

---

*SOUTH WEST REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY REVISION*

# EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC

## Final Programme

April 2007

---

### **Matters &**

### **Provisional**

### **Agenda Questions**

### **EiP Weeks 4 & 5**

<p>Before the EiP the Panel Secretariat Office will be based in Bristol.</p> <p><b>Panel Secretariat Office</b> South West RSS EiP 2 Rivergate Temple Quay Bristol BS1 6EH Telephone enquires: 0117 9001814</p>	<p>During the EiP the Panel Secretariat Office will be based in Exeter from 12 April 2007</p> <p><b>Panel Secretariat Office</b> South West RSS EiP Thistle Hotel Queen Street Exeter EX4 3SP Telephone enquires: 01392 312270</p>
---	--

General email: [enquiries@southwesteip.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@southwesteip.co.uk)  
Website: [www.southwesteip.co.uk](http://www.southwesteip.co.uk)

**Day/Time Matters & Provisional Agenda Questions Participants**

**EiP Week 4**

**Day 12 – Tuesday 15 May**

**Matter 4: Sub-Regional Strategies**

10.00 am **4.1 West of England HMA sub-regional strategy** 25

West of England HMA covers the urban areas of Bristol, Bath and Weston-super-Mare and also Trowbridge. Other towns referred to within the HMA include Bradford-on-Avon, Frome, Melksham, Warminster and Westbury.

In setting out policies and proposals for the HMA sub-region, does the draft RSS adequately deal with the following questions:

- a) Is the draft RSS sufficiently clear about the spatial outcomes it is seeking in Bristol, Bath and Weston-super-Mare in terms of their present and future regional and sub-regional roles and their relationship with the other parts of the HMA?
- b) Has the scale of additional greenfield development been adequately justified against the likely level of housing requirements and in particular the urban renewal opportunities in Bristol, Bath and Weston-super-Mare?
- c) Has sufficient consideration been given to the impact of the lead-in times for larger developments on the required annual output for the HMA?
- d) Have environmental limits arising from matters such as flood risk and the protection of environmental assets, including the Bath World Heritage Site, been adequately taken into account?
- e) Have infrastructure considerations been adequately taken into account?
- f) Do the proposals adequately reflect the need to reduce the need to travel, support the use of public transport and minimise congestion and in particular do they reflect the output from the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study?
- g) Are the proposed modifications to the Green Belt adequately justified? and
- h) Does the draft RSS set out adequate guidance on the provision of Green Infrastructure?

**Opened by Barton Wilmore Planning Partnership**

1. What is the appropriate level of development within the HMA to support the vision of the sub-region as one of Europe's fastest growing and most prosperous sub-regions?
2. What further guidance, particularly in relation to Bristol city centre, is required to support this economic growth?
3. What balance of growth should be struck between the main urban areas and the more peripheral parts of the HMA?
4. Does the draft RSS provide adequate guidance on the balance to be struck within the HMA between regeneration and the release of new development areas?
5. To what extent should the development of the South Bristol Ring Road be regarded as an integral part of the regeneration and development of South Bristol?
6. What would be the most appropriate spatial pattern for development in the Greater Bristol area to accommodate the level of growth required?

Day/Time	Matters & Provisional Agenda Questions	Participants
----------	--	--------------

7. How best can the tensions in the City of Bath area between economic growth and the requirements of the World Heritage Site designation be resolved?
8. In what ways can economic growth and housing provision in the Weston-super-Mare area be better managed to minimise commuting to the Bristol area?
9. Does the draft RSS adequately justify the proposed release of land from the Green Belt within the sub-region?
10. Does the draft RSS adequately justify the proposed extensions to the Green Belt within the sub-region?
11. Is there a need to provide further guidance on the strategic elements of Green Infrastructure to ensure a consistent approach across local authority boundaries?

2.00 pm **4.1 West of England HMA sub-regional strategy (continued)**

Day 13 – Wednesday 16 May

10.00 am **4.1 West of England HMA sub-regional strategy (continued)**

2.00 pm **4.1 West of England HMA sub-regional strategy (continued)**

Day 14 – Thursday 17 May

10.00 am **4.1 West of England HMA sub-regional strategy (continued)**

Day/Time	Matters & Provisional Agenda Questions	Participants
----------	--	--------------

Day 14 – Thursday 17 May		
--------------------------	--	--

2.00 pm	<b>4.2 Swindon HMA sub-regional strategy</b>	25
---------	--	----

Swindon HMA covers Swindon. Other towns referred to within the Swindon HMA include Chippenham and Cirencester.

In setting out policies and proposals for the HMA sub-region, does the draft RSS adequately deal with the following questions:

- a) Is the draft RSS sufficiently clear about the spatial outcomes it is seeking in Swindon and Chippenham in terms of their present and future regional and sub-regional roles and their relationship with the other parts of the HMA?
- b) Has the scale of additional greenfield development been adequately justified against the likely level of housing requirements and in particular the urban renewal expected to be generated by the New Swindon Company?
- c) Has sufficient consideration been given to the impact of the lead-in times for the large Eastern Extension Area on the required annual output for the HMA?
- d) Have environmental limits arising from matters such as flood risk and the protection of environmental assets been adequately taken into account?
- e) Have infrastructure considerations been adequately taken into account and in particular do the proposals reflect the problems of water supply and waste water treatment?
- f) Do the proposals adequately reflect the need to reduce the need to travel, support the use of public transport and minimise congestion? and
- g) Does the draft RSS set out adequate guidance on the provision of Green Infrastructure?

**Opened by Wiltshire County Council**

- 1. What are the future roles and functions of Swindon and Chippenham viz. a viz. the South West and the South East as well as the HMA?
- 2. How do the peripheral settlements, such as Malmesbury and Kennet towns relate to Swindon?
- 3. What are the appropriate levels for housing and employment in the Swindon/Chippenham locality?
- 4. What is the strategic importance of Swindon town centre in the overall growth scenario?
- 5. Has sufficient consideration been given to growth on the western side of Swindon?
- 6. What are the prospects for the timely delivery of the requisite infrastructure for Swindon, particularly improvements to the M4 and the A419 for the eastern expansion?

Day 15 – Friday 18 May		
------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	<b>4.2 Swindon HMA sub-regional strategy (continued)</b>	
----------	--	--

**Day/Time Matters & Provisional Agenda Questions Participants**

**EiP Week 5**

**Day 16 – Tuesday 22 May**

**Matter 4: Sub-Regional Strategies (continued)**

10.00 am **4.3 Gloucester and Cheltenham HMA sub-regional strategy** 25

Gloucester and Cheltenham HMA covers Cheltenham and Gloucester. Other towns referred to within the HMA include Stroud, the Forest of Dean Towns (Coleford, Lydney and Cinderford) and Tewkesbury.

In setting out policies and proposals for the HMA sub-region, does the draft RSS adequately deal with the following questions:

- a) Is the draft RSS sufficiently clear about the spatial outcomes it is seeking in Gloucester and Cheltenham in terms of their present and future regional and sub-regional roles and their relationship with the other parts of the HMA?
- b) Has the scale of additional greenfield development been adequately justified against the likely level of housing requirements and in particular the urban renewal opportunities expected to be generated by the Gloucester Heritage URC Ltd.?
- c) Is the contribution from non-green belt extensions adequately justified and what is the status of 'commitments' referred to in SR11?
- d) Has sufficient consideration been given to the impact of the lead-in times for the two large urban extension areas on the required annual output for the HMA?
- e) Have environmental limits arising from matters such as flood risk and the protection of environmental assets been adequately taken into account and in particular do the proposals reflect the need to avoid development in the flood plain?
- f) Have infrastructure considerations been adequately taken into account?
- g) Do the proposals adequately reflect the need to reduce the need to travel, support the use of public transport and minimise congestion?
- h) Are the proposed modifications to the Green Belt adequately justified? and
- i) Does the draft RSS set out adequate guidance on the provision of Green Infrastructure?

**Opened by Gloucestershire County Council**

1. What is the appropriate level of development within the HMA in the light of the relatively modest economic forecasts for both the Gloucester and Cheltenham economies?
2. What balance of growth should be struck between the two main urban areas and other parts of the HMA?
3. Does the draft RSS provide adequate guidance on the balance to be set between the regeneration of the main urban areas, particularly Gloucester, and the release of new greenfield development areas?
4. Does the draft RSS take flood risk adequately into account in the selection of the strategic release areas?
5. To what extent should the potential contribution of non strategic Greenfield opportunities be taken into account in meeting the housing requirements of the area?
6. Does the draft RSS adequately justify the proposed release of land from the Green Belt within the sub-region?
7. Does the draft RSS adequately justify the proposed extensions of the

Day/Time	Matters & Provisional Agenda Questions	Participants
	Green Belt within the sub-region?	
	8. Should the draft RSS provide further guidance on the strategic elements of Green Infrastructure to ensure a consistent approach across local authority boundaries?	
2.00 pm	<b>4.3 Gloucester and Cheltenham HMA sub-regional strategy (continued)</b>	

Day 17 – Wednesday 23 May

10.00 am	<b>4.3 Gloucester and Cheltenham HMA sub-regional strategy (continued)</b>	
2.00 pm	<b>4.3 Gloucester and Cheltenham HMA sub-regional strategy (continued)</b>	

Day/Time	Matters & Provisional Agenda Questions	Participants
Day 18 – Thursday 24 May		
10.00 am	<b>4.4 Exeter HMA sub-regional strategy</b>  Exeter HMA covers Exeter, Newton Abbot and also part of Dartmoor National Park. Other towns referred to within the Exeter HMA include Exmouth, Crediton, Dawlish, Tiverton, Honiton, and Ottery St Mary. In setting out policies and proposals for the HMA sub-region, does the draft RSS adequately deal with the following questions:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Is the draft RSS sufficiently clear about the spatial outcomes it is seeking in Exeter and Newton Abbot in terms of their present and future regional and sub-regional roles and their relationship with the other parts of the HMA?</li><li>b) Has the scale of additional greenfield development been adequately justified against the likely level of housing requirements and in particular the urban renewal opportunities in Exeter?</li><li>c) Has sufficient consideration been given to the impact of the lead-in times for the Cranbrook New Community on the required annual output for the HMA?</li><li>d) Have environmental limits arising from matters such as flood risk and the protection of environmental assets been adequately taken into account and in particular do the proposals reflect the need to avoid development in the flood plain?</li><li>e) Have infrastructure considerations been adequately taken into account?</li><li>f) Do the proposals adequately reflect the need to reduce the need to travel, support the use of public transport and minimise congestion? and</li><li>g) Does the draft RSS set out adequate guidance on the provision of Green Infrastructure?</li></ul> <b>Opened by Devon County Council</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. What is the future role of Exeter?</li><li>2. What is the future role of Newton Abbot and should it be more appropriately linked to Torbay?</li><li>3. On the basis of the revised household projections, what would be the appropriate level of housing distribution within the HMA?</li><li>4. To what extent can development at the coastal and market towns help sustainable development principles?</li><li>5. What are the spatial planning implications of the employment projections?</li><li>6. Should there be extensions to the New Community or extensions and/or additions to “areas of search” or would a restriction on green-field development force the further re-generation of Exeter?</li></ul>	25
2.00 pm	<b>4.4 Exeter HMA sub-regional strategy (continued)</b>	
Day 19 – Friday 25 May		
10.00 am	<b>4.4 Exeter HMA sub-regional strategy (continued)</b>	
<b>EiP Week 6</b>		
Day 20 – Tuesday 5 June 2007		
10.00 am	<b>4.4 Exeter HMA sub-regional strategy (continued)</b>	