann Bartaby – Terence O'Rourke Christina Biggs - Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways Graham Parker - PJ Planning Jeremy Cahill QC for PJ Planning Jill Kempshall - CPRE Catherine Seddon - Jones Lang LaSalle Hollie Bryant - Pegasus Planning Karl Scholz - Alder King Ian Crawford - Transport for Greater Bristol Alliance Steve Micklewright - Avon Wildlife Trust Gareth Williams - NLP (on behalf of Redrow SW) Cllr Adam Monk - South Glos Labour Group Simon Fitton - RPS Liz Summers – GVA Grimley James Fennell - NLP for Cribbs Mall Nominee 1&2 & J T Baylis David Goodwin Colin Chapman – Bristol City Council Andrew Roberts – Highways Agency</p>
<p>Day 10 Thur 12 July KCC</p>	<p><i>AM</i></p> <p>23 – Severnside</p> <p><i>AM/PM</i></p> <p>24 – Major Infrastructure and Oldbury Power Station</p> <p><i>PM</i></p> <p>25 - Rural Areas</p> <p><i>PM</i></p> <p>26 - Minerals</p>	<p>Severnside (CS35) Jonathan Porter - Barton Wilmore Dave Redgewell - (SWTN) Roger Daniels - Pegasus Planning Christina Biggs - Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways Kevin Gibbs – Chair of the Bristol Chamber of Commerce Planning Committee Bryan Smith - Bristol Port Company</p> <p>Major Infrastructure and Oldbury Power Station (CS36 & 37) Tim Roberts – DLP Planning Ltd Roger Daniels - Pegasus Planning Wayne Dyer for Scottish Power Barry Turner - Oldbury Parish Council Stefan Preuss - National Grid John Gilbert - Horizon</p> <p>Rural Areas (CS34) Ian Mellor - Barton Wilmore Chris Ashton – A W Land Ltd Martin Quinton - Hoddell Associates Ron Morton - Shortwood GB Campaign Barry Turner - Oldbury Parish Council Chris Willmore – Yate Town Council Ann Fay - British Horse Society Tim Roberts – DLP Planning Ltd</p> <p>Minerals (CS10) Chris Willmore - Yate Town Council</p>

Main Issues

1. Is the Council's strategy founded on an appropriate vision for the area and is it capable of accommodating the various pressures and challenges facing it over the course of the plan period?
2. Is the spatial strategy the most appropriate one for the area and will it deliver the sustainable development objectives promoted in the Planning Framework?
3. Will the Core Strategy provide sufficient housing in the most appropriate locations to meet future housing needs?
4. Are the Council's proposals for economic development well founded and are they likely to support the local economy and encourage growth in the wider sub-region and?
5. Is the retail hierarchy well-founded and have the consequences of further expansion of The Mall/Cribbs Causeway area on local and regional shopping patterns been fully assessed?
6. Does the CS adequately identify the need for the infrastructure required to support further development while addressing current deficiencies?
7. Is there appropriate policy coverage to protect the natural and built environment, respond to climate change and promote sources of renewable energy?
8. Are there clear indicators and targets in place so that plan policies and proposals can be monitored and actions identified if objectives in the Plan are unlikely to be delivered?

Core Strategy - Matters for Examination at Hearings

WEEK 1

DAY 1 Tuesday 19 June 2012

MATTER 1 - LEGAL COMPLIANCE / PROCEDURAL MATTERS

The Council responded to a number of questions I asked at the Pre Hearing Meeting covering statutory and regulatory matters. A written response to these questions is available on the Council's website. The questions below follow from its responses and are intended to provide an opportunity for those who have raised concerns to show where the Council has failed to comply with the relevant requirements.

1. Is there any evidence to show the Council has not consulted at all relevant stages of the plan preparation process and has failed to comply with the statutory requirements?
2. Is the Core Strategy (CS) in general conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Planning Framework) or, if not, is it possible to introduce modifications without detracting from the Council's overall strategy for South Gloucestershire?
3. Plans submitted prior to the introduction of the Localism Act on 15 November 2011 are not subject to the 'duty to cooperate'. Is there any basis for suggesting the Council has not complied with this principle irrespective of whether the test should apply to the South Gloucestershire CS?
4. The intention in the Planning Framework is to move largely towards a single Local Plan rather than many development plan documents. How will this affect the Council's approach to plan making?

MATTER 2 – JUSTIFICATION – THE EVIDENCE BASE:

1. Is the evidence base sufficiently comprehensive to support the strategy which the Council has put forward and, if not, what critical information is missing?
2. The Council continues to refer to policies in the South Gloucestershire Local Plan. In view of changes to the development plan system is it satisfactory to rely on older policies and how can any potential deficiency be addressed?

MATTER 3 – SPATIAL PORTRAIT, ISSUES, VISION & OBJECTIVES

1. Does the Spatial Portrait provide a reasonable snapshot of the area and the issues which face it?
2. Are the Strategic Objectives broadly consistent with the aspirations of organisations and the population and do they provide appropriate goals for the Council to pursue?
3. Are there any Visions which the Council has put forward which are inappropriate or unrealistic?

MATTER 4 – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

1. What deficiencies, if any, exist in the Sustainability Appraisal and how can these be addressed?
2. Is the latest version of the Sustainability Appraisal sufficiently comprehensive in setting out alternative options through all preparatory stages of plan preparation?

MATTER 5 – REGIONAL STRATEGY

1. The Regional Strategy for the South West of England (RPG10) remains part of the development plan until the relevant part of the Localism Act is enacted. Is there any suggestion that the CS is not in conformity with this plan?
2. There is concern that references to the Regional Strategy have been removed from the CS in advance of its demise. How significant is this given the likelihood that the RS will no longer form part of the development plan by the end of the examination?

MATTER 6 – GREEN BELT

1. In preparing the CS has the Council adequately explored the potential of land within the Green Belt to meet identified and future development needs?
2. Is the Council's approach to its Green Belt consistent with the requirements of the national planning policy framework?
3. How likely is it that existing Green Belt boundaries would need to be changed at the end of the plan period?

DAY 2 Wednesday 20 June 2012

MATTER 7 – SPATIAL STRATEGY (Chpt 4), LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT (CS5)

1. Is the overall strategy consistent with sustainable development principles as contained in the Planning Framework?
2. Are there other spatial options which would be more likely to deliver better outcomes for South Gloucestershire during the plan period?
3. Is the overall balance of growth between identified settlements clearly founded on the evidence base and is it likely to be effective in promoting sustainable development across the Borough?
4. Is the spatial strategy deliverable in the plan period and have the risks to delivery been properly assessed.
5. Is there sufficient flexibility in the CS to allow for change or unforeseen events?
6. Have the cross boundary implications of the strategy been taken into account?

MATTER 8 - PROVISION AND DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING– POLICY CS15

Housing Provision

1. Would the Council's modified Plan (December 2011) result in a serious undersupply of housing?
2. How significant are current economic circumstances on the overall level of housing that is feasible during the plan period - could the amount of housing proposed in either the draft Regional Strategy or the Secretary of State's proposed alterations be delivered if targets were increased to these levels?
3. Is the phasing of housing realistic and deliverable?
4. Should the Council provide an additional 5% or 20% in excess of a 5 year housing land supply as required by the Planning Framework?
5. Is there information to show windfalls should be taken into account as a valid source of housing land supply?

Housing Distribution

1. Is the distribution of housing proposed in the CS consistent with sustainable development objectives?
2. Is the level of allocation in each of the main locations broadly appropriate having regard to the character of these places?
3. Is there evidence to support opportunities for alternative/additional housing provision in other parts of South Gloucestershire?
4. Is there enough flexibility in the CS to allow for alternative sites to come forward?

DAY 3 Thursday 21 June 2012

MATTER 9 – FILTON AIRFIELD

1. Is there any evidence to show a case can be made for retaining an operational airfield at Filton?
2. Is the balance of uses proposed for this area appropriate to the needs of the North Fringe and Bristol area?
3. To what extent has the Council had regard to the impact of development at the Airfield on the surrounding communities including those in the City Council's area?
4. Some businesses and organisations have concerns that development of the Airfield could undermine their existing operations. Are their fears valid?
5. Is the amount of land to be retained for employment purposes adequate?

**MATTER 10 – DISTRIBUTION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LAND,
SAFEGUARDED AND NON-SAFEGUARDED EMPLOYMENT SITES – POLICIES
CS11, CS12 & CS13**

1. Is the amount of employment land provision sufficient to support the economic growth of the sub-region over the plan period?
2. Will the proposed distribution of employment land help to encourage more sustainable lifestyles?
3. The distinction between safeguarded and non-safeguarded sites appears to reduce the flexibility within the CS to allow for changing circumstances. Is this distinction necessary or desirable?
4. Should there be more encouragement for small-scale employment uses in rural areas?

DAY 4 Friday 22 June 2012

**MATTER 11 – AFFORDABLE/RURAL EXCEPTION SITES/EXTRA CARE
HOUSING – POLICIES CS18, CS19 & 20**

Affordable housing

1. Is the policy consistent with the Planning Framework?
2. Is the potential amount of affordable housing justified given the level of need identified?
3. Is criticism of the affordable housing policy to 'require' 35% on-site provision reasonable given that the supporting text (para 10.27) acknowledges that the economic viability of sites will be a factor to be taken into account?
4. Should there be more flexibility in the policy to recognise the constraints on affordable housing supply because of present economic difficulties?
5. How closely should affordable housing provision be reliant on future increases in house prices (para 10.32)?
6. Off-site or financial contributions in lieu of on-site affordable provision will be considered in exceptional circumstances. Is there a need to clarify what factors might be taken into account?

Rural exception sites

7. Is there sufficient flexibility in the policy to permit additional development in rural communities to address local needs identified through Neighbourhood Plans or local initiatives?

Extra care housing

8. What evidence is there to support the provision of 35% of units as a proportion of affordable housing provision in specified locations in the North Fringe and Yate?
9. How will the level of provision in other locations be determined?

MATTER 12 – GYPSY AND TRAVELLER PROVISION – POLICIES CS21 & CS22

1. Is there sufficient recent evidence to determine the likely level of need for Traveller provision in the South Gloucestershire area?
2. Can adequate provision for traveller sites be provided without compromising Green Belt locations?
3. Is policy provision consistent with the requirements of the Planning Framework to identify a 5 year supply of deliverable sites against locally set targets and further sites or broad locations in the longer term?
4. Does the Council's approach to provision otherwise accord with the requirements set out in the Planning Framework

WEEK 2

DAY 5 Tuesday 26 June 2012

MATTER 13 – TOWN CENTRES AND RETAIL – POLICY CS14

1. Is the hierarchy and role of the various centres appropriately defined in policy CS14?
2. Should The Mall/Cribbs Causeway be designated as a Sub-Regional Centre and what implications does this have for other retail locations both locally and regionally?
3. Is the expansion of The Mall/Cribbs Causeway consistent with the principles set out in the Planning Framework?
4. Are proposals for other retail provision clear, timely, deliverable and consistent with the Planning Framework?

DAY 6 Wednesday 27 June 2012

MATTER 14 – STRATEGIC TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY – POLICIES CS7 & CS8

1. Is the strategy based on a sound and rigorous assessment of the transport needs of South Gloucestershire?
2. Has sufficient regard been had to the impact of future development strategies of neighbouring authorities on levels of congestion and movement?
3. Is sufficient priority given to public transport improvements to reduce reliance on the car?
4. Is the delivery of transport initiatives in policy CS7 realistic in view of economic uncertainties?
5. Will policy CS8 provide an adequate basis for improving accessibility in South Gloucestershire?
6. What evidence is available to justify the 50% limit on garage spaces contributing to parking provision in major residential schemes?
7. Should the policy make clear how car parking will be addressed?

MATTER 15 – ENVIRONMENT/HERITAGE – POLICY CS9

1. Is policy CS9 sufficiently comprehensive in setting out criteria to protect the natural and built environment?
2. Is the Council's approach consistent with the guidance in the Planning Framework?
3. Is there sufficient coverage in the CS of the Council's position in relation to woodland including ancient woodland?

DAY 7 Thursday 28 June 2012

MATTER 16 – INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS – POLICY CS6

1. Is there is a need to prioritise developer contributions; i.e. is there a ranking methodology?
2. Should the policy identify that viability is a factor to be taken into account when identifying infrastructure requirements?

MATTER 17 - GREEN AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE & CULTURAL ACTIVITIES, SPORT & RECREATION – POLICIES CS2, 23 & 24

1. Should the policy or supporting text to policy CS2 acknowledge that the Council's objectives for existing or new Green Infrastructure provision will not necessarily affect all areas identified in the Strategic Green Infrastructure Network diagram?
2. Should policy CS2 include reference to the contribution of woodland as part of Green Infrastructure initiatives?
3. How will viability be taken into account when assessing the need for facilities and how will the priority for different facilities be determined?

MATTER 18 - RENEWABLES – POLICIES CS3 & CS4

1. Is either policy inconsistent with the objectives in the Planning Framework, excessively onerous or likely to place unreasonable requirements on development?
2. Is it sensible to provide for district heating networks in smaller schemes (less than 100 dw or 10,000 sq.m) when further development may not be forthcoming or where new technology could make provision redundant?

MATTER 19 – DESIGN – POLICY CS1

1. Is there sufficient emphasis in the CS to reflect the importance placed on design in the Planning Framework?
2. Is the supporting text too prescriptive or is the level of detail useful in setting out the Council's design priorities when assessing planning applications?
3. Is the Council justified in including reference to targets relating to the Code for Sustainable Homes or other standards where these are a requirement of different regulatory processes?

MATTER 20 - DENSITY/DIVERSITY– POLICIES CS16 & CS17

1. Is there sufficient detail contained in policy CS16 to clarify the Council's approach to housing density?
2. How crucial is viability in determining the mix of housing to be provided on a site and is it essential to reference this as factor when considering development proposals?

DAY 8 Friday 29 June 2012

MATTER 21 – YATE AND CHIPPING SODBURY – POLICIES CS30 & CS31

1. How likely is it that the range of measures in policy CS30 will address the deficiencies in the Yate/Chipping Sodbury area identified by the Council?
2. Is the Council's strategy for development to the north of Yate the most appropriate one?
3. Is the scale of development envisaged likely to meet local needs or will it encourage more commuting to other centres?
4. Do alternative sites in the Yate/Chipping Sodbury area have discernible advantages over the Council's preferred location and, if so, what are these?
5. Is there sufficient flexibility in the proposals to cope with changing circumstances?
6. Is the Council's approach to employment provision in Yate/Chipping Sodbury sound?

WEEK 3

DAY 9 Wednesday 11 July 2012

MATTER 22 – COMMUNITIES OF THE NORTH FRINGE/ CRIBBS/PATCHWAY / EAST OF HARRY STOKE AND UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF ENGLAND – POLICY CS25, CS26, CS27 & CS28

I intend to run these sessions together and wish to limit debate about the future of The Mall/Cribbs Causeway shopping complex which I expect to deal with under retail matters. I will, however, consider other more general matters providing they are relevant to the Council's plans for the North Fringe areas.

1. Is it feasible to accommodate the scale of development envisaged in the North Fringe areas without increasing levels of congestion?
2. Is there scope to utilise Filton Airfield to improve traffic flows in the North Bristol area?
3. Is the possible identification of a major sports facility in this area a good use of urban land or are there alternative locations better suited for this purpose?
4. Is there sufficient flexibility in phasing arrangements to ensure housing can be brought forward on other sites in the North Fringe areas if those being developed are not completed to schedule?
5. Should policy CS26 be revised to reduce complexity and, if so, how could this be achieved?
6. Is it realistic to expect the range and type of facilities required can be provided as part of the Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood?
7. Development of the new neighbourhood East of Harry Stoke is predicated on the provision of the Stoke Gifford Transport link. What implications does this have for delivery of the CS should the link be delayed through lack of funding or for other reasons?
8. Are proposals for revised Green Belt boundaries both to the west of the A4018 and as part of the East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood appropriate?

DAY 11 Thursday 12 July 2012

MATTER 23 – SEVERNSIDE – POLICY CS35

1. Is the approach in policy CS35 consistent with government objectives in the Planning Framework and the Ministerial Statement on 'Planning for Growth' to encourage sustainable economic development?
2. In view of the extant planning permissions affecting land at Severnside is the Council's strategy for the area deliverable?
3. Is there evidence to show the implementation of extant permissions would have adverse impacts on nature conservation or archaeological assets or be likely to increase flood risk?
4. Are improvements to the transport system for this area sufficient, realistic and deliverable?

MATTER 24 – MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND OLDBURY POWER STATION – POLICIES CS36 & CS37

1. Is the Council's approach to Major Infrastructure Projects consistent with Government policy?
2. Does policy CS36 and the supporting text set out appropriate factors to be considered having regard to the wide-ranging impact such schemes would have on the area?
3. Does policy CS37 and supporting text require amendment in view of the changed circumstances in relation to a future power station?
4. Is the range of ancillary factors to be taken into account in policy CS37 comprehensive and appropriate to the nature of the proposal?

MATTER 25 – RURAL AREAS – POLICY CS34

1. Is there any benefit in defining boundaries to villages either to encourage or limit future development?
2. Should greater emphasis be given to allocating more housing in the rural areas as suggested by some respondents?
3. Does the policy allow sufficient scope for the needs of local communities to be met including affordable housing or provision for the elderly?
4. Is there too much emphasis on affordable/specialist housing in rural areas rather than market housing?
5. Should a more positive approach be taken to allow brownfield sites in rural areas/green belt locations to be re-used?
6. What role is envisaged for neighbourhood plans in bringing forward local development initiatives

MATTER 26 – MINERALS – POLICY CS10

1. Is the Council's approach inconsistent with the Planning Framework?

DAY 12 Friday 13 July 2012

MATTER 27 – THORNBURY – POLICIES CS32 & CS33

1. Concerns have been raised regarding both the consultation process and the sustainability appraisal. What evidence is there to show the Council has failed to comply with the either legislative or regulatory requirements in connection with these processes?
2. A number of respondents say the Council's aim to retain and improve services, facilities and employment in Thornbury is not supported by the evidence. What information has the Council relied upon in reaching its conclusions on the need for and the scale of development appropriate for the town?
3. In relation to proposals for development at Park Farm a number of potential constraints have been identified. These include heritage and archaeological assets, wildlife and agricultural land quality as well as concerns with flooding, the loss of open space and access issues. How

- far have these factors been taken into account in identifying this location as the Council's preferred choice?
4. Do alternative sites in the Thornbury area particularly to the east and south have advantages over the Park Farm location and, if so, what are these?
 5. Is Morton Way South a more sustainable location for housing purposes and/or are the constraints at this location a significant factor against the development?
 6. Some respondents are concerned that no account has been taken of the impact of a new nuclear power station at Oldbury. How significant is this to the proposals for Thornbury?

MATTER 28 – COMMUNITIES OF THE EAST FRINGE – POLICY CS29

1. There is the suggestion that the Council previously supported the idea of some development beyond the existing urban areas on the east side of Bristol. Does this not remain a suitable option to meet development needs during the plan period?
2. Are there viable transport options capable of improving accessibility in the East Fringe which have not been included in the CS?
3. Do detailed concerns affecting land ownership negate the principles expounded in the Plan to development Green Infrastructure and other facilities?

WEEK 4

Reserved for further hearing sessions if necessary

Matters to be dealt with via written correspondence with the Council.

Implementation and Monitoring
Policies Map/Key Diagrams
Saved policies
Miscellaneous Items

Paul Crysell
Inspector
25 April 2012