

## **AGENDA**

**Tuesday 29 January 2013**

**TIMING AND PROGRAMMING:** In order to make efficient use of time whilst allowing each participant the opportunity to put their case, the hearing will be run as a "Rolling Programme" with no set timings for agenda items. The matters to be discussed will be dealt with in Plan order unless any participants have time constraints, in which case the programme will be adjusted by agreement at the commencement of the Hearing. The Hearing will run from 10:00 until approximately 17:00 with mid morning, lunch and afternoon breaks to be agreed by participants.

1. Inspector's opening
2. Any questions / procedural or programming matters
3. Council's Opening Statement

### **Matter 1**

4. Legal requirements
5. Compliance with the Waste Core Strategy.

### **Matter 2 – A desirable Place to Live**

6. Does the Plan make provision for sufficient housing based on up-to-date assessments / evidence of need? Are the policies sufficiently flexible to accommodate any additional residential development that may be required?
7. How has the SAPDPD evolved in terms of the alternatives considered? How were these evaluated and have all reasonable options been examined? Are the choices made properly justified and is it clear from the Sustainability Appraisal why the preferred options have been chosen?
8. Does the Plan adequately address the provision of affordable housing?
9. Is Policy SAL.DPL2 consistent with the Core Strategy, in particular Policy CPO4 which indicates that the Council will to secure affordable housing provision of 30% on sites of 6 or more dwellings within Bewdley and the rural areas?
10. Policy SAL.DPL2 currently restricts development in Bewdley and rural areas (other than those allocated for development), except in specific circumstances, including schemes for 100% affordable housing. Is the provision of 100% affordable housing justified and a viable proposition? A main modification is suggested to enable windfall development on brownfield sites for up to 5 dwellings. What is the justification for this modification?

11. The Council have requested that I consider a number of suggested main modifications. Are the main modifications suggested by the Council justified and necessary to address soundness?

### **Matter 3 - Gypsies and Travellers**

12. Does the SAPDPD conform to the Planning Policy for traveller sites (PPTS)?
13. Is the current assessment of need robust?
14. Insufficient sites are allocated to meet the currently identified need for additional pitches over the Plan period. How is the shortfall of pitches to be addressed?
15. Have all reasonable options been examined? Are the choices made properly justified and is it clear from the SA why the preferred options have been chosen? Have the choices had sufficient regard to flooding issues?
16. Does the SAPDPD have due regard to the strategies of neighbouring authorities? In particular is there justification for encouragement in paragraph 4.67 to locate additional sites near Stourport-on-Severn?
17. What assessment has the Council made of the deliverability of sites to meet the identified need within the constraints of the selected criteria contained in Policy SAL.DPL9 & 10?
18. Should provision be made for windfall sites where there is no identified need (refer to paragraph 10 of the PPTS)? Policies SAL.DPL9 & DPL10 both contain criteria requiring the Council to be satisfied that there is clear evidence of an established need if planning permission is to be granted.
19. Is Policy SAL.DPL10 (Part 4) justified and sufficiently precise to maintain a balance between employment and residential uses and to ensure that the cumulative impact of gypsy sites within the Sandy Lane area of Stourport-on-Severn does not dominate the area? What is the current position with the implementation of Site L?
20. Are the design criteria set out in Part 2 of Policy SAL.DPL10 justified? Part 2 (IV) requires communal recreation areas to be provided. It appears to assume that all sites will be for more than one pitch and will have a site manager. Is Policy SAL.DL10 intended to exclude private family run pitches? Are the main modifications suggested in response to this, necessary to address soundness?