

(Draft) Matters and Issues for Examination

Matter 1 – Procedural / General Matters

1. Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with relevant legal requirements, including the Duty to Co-operate and the procedural requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework?
2. Is the Plan in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)? Does it reflect the National Planning Policy Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development?
3. Is the SAPDPD consistent with the adopted Wyre Forest Core Strategy and Waste Core Strategy?
4. What mechanisms are in place to ensure the necessary infrastructure is delivered?

Matter 2 – A desirable Place to Live

1. It is suggested that the overall housing target as specified in the adopted Core Strategy is out-of-date. 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?
2. 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? Have the choices and phasing of development been sufficiently informed by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Sequential Testing (Flooding) reports?
3. It is suggested that the DPD is flawed and unsound as it fails to identify enough land to accommodate sufficient affordable housing. Does the Plan adequately address the provision of affordable housing?
4. Policy SAL.DPL2 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 on windfall sites?
5. Is Policy SAL.DPL2 consistent with the Core Strategy, in particular Policy CPO4?
6. Is Policy SAL.DPL6 consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraph 60?

Matter 3 – Gypsies and Travellers

1. Does the SAPDPD conform to the Planning Policy for traveller sites (PPTS)?
2. Is the current assessment of need robust? What is the justification for the pitch requirement figure of 35 pitches (to 2017) adopted by the Council for the purposes of the Plan?
3. 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 SA why the preferred options have been chosen? Have the choices had sufficient regard to flooding issues?
4. Does 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?
 5. 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?
 6. 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?
 7. Should provision be made for windfall sites where there is no identified need (please refer to paragraph 10 of the PPTS)?
 8. 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?
 9. 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?

Matter 4 - A Good Place to do Business

1. Is Policy SAL.GPB1 sufficiently flexible to ensure the deliverability of economic development on the allocated sites?
2. Does the amount of land allocated for employment purposes have regard to the requirements for the delivery of green infrastructure and open space?

Matter 5 - Retailing

1. Does the sequential approach set out in Policy SAL.GPB2 accord with the Framework?
2. Is the retail floorspace threshold of 250 sq m referred to in a number of policies appropriate and justified?

Matter 6 - Climate Change

1. Do policies in this section have sufficient regard to the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy?

Matter 7 - A Unique Place

1. Are policies SAL.UP1 & UP6 consistent with the Framework?
2. Will the policies in the SAPDPD deliver open space?
3. Should the SAPDPD identify the amount of space required for green infrastructure?
4. Is Policy SAL.UP13 positively prepared and sound?

Matter 8 - South Kidderminster Enterprise Park

1. Are policies SAL.SK1, SK2 & SK3 consistent with the Waste Core Strategy in terms of the uses proposed?
2. Is Policy SAL.SK1 consistent with the Framework in terms of the longer term protection of employment sites?

3. Is economic development within the South Kidderminster Enterprise Park, in particular land in the ownership of Revelan, justified and deliverable given the current economic circumstances?
4. Is the indicative phasing period for Oasis Arts & Crafts and Reilloc Chain justified?

Matter 9 - Rural allocations

Blakedown Nurseries

1. Does Policy SAL.RS1 adequately address local needs? Is it consistent with the Core Strategy?

Clows Top

2. The Coal Authority suggests that the development of this site would sterilise mineral reserves. Has consideration been given to how this would impact on the deliverability of the site within the Plan period?
3. Has sufficient regard been made to the necessary infrastructure upgrades referred to by the Environment Agency in the allocation of this site and the implications that may arise in terms of its deliverability within the Plan period?

Matter 10 - Green Belt

1. Concerns are raised about the viability of development on the former Lea Castle Hospital site. Is the relevant section of Policy SAL.PDS1 sufficiently flexible to ensure that the re-development of the site is deliverable?

Claire Sherratt
Inspector