
SOUTH WEST REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY REVISION

EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC

Final Programme

April 2007

Matters &

Provisional

Agenda Questions

EiP Weeks 8, 9 & 10

<p>Before the EiP the Panel Secretariat Office will be based in Bristol.</p> <p>Panel Secretariat Office 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>Panel Secretariat Office South West RSS EiP Thistle Hotel Queen Street Exeter EX4 3SP Telephone enquires: 01392 312270</p>
---	--

General email: enquiries@southwesteip.co.uk
Website: www.southwesteip.co.uk

Day/Time Matters & Provisional Agenda Questions Participants

EiP Week 8

Day 28 – Tuesday 19 June 2007

Matter 4: Sub-Regional Strategies (continued)

10.00 am **4.10 Polycentric Devon and Cornwall HMA sub-regional strategy** 21

Polycentric Devon and Cornwall HMA covers Barnstaple and also part of Exmoor National Park. Other towns include Bideford/Northam and Bodmin.

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 Barnstaple and Bideford 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 the main settlements?
- c) Has sufficient consideration been given to the distribution of development across 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?
- 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 Devon County Council

1. What is the appropriate level of development within the HMA in the light of the most recent national household forecasts that appear substantially higher than draft RSS Table 4.1?
2. What should be the balance of growth between the main urban areas of Barnstaple and Bideford and the other parts of the HMA?
3. Are the future roles of Barnstaple and Bideford sufficiently clear in the RSS?
4. Is there a need to provide further guidance on the strategic elements of Green Infrastructure to ensure a consistent approach across local authority boundaries?

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

Day 28 – Tuesday 19 June 2007		
-------------------------------	--	--

2.00 pm	4.11 Salisbury District HMA sub-regional strategy	18
---------	--	----

Salisbury District HMA covers Salisbury.

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 Salisbury in terms of its present and future regional and sub-regional roles and its 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 Salisbury?
- c) Has sufficient consideration been given to the distribution of development within 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?
- 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 Barton Wilmore Planning Partnership

1. What is the appropriate level of development within the HMA in the light of the most recent national household forecasts?
2. What balance of housing and employment growth should be struck for the HMA and between the urban area of the City and other parts of the HMA?
3. Does the draft RSS sufficiently address the need to promote functional and economic linkages with the SE region while avoiding increases in long-distance commuting?
4. Should the draft RSS seek to address uncertainties over additional development capacity and distribution at Salisbury consequent upon the outcomes of future studies of environmental limitations relating to water quality, flood risk and impact on River Avon SAC at LDD preparation stage?

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

Day 29 – Wednesday 20 June		
----------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	4.12 Weymouth and Dorchester HMA sub-regional strategy	18
----------	---	----

Weymouth and Dorchester HMA covers Dorchester and Weymouth and includes a wider area and the town of Bridport..

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 Weymouth and Dorchester 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 Weymouth and Dorchester?
- c) Has sufficient consideration been given to the distribution of development within 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?
- 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 Pegasus Planning Group

- 1. What is the appropriate level of development within the HMA in the light of the most recent national household forecasts and the high local affordability index?
- 2. What balance of growth should be struck between the two SSCTs and other parts of the HMA?
- 3. To what extent is further housing provision required at Dorchester to achieve a higher level of self containment and would further provision conflict with flooding and other environmental constraints?
- 4. Is there a need for more explicit guidance on the broad location of economic development in order to achieve higher levels of self-containment, particularly at Weymouth and would such provision be constrained by flood risk?

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

Day 29 – Wednesday 20 June		
----------------------------	--	--

2.00 pm	4.13 South Somerset District HMA sub-regional strategy	19
---------	---	----

South Somerset District HMA covers Yeovil. Other Towns include Chard and Crewkerne. Sherborne, to the east of Yeovil, is in an adjoining HMA.

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 Yeovil in terms of its present and future regional and sub-regional roles and its 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?
- c) Has sufficient consideration been given to the distribution of development within the HMA and to the relationship with development at Sherborne?
- 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?
- 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 Pegasus Planning Group

1. What is the appropriate level of development within the HMA in the light of the most recent national household forecasts?
2. What balance of housing and employment growth should be struck between the urban areas of Yeovil and Sherborne and other parts of the parts of the HMA?
3. Does the draft RSS provide adequate guidance on the balance to be struck within the HMA between regeneration and the release of new greenfield housing and employment areas, particularly having regard to identified flood risks in and around Yeovil?
4. Does the draft RSS establish a sufficiently clear framework of measures to ensure diversification of Yeovil's economic and skills base and development of a sustainable mixed community in line with the "Yeovil Vision"? What are the strategic infrastructure investment requirements to support such development?

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

Day 30 – Thursday 21 June		
---------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	4.14 Reconciling overall demand and sub-regional capacity	25
----------	--	----

Does the draft RSS plan for an appropriate and deliverable level of housing in each Housing Market Area and local authority area and properly reconcile evidence on demand with evidence on capacity and in particular:

- a) How should housing need be reflected in the distribution?
- b) What influence should evidence on affordability have on the distribution?
- c) How should economic potential be reflected in the distribution?
- d) What are the appropriate responses to environmental limits?
- e) What consideration should be given to past building rates and deliverability?
- f) What consideration should be given to phasing?

Opened by Devon County Council

- 1. To what extent does the housing distribution implied by the national household projections provide a broad guide to variations in housing need across the region?
- 2. What is the appropriate response where the draft RSS proposed level of provision and other proposed distributions exceed the national projections e.g. Swindon and Plymouth HMAs?
- 3. What is the appropriate response in HMAs where the affordability indices of price/earnings and house price are lower than the national average e.g. Plymouth, Swindon and Taunton?
- 4. To what extent can high HMA affordability indices be generated by high levels of demand in limited “valued” locations and what might the appropriate response be?
- 5. Is a jobs/homes balance of 1.2 a reasonable benchmark in the consideration of the draft RSS housing distribution?
- 6. To what extent should alternative distributions within HMAs be considered in order to conserve important environmental assets?
- 7. To what extent should evidence on past rates of development be taken into account where proposed housing distributions would require a very significant step change in the rate of development?

2.00 pm	4.14 Reconciling overall demand and sub-regional capacity (continued)	
---------	--	--

Day B – Friday 22 June		
------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	Keep Free	
----------	------------------	--

Day/Time	Matters & Provisional Agenda Questions	Participants
EiP Week 9		
Day 31 – Tuesday 26 June		
Matter 5: Transport/Regional Transport Strategy		

10.00 am **5.1 Management of the transport network** 22

Does the draft RSS deal adequately with the future movement needs of the region and in particular;

- a) Has the draft RSS adequately demonstrated that the policies and proposals are based on a sound assessment of demand for transport?
- b) Is the draft RSS/RTS ambitious enough in seeking to reduce the growth of travel or should it seek to reduce the overall levels of travel by car? and
- c) What other demand management could be considered?

Opened by West of England Strategic Authorities

1. To what extent does the draft RSS reflect government guidance and incorporate a full Regional Transport Strategy statement?
2. To what extent is it practical to aspire to an absolute reduction in the level of traffic given the expected levels of economic growth and the rural nature of the region?
3. To what extent should consideration be given to traffic demand management regimes in advance of a national road charging initiative and what degree of public transport improvement should be sought prior to the introduction of road pricing?
4. Does the draft RSS adequately consider the contribution that the intensification of development along major public transport corridors within and around the main urban areas could make to increasing the use of public transport?

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

Day 31 – Tuesday 26 June		
--------------------------	--	--

2.00 pm **5.2 Improvements to the transport network** 25

Is the proposed package of improvements to the transport network adequately justified and in particular:

- a) Does the draft RSS adequately set out spatially specific transport policies that support the sub-regional strategies?
- b) Is the balance between connectivity and 'making urban areas work' sufficiently clear?
- c) Does the draft RSS adequately demonstrate that the transport priorities and phasing proposals adequately reflect their contribution to the wider spatial strategy and deliverability?
- d) Are the implications of air traffic growth adequately considered? and
- e) To what extent are the draft RSS proposals consistent with the Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) transport priorities?

Opened by West of England Strategic Authorities

1. Does the anticipated level of resources for transportation adequately reflect the pressures likely to be generated by the expected rate of economic growth?
2. In view of the likely impact on transportation resources of the "Second Route" and the need for further investment to make urban transportation effective should further consideration be given to alternatives?
3. Does the draft RSS give adequate weight to the contribution that the existing rail network might make to the reduction in car travel, particularly in the Bristol area?
4. To what extent is the use of a number of road networks in the draft RSS confusing and is their derivation clear?
5. Does the draft RSS give adequate weight to rural transport issues?
6. Does the draft RSS adequately deal with the surface transport implications of the airport passenger growth forecasts?
7. Does the draft RSS adequately set out the contribution to the draft RSS objectives that the Westbury Bypass is expected to make?

Day 32 – Wednesday 27 June		
----------------------------	--	--

10.00 am **5.2 Improvements to the transport network (continued)**

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

Matter 6: Housing		
-------------------	--	--

Day 32 – Wednesday 27 June		
----------------------------	--	--

2.00 pm	6.1 Affordable Housing	24
---------	-------------------------------	----

In setting out policies on affordable housing does the draft RSS give adequate consideration to the likely composition of future households and in particular:

- a) Does the draft RSS adequately justify the target of 7500 additional affordable houses per year?
- b) Does the draft RSS adequately deal with the variations in affordable housing circumstances across the region and is there scope for sub-regional targets? and
- c) Does the draft RSS set out an adequate approach to rural housing and rural affordable housing?

Opened by Shelter

1. Is the 7500 dpa/30-60% target sufficiently well justified to warrant relinquishing the RPG10 target range?
2. Should the draft RSS anticipate situations where SHMAs indicate that affordable housing needs exceed overall dwelling provision, and indicate what the approach should be in such circumstances?
3. Should the draft RSS give with regard to intermediate housing and low cost market housing?
4. Should the draft RSS give guidance on how housing needs in rural areas be addressed without compromising the spatial strategy of the draft RSS?

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

Day 33 – Thursday 28 June		
---------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	6.2 Housing density	18
----------	----------------------------	----

In setting out the policies on housing density does the draft RSS give adequate consideration to the likely composition of future households and in particular:

- a) Do the draft RSS housing density proposals adequately reflect the range of circumstances across the region and is there scope for sub-regional targets? and
- b) Does the draft RSS provide sufficient guidance to ensure mixed and balanced communities?

Opened by West of England Strategic Authorities

- 1. Does the draft RSS suitably reflect the now current guidance on densities in PPS3?
- 2. Are the density ranges advanced in the draft RSS, and the way in which they are expressed, sufficiently supportive of the objectives of Development Policy SD4?
- 3. Should the draft RSS seek to address questions of housing type, mix and size before an evidential base is available in the form of SHMAs and if so to what extent?

Day/Time Matters & Provisional Agenda Questions Participants

Day 33 – Thursday 28 June

Matter 7: The Environment and Resource Management

2.00 pm **7.1 Flood risk** 21

In setting out policies on Flood Risk does the draft RSS set out an adequate approach to flood risk assessment of major development options and in particular:

- a) Does the draft RSS provide sufficient guidance to DPDs for addressing flood risk priorities?
and
- b) Should the draft RSS identify strategic areas in need of flood protection and those areas of the region where managed retreat would be acceptable?

Opened by Environment Agency

1. To what extent should the RSS respond to the RFRA on a) the scale and nature of flood management issues, the strategy for managing the risks and b) the steps that LPAs should take?
2. To what detailed extent should the RSS tie in with non-statutory Catchment Flood Management and Shoreline Management Plans?
3. Bearing in mind the likely availability of funding, should the RSS give guidance on the balance to be struck between safeguarding developed (e.g. economic, tourist and community) areas and nature conservation sites?
4. Should the RSS particularize coastal towns and tourist facilities and give advice so that there is consistency on advice and priorities between local authorities?

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

Day 34 – Friday 29 June		
-------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	7.2 Energy & renewable targets	24
----------	---	----

In setting out policies for Renewable Energy does the draft RSS set out adequate guidance and in particular:

- a) Does the draft RSS properly reflect the requirements of PPS22 in terms of the setting of targets for renewable energy and how should these targets be expressed in the RSS?
- b) Does it provide a justification for linking renewable energy targets with targets for energy efficiency?
- c) Is there clear guidance for stakeholders as to what the target for renewable energy capacity in 2020 is? and
- d) Is the promise of SPD documents an adequate response to paragraph 7 of PPS22, which proposes the development of policies in the RSS to identify broad areas where development of particular types of renewable energy may be considered appropriate?

Opened by Campaign to Protect Rural England

1. Does the draft RSS contain a coherent strategy to meet the Government's target to generate 10% of the United Kingdom's electricity from renewable sources by 2010 and an aspiration to double that figure by 2020?
2. Should there be advice for the purposes of LDD formulation, in the light of an impending shortfall against the 2010 national electricity generation target?
3. Does the draft RSS adequately address the implications of the "Planning and Climate Change" consultation supplement to PPS1, "Building a Greener Future – Towards Zero Carbon Development" and "the Code for Sustainable Homes" with regard to the target for on-site renewable energy generation in policy RE5?

Matter 7: The Environment and Resource Management (continued)

10.00 am **7.3 Waste Management** 17

Does the draft RSS set out an adequate approach to Waste Management and in particular:

- a) Does the draft RSS adequately set out the basis for the amount, type and apportionment of waste in Appendix 2?
- b) Does the proximity principle have a particular relevance in the South West?
- c) Does the draft RSS properly comply with the requirement of PPS10 to identify the need and broad locations for additional waste management capacity of regional or sub-regional significance?
- d) Is the guidance for planning for hazardous waste facilities adequate? and
- e) Is the draft RSS sufficiently clear on the re-use and recycling of demolition and construction wastes?

Opened by Viridor Waste Management

1. Have the implications of future household and economic growth been fully taken into account in Appendix 2 tabulations and do policy W1 and Appendix 2 adequately reflect the waste hierarchy?
2. With regard to policy W1, on the evidential base currently available, does the draft RSS give sufficient and timely guidance on the identification of existing and emerging capacity shortfalls (for M and C & I waste) within the region and the nature and distribution of any necessary additional capacity to enable LDF preparation?
3. In the absence of identification of broad areas of search, does policy W2 give adequate advice on which LDDs may progress towards site identification, particularly with regard to transport?
4. With regard to policy W3, is the approach to the identification of hazardous waste sites likely to lead to a timely and appropriate distribution of such facilities?

Day/Time Matters & Provisional Agenda Questions Participants

Day 35 – Tuesday 3 July

Matter 8: Economy and Employment

2.00 pm **8.1 Employment development requirements** 25

In setting out the approach to accommodating economic growth, does the draft RSS provide sufficient policy guidance for the places that are expected to accommodate the most significant economic change and in particular:

- a) Does the draft RSS adequately deal with the provision of sustainable sites and premises to accommodate the full range of future employment growth?
- b) To what extent should an assessment of employment land requirements be provided on a TTWA or District basis?
- c) Does the draft RSS adequately deal with the competition between employment and other uses? and
- d) Does the draft RSS provide adequate guidance on the re-use and redevelopment of existing employment sites outside of the defined settlements?

Opened by South West Regional Development Agency

- 1. Does the draft RSS adequately set out a spatial plan for the regional economy and how should the non land-use elements, such as skills development, be spatially expressed?
- 2. Does the draft RSS adequately set out an approach to the translation of employment forecasts to employment land requirements and does the draft RSS appropriately reflect evidence of areas of significant shortages of employment land and provide sufficient guidance on the action required for employment land and floorspace requirements?
- 3. Should specific encouragement be given to employment development in central urban areas and does the sequential approach set out in policy E4 provide an adequate response to managing the re-use of employment land?
- 4. In view of its unique scale and planning history is there a need for specific policy guidance on the future of the Severnside area?
- 5. How could the draft RSS deal more adequately with the needs of the rural economy and what might such a policy encompass?

Day 36 – Wednesday 4 July

10.00 am **8.1 Employment development requirements (continued)**

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

Day 36 – Wednesday 4 July		
---------------------------	--	--

2.00 pm	8.2 Retailing and city and town centres	14
---------	--	----

Does the draft RSS set out adequate guidance on the role and function of city and town centres within the region and in particular:

- a) Does the draft RSS adequately set out policies for the role of centres within the region in terms of the functions set out in PPS6?
- b) Is the draft RSS sufficiently clear on the appropriate locations for office development?
- c) Does the draft RSS provide adequate guidance on the accommodation of the anticipated scale of development for city and town centres? and
- d) Is the guidance on 'out-of-town provision' in the draft RSS sufficiently clear, particularly in respect of the Cribbs Causeway retail development?

Opened by Cushman and Wakefield

- 1. Does the hierarchy set out in RPG 10 more appropriately reflect functional relationships than that set out in the draft RSS and is there a need to modify the existing hierarchy to better reflect the strategy?
- 2. To what extent should the draft RSS deal more specifically with the balance to be struck between town centre uses in city and town centres and in other locations within the region including urban extensions?
- 3. Given the potential scale of redevelopment opportunities at Cribbs Causeway does the draft RSS provide adequate guidance in the broad scale and type of development envisaged and the future status of the centre?

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

Day 37 – Thursday 5 July		
--------------------------	--	--

10.00 am	8.3 Tourism development	20
----------	--------------------------------	----

Does the draft RSS provide sufficient guidance on tourism development?

Opened by West of England Strategic Authorities

1. Does the draft RSS follow the national guidance “Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism” and does the draft RSS give a clear indication of the economic growth expected from tourism?
2. Should the draft RSS give more support to “urban” tourism rather than “rural” tourism?
3. Should there be express guidance on the interlinking of transport and the environmental attractions?
4. How best can the draft RSS deal with the conflict between tourism and environmentally vulnerable areas?

Day/Time Matters & Provisional Agenda Questions Participants

Day 37 – Thursday 5 July

Matter 9: Implementation and Monitoring

2.00 pm **9.1 Delivery and infrastructure** 24

Does the draft RSS adequately deal with the issues arising from the implementation of the strategy, particularly:

- a) Is the private sector capable of responding to the increased level of development implied by the technical forecasts?
- b) Does the draft RSS set out an adequate assessment of what is required in terms of infrastructure to deliver the proposed growth, particularly in the Joint Study Areas?
- c) To what extent can major urban extensions be expected to fund the infrastructure implications of the development?
- d) What role might the New Growth Points Fund from the Government play in funding the required infrastructure?
- e) What contribution can be expected from the regional and local funding mechanisms identified in the implementation plan? and
- f) Does the Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) process provide a guide to future resource availability?

Opened by Baker Associates

- 1. Is there sufficient guidance on timelines for LDD formulation (in JSAs and other SSCTs) to ensure that strategic housing land requirements will be met?
- 2. Does the draft RSS distinguish sufficiently clearly between strategic and non-strategic infrastructure?
- 3. Does the draft RSS provide adequate guidance on the phasing of strategic infrastructure relative to the phasing of development?
- 4. Does the draft RSS provide sufficient clarity on the approach to funding cross-boundary infrastructure?

Day 38 – Friday 6 July

10.00 am **9.1 Delivery and infrastructure (continued)**

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

Day 38 – Friday 6 July		
------------------------	--	--

2.00 pm	9.2 Implementation and Monitoring	19
---------	--	----

Does the RSS adequately address the arrangements for monitoring?

Opened by Pegasus Planning Group

1. Has the draft RSS Implementation Plan suitably taken forward the requirements of RPG10 policy MON1, clause (a) and the first sentence of clause (b)?
2. Is the draft RSS Implementation Plan sufficiently clear on how key indicators, such as the ecological footprint (policy SD1) and progress towards sustainable communities (policy SD4) are to be measured?
3. Is the way in which targets are to be expressed sufficiently clear to enable progress against existing position to be measured, for example in the context of reducing rural dispersal relative to urban concentration?
4. Should the draft RSS Implementation Plan include trigger points for remedial action and an outline of what form such action might take particularly with regard to the monitoring and management of the release of land for housing and the delivery of affordable housing?

Chairman's Closing Statement

Close of EiP
