

---

*SOUTH WEST REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY REVISION*

# EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC

## Final Programme

April 2007

---

### Matters &

### Provisional

### Agenda Questions

### EiP Weeks 1, 2 & 3

<p>Before the EiP the Panel Secretariat Office will be based in Bristol.</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 2 Rivergate Temple Quay Bristol BS1 6EH Telephone enquires: 0117 9001814</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
<b>EiP Week 1</b>		
Day 1 – Tuesday 17 April 2007		
<b>Matter 1: A Sustainable Future</b>		

11.00 am     **1.1 Sustainability appraisal - soundness/role**     24

To what extent can the Strategic Sustainability Assessment process be regarded as sound and in particular:

- a) To what extent has the draft RSS been informed by the Strategic Sustainability Assessment? and
- b) Does the Sustainability Assessment give adequate coverage to a realistic range of options?

**Opened by Environment Agency**

1. To what extent should the Sustainability Assessment place greater emphasis on matters other than environmental aspects of the RSS?
2. How adequately has the Sustainability Assessment been able to deal with the JSA element of the draft RSS?
3. Does the Sustainability Assessment give adequate coverage to a realistic range of options?

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

Day 1 – Tuesday 17 April 2007		
-------------------------------	--	--

2.00 pm	<b>1.2 Appropriate assessment</b>	22
---------	-----------------------------------	----

In the light of the decision that the Habitats Regulations apply to Strategic Plans:

- a) How can the draft RSS adequately demonstrate that the policies and proposals will not threaten the integrity of the sites covered by Regulation 48 of the Habitats Regulations? and
- b) To what extent can particular impacts be made acceptable by mitigation measures?

**Opened by Royal Society for the Protection of Birds**

1. Does the Habitats Regulation Assessment of the draft RSS comply with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, particularly in relation to “in combination” effects?
2. What are the broad policy consequences from the Assessment and how could those be incorporated into the draft RSS?
3. Does the Assessment provide an adequate basis on which to consider the implications of different levels of growth?
4. If mitigation measures “down the line” are not capable of being delivered, is there a mechanism for re-visiting the distribution of development?

Day 2 – Wednesday 18 April		
----------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	<b>1.2 Appropriate assessment (continued)</b>	
----------	---	--

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

Day 2 – Wednesday 18 April		
----------------------------	--	--

2.00 pm	<b>1.3. Climate Change</b>	25
---------	----------------------------	----

Does the RSS adequately set out how the spatial strategy and its proposals have reflected issues arising from climate change during the lifetime of the plan and in particular:

- a) What are the spatial consequences and actions that will be relevant to this issue?
- b) Are the ways in which the Climate Change objectives will be achieved sufficiently clear in terms of mitigation and adaptation? and
- c) Are the other draft RSS policies as supportive as they should be?

**Opened by Government Office for the South West**

1. Do the draft RSS policies on climate change suitably reflect emerging national policy guidance on Planning and Climate Change and is it appropriate for RSS to deal with the formulation of policies for building construction?
2. How can the draft RSS adequately resolve the conflict between the implications of the “Future of Air Transport” White Paper and the policy intent to reduce the carbon emissions in the region?
3. To what extent does the draft RSS set an appropriate balance between measures that seek to influence drivers of climate change and those concerned with adaptation to the consequences of climate change?

Day 3 – Thursday 19 April		
---------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	<b>1.3. Climate Change (continued)</b>	
----------	--	--

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

Day 3 – Thursday 19 April

**Matter 2: The Context**

2.00 pm      **2.1 Level of economic change**      22

In setting out the economic context for the strategy, does the draft RSS adequately set out the assumptions with regard to national and regional economics and the components of growth and demonstrate that:

- a) The alignment between the RSS and the RES is sufficiently close?
- b) The RES growth assumptions are sufficiently robust in view of the potential implications of globalisation processes, long-term oil supplies and climate change?
- c) The scale, type and distribution of economic growth and job growth is sufficiently justified in the RSS? and
- d) The economic prospects of the rural areas have been adequately taken into account?

**Opened by South West Regional Development Agency**

1. Can the SWRDA growth rate of 3.2% be adequately reconciled with the acceptance by the RDA of environmental limits to growth?
2. To what extent can the forecast that 80% of job growth is expected to be in the TTWAs of the 21 SSCTs be reconciled with calls for an acceptance of a wider distribution of growth?
3. To what extent does the RES place too much emphasis on the dependency of economic growth on employment growth instead of considering higher levels of productivity?
4. How could the draft RSS more adequately reflect and respond to the future economic prospects of the rural areas?

Day 4 – Friday 20 April

10.00 am      **2.1 Level of economic change (continued)**

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

EiP Week 2		
------------	--	--

Day 5 – Tuesday 24 April		
--------------------------	--	--

**Matter 2: The Context (continued)**

10.00 am	<b>2.2 Regional population implications</b>	23
----------	---	----

In setting out the expected level of population change, does the draft RSS adequately set out the demographic and other assumptions, which determine the likely future population and demonstrate that:

- a) The implications of the economic forecasts have been adequately reflected in the population forecasts in terms of the likely composition of the future population?
- b) The implications of the different migration streams, such as the retirement flows to rural areas, have been adequately reflected in the population forecasts? and
- c) The consequences of an ageing population have been sufficiently taken into account?

**Opened by Barton Wilmore Planning Partnership**

1. To what extent can the population implications of the draft RSS housing-led strategy be reconciled with employment forecasts?
2. What are the consequences of benchmarking the population implications of the proposed strategy against the 2004 based population projections?
3. To what extent can established migration flows be influenced by housing provision policy?
4. To what extent do past changes in migration and differences in the output of the long-term projections provide a basis for questioning the validity of the 2004 population projections?
5. What are the population and migration implications of the higher levels of housing growth proposed by the development industry?

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

Day 5 – Tuesday 24 April

2.00 pm      **2.3 Overall level of housing**      25

Does the draft RSS adequately reflect the most up-to-date assessment of the factors likely to influence the level of housing for which provision should be made and in particular;

- a) Is adequate evidence available to the EiP to understand the consequences of higher household projections and to enable such consequences to be identified?
- b) Is the methodology used to derive the overall level of housing sufficiently “sound”, clear and comprehensive?
- c) To what extent does the overall housing requirement reflect the economic and population forecasts?
- d) What implications should be drawn from the 2003 based Household Forecasts?
- e) Should the draft RSS consider measures to reduce the demand for housing?
- f) Has the RSS responded appropriately in identifying the needs of different groups, such as an ageing population?
- g) Has the RSS adequately set out the spatial implications of these needs?
- h) What are the implications of over or under provision? and
- i) To what extent should the overall level of provision be influenced by evidence on housing needs?

**Opened by Town and Country Planning Association**

- 1. In the light of the 2004 based household projections what is the most appropriate equivalent forecast to the draft RSS “technical forecast” of 25000 additional dwellings per annum?
- 2. To what extent would a higher level of provision threaten the broad strategy set out in draft RSS?
- 3. What is the appropriate role for a Plan Monitor and Manage approach to land provision in the case of the draft RSS?
- 4. To what extent is demand constraint:
  - a. Consistent with national policy and the powers available through the draft RSS? and
  - b. Consistent with the broader objectives of the draft RSS?

Day 6 – Wednesday 25 April

10.00 am      **2/3 Overall level of housing (continued)**

2.00 pm      **2/3 Overall level of housing (continued)**

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

Day 7 – Thursday 26 April		
---------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	<b>2.4 Housing market implications</b>	25
----------	--	----

How could the distribution of the overall level of housing to Housing Market Areas respond to higher levels of development? Should it seek to

- a) Strike an appropriate jobs/housing balance?
- b) Reflect migration preferences?
- c) Reflect environmental limits within the HMA? Or
- d) Reflect the distribution within the 2003 based Household Projections?

**Opened by Pegasus Planning Group**

1. To what extent do the Housing Market Areas provide an appropriate framework for the strategic distribution of housing demand?
2. To what extent can it be assumed that demand arising within a Housing Market Area may be redistributed within the Area, but should not usually be redistributed across Housing Market Boundaries?
3. In so far as the 2004 based household projections reflect assumptions on locally generated demand, economic led migration and other forms of migration, can they be regarded as appropriate evidence in the consideration of RSS housing allocations?
4. In order to consider the implications of Policies A, B and C, how useful would it be to distinguish between locally generated demand and strategic demand at Housing Market level?
5. What consideration should be given to the forecasts of employment growth with a view to achieving “balance”?
6. What consideration should be given to affordability in the distribution of housing demand?
7. What consideration should be given to the ability of locations to absorb further growth e.g. Taunton?
8. What evidence is available that international or national designations would prevent specific Housing Market Areas from accommodating the proposed scale of housing provision?

2.00 pm	<b>2.4 Housing market implications (continued)</b>	
---------	--	--

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

Day 8 – Friday 27 April		
-------------------------	--	--

<b>Matter 3: The Spatial Strategy</b>		
---------------------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	<b>3/1 Strategy approach</b>	24
----------	------------------------------	----

In setting out the broad Spatial Strategy is the draft RSS sufficiently clear on the meaning of 'balanced growth' and in particular:

- a) Do the three broad strategy emphases adequately reflect the range of strategic issues in the region? and
- b) To what extent are these strategic emphases reflected in the draft RSS policies? Should there be differences of approach to the rural area issues in the three broad areas? and
- c) Are the broad transportation implications adequately identified?

**Opened by South West Regional Development Agency**

1. Is there a need to amend the descriptions of the three strategic emphases to better reflect the type of approach required?
2. Could the Functional Economic Zones provide an opportunity to refine the delivery of the three strategic emphases?
3. The three broad areas contain parts which seem inconsistent with the general approach advocated e.g. Bath would seem to need a "managed" approach but lies within the "realise potential" area. To what extent could such anomalies be overcome by a supplementary statement?
4. To what extent would the incorporation of the statement of intent relating to the Vision of the RES, which recognises that economic growth should be secured within environmental limits, provide a more comprehensive strategic context?
5. To what extent would the drawing together of a vision and a statement of intent in the introduction to the spatial strategy statement provide a more comprehensive strategic context?

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

<b>EiP Week 3</b>		
Day 9 – Tuesday 1 May 2007		

**Matter 3: The Spatial Strategy (Continued)**

10.00 am	<b>3.2 Strategy approach - SSCTs and other settlements</b>	24
----------	--	----

Draft Is the basis and purpose of identifying SSCTs sufficiently clear and is the balance between the identified SSCTs and other settlements appropriate and in particular:

- a) Set out an adequate definition of airport related development? Does the draft RSS adequately set out the planned roles of the SSCTs and other settlements?
- b) Is there a justification for the identification of additional SSCTs?
- c) Does Development Policy B provide adequate guidance on the wide range of towns within the region?
- d) Are the development implications of Policy C adequately set out and are they consistent with the wider strategy? and
- e) Is sufficient guidance provided on what is meant by local need?

**Opened by Gloucestershire/Wiltshire/Swindon Strategic Authorities**

1. To what extent could the emphasis on SSCTs exacerbate the problems of smaller towns and rural areas and does it conflict with Government policy to support and promote a thriving rural economy?
2. Should the draft RSS provide more adequate guidance on the anticipated rates of development for policies A, B and C?
3. Is there a need to provide more adequate guidance on the role of smaller settlements within the sphere of influence of SSCTs?
4. Does a single grouping of SSCTs adequately reflect the scale and functions of the settlements concerned and is there a need to identify additional SSCTs?
5. Does the draft RSS provide adequate descriptions of the SSCTs e.g. S.E. Dorset?
6. Could policy B be reworded to provide more adequate guidance?
7. Could policy C be reworded to more adequately reflect the need to maintain a sustainable rural economy?
8. Do policies B and C respond adequately to paragraph 38 of PPS3? With regard to “local need” is there scope for a wider ranging definition than that relating to affordable housing in PPS3, to include market housing?

2.00 pm	<b>3.2 Strategy approach - SSCTs and other settlements (continued)</b>	
---------	--	--

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

Day 10 – Wednesday 2 May		
--------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	<b>3.3 Strategy approach - Rural areas</b>	24
----------	--	----

In setting out the broad strategic approach, does the draft RSS adequately deal with rural issues such as the pressures on agriculture due to CAP changes and the threats and opportunities related to other rural activities and in particular does the draft RSS adequately:

- a) Identify the range of issues pertaining to the rural areas?
- b) Reflect the spatial needs and opportunities?
- c) Establish realistic proposals? and
- d) Does the draft RSS give sufficient guidance on the appropriate scale and distribution of development in rural areas?

**Opened by National Farmers Union**

- 1. Given the wide range of countryside areas within the region, could an adequate definition of what constitutes the rural areas be established?
- 2. Does the Context section of the draft RSS adequately reflect the scale and relative importance of the rural areas in the South West?
- 3. To what extent do some of the policies relating to the rural areas conflict with policy SD4 and could this be overcome by the introduction of a broad policy statement on the role of the rural areas?
- 4. Should the draft RSS attempt to deal with the fine-grained nature of planning issues in the rural areas?
- 5. To what extent should the cumulative effect of additional housing in the rural area be regarded as a threat to the strategy and could the draft RSS better reflect the relationship between the urban areas and the rural areas?
- 6. Is there a need to reconsider the application of sustainability tests for development in the rural areas?
- 7. Does the draft RSS provide adequate guidance on development in the open countryside?

2.00 pm	<b>3.3 Strategy approach - Rural areas (continued)</b>	
---------	--	--

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

Day 11 – Thursday 3 May		
-------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	<b>3.4 Reuse of previously developed land and buildings</b>	23
----------	---	----

In setting out the approach to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings, does the draft RSS:

- a) Set a sufficiently challenging target for the re-use of brownfield land?
- b) Adequately reflect the uneven distribution of such land within the region? and
- c) Provide adequate guidance on rural brownfield sites?

**Opened by Barton Wilmore Planning Partnership**

1. To what extent does the evidence base allow a judgement on the scale of a realistic or challenging target?
2. What would be the implications for the target of the adoption of a higher level of housing growth?
3. Is there a need to clarify the role of the target in terms of the balance to be struck between positive encouragement of the use of PDL and restrictions on the release of greenfield land to achieve the target?
4. Does the draft RSS adequately reflect the uneven distribution of such land within the region?
5. To what extent is the evidence available to support sub-regional targets?
6. Does the draft RSS provide adequate guidance on rural brownfield land and should that guidance confirm that the achievement of the target should not provide a justification for the release of unsustainable brownfield land?
7. Is it appropriate for Policy I to effectively establish a separate policy regime for PDL in public ownership and is that policy unduly restrictive, for example with regard to national defence interests?

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

Day 11 – Thursday 3 May		
-------------------------	--	--

2.00 pm	<b>3.5 The selection of strategic greenfield development areas</b>	21
---------	--	----

Has a suitably systematic approach been taken to the identification of strategic green field development areas and in particular:

- a) Has a suitably systematic approach been taken to the identification of strategic green field development areas and in particular:
- b) To what extent should the 5 purposes of including land in Green Belts, set out in paragraph 1.5 of PPG2, contribute to the area selection process? and
- c) Does the provision of a strategic 20 year land supply through the draft RSS meet the advice in PPG2 that consideration should be given to safeguarding land to ensure that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period?

**Opened by Baker Associates**

1. How useful is the application of the 5 Green Belt purposes in the Buchanan Green Belt Review, when the Arup report indicates that areas identified as causing “least” or “second least” harm are located a significant distance from the boundary of Bristol and Bath, in what others have described as relatively unsustainable locations?
2. What approach could be adopted to resolve the tensions between sustainable development principles and the 5 purposes of including land in the Green Belts e.g. in transport corridors between main settlements?
3. To what extent should the draft RSS assess and provide guidance on the potential contribution from non-strategic greenfield opportunities?
4. To what extent have sustainable development principles and the 5 Green Belt purposes been used to guide the need for extensions to the Green Belt?
5. Should the guidance on the release areas in area affected by Green Belts accept the need to identify the maximum sustainable capacity of each area in order to allow for comprehensive planning and respond to the requirements of PPG2 in terms of safeguarding?
6. Does the draft RSS provide an adequate policy framework for dealing with Green Belt review?

Day A – Friday 4 May		
----------------------	--	--

10.00 am	<b>Keep Free</b>	
----------	------------------	--