

London Borough of Richmond

RICHMOND UPON THAMES LOCAL PLAN 2017

ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

- including timetable

September 2017

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES LOCAL PLAN 2017 (LBR)

Venue: The hearing sessions will be held in the **Council Chamber, York House, Richmond Road, Twickenham, TW1 3AA**, commencing on Tuesday 26th September 2017 at 10.00am.

Council: London Borough of Richmond will be participating in all hearing sessions.

Statement deadlines:

All Statements for the Hearing Sessions, from Representors, must be sent to the Programme Officer by **14.00 on Friday 8th September 2017**. This deadline relates to the receipt of both **paper and electronic copies**.

Statements:

The Inspector requests written responses from the Council to all the matters raised.

Written Statements from Representors are not compulsory but if Representors feel a Statement is warranted they should seek only to answer the Inspector's Questions as far as they relate to their original representations.

The examination starts from the assumption that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound Plan and that the Council has fulfilled its legal duty with regard to the Duty to Co-operate. The hearings will be concerned only with considerations relating to the soundness of the document and the legality of the process followed, and all submissions should address those issues as appropriate.

The Guidance Note provided set out the requirements for the presentation of all Statements. Its provisions should be thoroughly read and implemented as otherwise Statements could be returned. Please note the 3,000 word limit.

In the Statements from respondents it would be very helpful for the Inspector to have a brief concluding section stating:

- what part of the Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan is unsound;
- which soundness criterion it fails;
- why it fails (point to the key parts of your original representations);
- how the Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan can be made sound; and
- the precise change and/or wording that you are seeking.

The Inspector will give equal weight to views put orally or in writing.

If you have any queries – please contact the Programme Officer at bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com

ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

Preamble

If the Inspector is satisfied that an Issue or Question has been satisfactorily addressed in the submitted Statements it is possible that it may not be included in the final Agenda. Consequently the timetable and lists of participants may be subject to change, so please contact the Programme Officer or view the programme on the Examination page of the Council's web-site.

Tuesday 26th September - 10.00

Introduction by the Inspector

Opening Statement by the Council

Hearing 1 26th Sept - Morning

LEGAL COMPLIANCE, SPATIAL VISION AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Is the Plan legally compliant? Does the Plan contain a robust spatial vision and justified strategic objectives consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan?

Potential Participants

London Borough of Richmond

181- Max Millington

187- Tim Catchpole Mortlake Brewery Community Group and East Sheen Society

Agenda

- a) Welcome**
- b) Factual updates and clarifications**
- c) Focus for Discussion:**

1.	Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures of the 2004 Act (as amended) and the associated regulations ¹ , including in respect of the publication and availability of documents, advertisements and notification?
2.	Does the Plan acknowledge adequately cross border issues, particularly with regard to the Duty to Cooperate on strategic matters?

¹ Particularly, The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

	<p>Have there been timely, effective and conclusive discussions with key stakeholders and prescribed bodies on what the plan should contain?</p> <p>How does the Plan align with those of adjacent Boroughs?</p>
3.	Has the production of the Plan followed the Local Development Scheme (is the LDS up to date in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act 2011)?
4.	Has the production of the Plan followed the Statement of Community Involvement? Has the consultation on the submitted plan (and its changes) been adequate?
5.	Is the Equalities Impact Assessment adequate and robust in terms of its methodology and conclusions?
6.	<p>Has the Plan been prepared to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and in general conformity with the London Plan? What review mechanisms are inbuilt?</p> <p>Is the Plan in general conformity with the London Plan?</p>
7.	Has adequate consideration been given to the Habitat Regulations? Will the implementation of the Plan, alone or in combination, affect adversely any Natura 2000 sites? Is Natural England satisfied with the content of the Plan, particularly with regard to potential effects on Richmond Park SAC?
8.	Does the Plan contain a positively prepared, clear and justified vision for the Borough? How have reasonable alternatives been considered and discounted? Is the spatial vision justified and robust with due regard to inclusive design?
9.	How have the Strategic Objectives been derived, are these adequate and linked to specific policy provision? Are the Strategic Objectives, as worded, consistent with subsequent policy provision, eg meeting peoples' housing needs? Is inclusive design referenced adequately?
10.	<p>To what extent, and through which iterations, has the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) informed the content of the submitted Plan²?</p> <p>Is the Council satisfied that the SA adequately summarises or repeats the reasons that were given for rejecting the alternatives at the time when they were ruled out (and that those reasons are still valid)?</p>

² Discussion upon alternative approaches to specific policy content will be undertaken at subsequent and relevant hearing sessions as necessary.

11.	Are issues of development viability recognised adequately by the Plan and its evidence base? Has a final viability assessment been undertaken for the content of the Plan as a whole which supports the deliverability of the plan objectives in a manner consistent with national policy?
12.	Should the Plan contain a more fulsome and inclusive reference to the role of Neighbourhood Planning? Is the submitted Plan in line with national policy in this regard?
13.	How are changes to the policies map ³ intended to be collated and shown within the Plan? Are the changes proposed to the map currently sufficiently clear and comprehensive?

³To be discussed at Hearing 7 further.

d) Any Other Business

e) Close

Tuesday 26th September - 14.00

Hearing 2 26th Sept - Afternoon

Is the approach of the Plan to Community Facilities justified by the evidence base, consistent with national policy and will it be effective in operation?

Potential Participants

London Borough of Richmond

026- Indigo Planning On Behalf Of Beechcroft Developments Ltd.

141- SSA Planning On Behalf Of Kentucky Fried Chicken (Great Britain) Ltd. (LP30 B2)

187- Tim Catchpole Mortlake Brewery Community Group and East Sheen Society

181- Max Millington

208- Nicholas Grundy, Park Road Surgery Teddington.

210- Patient Participation Group, Park Road Surgery Teddington

Agenda

a) Welcome

b) Factual updates and clarifications

c) Focus for Discussion:

Community Facilities	
1.	Is LP 28 based on robust evidence of needs and existing provision? Is it flexible, consistent with national policy and will it be effective in delivery?

	Is it clear what social/community infrastructure is? Why is a threshold of 10 units used in criterion E?
2.	Is LP 29 based on robust evidence of needs and existing provision? Is it flexible and will it be effective in delivery? What is the justification for requiring a Local Employment Agreement and is this consistent with national policy?
3.	Does the plan reference robustly and accurately the health care services of the Borough and its future infrastructure needs? Is the plan and LP 30 based on sufficient evidence of demand and supply over the Plan period?
4.	What is the justification for LP30 B2? Is this consistent with national policy and aligned with the London Plan?
5.	Is the approach to public open space, play space, sport and recreation justified by a sufficiently robust evidence base? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How have current open space provision and needs been assessed? What up to date evidence supports the approach and is it consistent with national planning policy? • Are the requirements of criteria B justified and have they been assessed for their effect on development viability? • Is Sport England satisfied with the approach of the Plan towards sport and recreation?
6.	Is food growing referenced adequately and is the Plan aligned with the London Plan adequately in this regard?

d)Any Other Business**e)Close**

Wednesday 27th September - 09.30 Full Day**(Contingency for Overrun on Thursday 28th)****Hearing 3 27th Sept
HOUSING**

Is the Local Plan's approach to housing provision sufficiently justified and consistent with national planning policy and in general conformity with the London Plan? With particular regard to deliverability, has the Plan been positively prepared and will it be effective in meeting the varied housing needs applicable to the Borough over the plan period?

Potential Participants***London Borough of Richmond******026- Indigo Planning On Behalf Of Beechcroft Development Ltd.******059- Louise Spalding Defence Infrastructure Organisation (LP34)******073- GL Hearn On Behalf Of Evergreen Investment Retail Company.******118- James Stevens Home Builders Federation.******187- Tim Catchpole Mortlake Brewery Community Group and East Sheen Society******228-Quantum Group*****Agenda****a) Welcome****b)Factual updates and clarifications****c)Focus for Discussion:**

	LP 34 New Housing
1.	<p>Is Policy LP34 justified, consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and aligned adequately with the London Plan?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has the Plan been informed by, and is it consistent with, the Council's (and London's) Housing Strategy? • Is the evidence in support of the planned level of housing provision robust (with due regard to data relating to population projections and alternative methodologies and the Council's SHMA)? • Is the SHMA robust, has it used the most up to date housing projections and how does it inform the Plan housing requirement with due regard to the housing market area? How does the Council anticipate that the housing needs identified in the SHMA will be met?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How have market signals been considered? • Are the population forecasts and assumptions relating to migration robust? • How will the Council address future changes to the London Plan? • Should housing targets be referenced clearly as minimums? Are the ranges shown in LP 34 B minimums? • Is the level of proposed housing over the plan period deliverable? How has the housing trajectory been derived and is it robust? Does the Council have a five year supply of housing sites that is consistent with national policy? • To what extent has the council considered increasing the overall level of housing proposed to increase the provision of affordable homes? • Is a 'non-implementation allowance' required? • The consultation document "Planning for the right homes in the right places" sets out a proposed approach to calculating local housing need, on which the Government is seeking further views. It also sets out proposed transitional arrangements for applying that approach. For plans at the examination stage, the proposed transitional arrangement is to progress with the examination using the current approach. In this context, are there any implications for the current examination?⁴
	LP 35 Housing Mix and Standards
2.	<p><u>Mix</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the housing mix proposed within LP 35 justified by the evidence base and viable? How has this been considered against alternatives? • Is LP 35 sufficiently clear and capable of flexibility in delivery?

⁴ Additional question added 18.9.17. Planning for the right homes in the right places: consultation proposals (DCLG Sept 2017)

	<p><u>Standards</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the requirement to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standard justified? • Is the requirement to comply with the Council's external space standards justified, flexible and capable of effective delivery? • Is LP 35 D clear and capable of effective delivery?
3.	What robust evidence underpins the approach of the Plan towards the housing needs of vulnerable and older people? Does this encompass the need for retirement properties adequately?
4.	Are the needs of single persons recognised adequately?
5.	Does the Plan recognise the issues around 'build to rent'? Does the plan acknowledge adequately the provision of private rented housing in the supply side?
	LP 36 – Affordable Housing
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is LP 36 A justified by the evidence base with regard to national policy? • Is a 50% threshold for affordable housing deliverable and viable? Is the Policy consistent with the NPPF, with due regard to positive planning and considerations of viability? • What is the expected tenure mix for affordable housing and is it justified by the evidence base? • Is LP 36 B justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy? Is it supported adequately by the viability evidence? • Does LP 36 C apply to all schemes and is it consistent with LP 36A? How will it operate in practice? Do all planning applications require a viability assessment? • Does LP 36 contain adequate flexibility to be effective in delivery? • Is the calculation for affordable housing, based on the gross level of development proposed, justified? • Is the Policy consistent with the Mayor's emerging SPG? • Does the plan acknowledge adequately the role of intermediate rent as an affordable housing tenure within private rented developments?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the Plan reference self-build opportunities for affordable housing? Are self-build and starter homes referenced adequately and in line with national policy?
	LP 37
7.	<p>What specific housing needs are addressed by LP 37? Is it justified by the evidence base and will it be effective in delivery?</p> <p>Should the policy contain clearer targets for the delivery of housing to meet needs, eg for the provision of supported homes or student accommodation et al?</p> <p>Is the approach of LP 37 aligned adequately with the London Plan?</p>
8.	<p>What evidence justifies the approach of the Plan towards gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople and is this sufficiently up to date and consistent with national policy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the duty to cooperate been employed adequately (and sufficiently widely) to address the issue of gypsy and traveller accommodation effectively? What engagement with relevant communities has been undertaken outside of the Borough? How have alternatives been considered and discounted? Is the needs assessment adequate for the entire plan period and how does it relate to Section 124 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 (caravans and houseboats)? How will the issue of needs assessment and site supply be addressed into the future?
9.	<p>Should LP 39 be more permissive?</p> <p>Is it necessary to reference other LP policies?</p>

d)Any Other Business**e)Close**

Thursday 28th September - 09.30 Morning Session Only

Hearing 4 28th Sept – Morning
Site Allocations

Potential Participants

London Borough of Richmond

026- Indigo Planning On Behalf Of Beechcroft Development Ltd.

059- Louise Spalding Defence Infrastructure Organisation (SA14)

169- Greater London Authority On Behalf Of Mayor of London (SA8)

247- Lichfields On Behalf Of The Rugby Football Union (RFU)(SA11)

275- Strawberry Hill Residents' Association

304- Lichfields On Behalf Of West London Mental Health NHS Trust

Agenda

- a) Welcome
- b) Factual updates and clarifications
- c) Focus for Discussion:

1.	Are the Site Allocations justified by the evidence base and of sufficient detail so as to be effective in delivery? Are heritage assets referenced adequately?
2.	SA2- does the allocation recognise adequately the heritage assets potentially affected? How does the allocation reconcile flood risk?
3.	Is SA3 – justified by the evidence base and should it recognise the planning permission resolved to be granted by the Council?
4.	Are the provisions of SA7 sufficiently clear and justified? Should the allocation include specific reference to the provision of appropriate outside space and parking provision?
5.	SA8 – is the site allocation, particularly in relation to the extent of MoL, justified and consistent with the London Plan? Are heritage assets referenced appropriately?
6.	SA11 – is the allocation justified adequately and should it reference clearly the approach to growth of facilities at the site?
7.	SA14 – is the allocation justified and up to date? Is it sufficiently flexible to be effective in delivery?

8.	SA 15 – is the allocation justified by the evidence base with due regard to reasonable alternatives? Should the allocation be more flexibly worded to accommodate the potential for residential provision?
9.	SA 17 ⁵ – is the allocation justified by the evidence base, particularly in relation to the identified land uses and the garden designation as OOLTI (Other Open Land of Townscape Importance) and OSNI (Other Site of Nature Importance)? Will the allocation be capable of effective implementation?
10.	SA 16 ⁶ – is the allocation justified by the evidence base and will it be effective in delivery?

⁵ This question originally referred to SA16 in error. A discussion upon SA16 may be held at the Inspector's discretion following submission of additional statements.

⁶ Additional question added for discussion in light of submissions at the Inspector's discretion (18.9.17).

d)Any Other Business

e)Close

Monday 9th October - 09.30 Full Day

Hearing 5 9th October

Character and Design. Green Infrastructure. Climate Change
Does the Plan take a justified and suitably evidenced based approach towards design, Green Infrastructure and climate change? Is the Plan consistent with national policy in such regards and will it be effective in implementation?

Potential Participants

Richmond upon Thames Borough Council

026- Indigo Planning On Behalf Of Beechcroft Development Ltd.

083- Friends of The River Crane Environment (FORCE)

181- Max Millington

186- Ann Hewitt Mortlake Brewery Community Group

187- Tim Catchpole Mortlake Brewery Community Group and East Sheen Society

202/299- Old Deer Park Working Group (Question9)(ODPG)

228- Barton Willmore On Behalf Of Quantum Group

240- Indigo Planning On Behalf of Sharpe's Refinery Service.

274- Lichfields On Behalf Of St Paul's School(Question 8&9)

279- David Taylor with Counsel (Question 9)

280- Teddington Community Sports Ground CIC

290- RPS CgMs On Behalf Of Mr Malachi Trout

Agenda**a) Welcome****b) Factual updates and clarifications****c) Running order will be as follows:**

- i. Green Infrastructure (Questions 8 – 15)**
- ii. Climate Change (Questions 16 – 20)**
- iii. Character and Design (Questions 1 – 7)**

Focus for Discussion:

Character and Design	
1.	Is LP 1 justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy? To ensure soundness, should the Council's SPD be referenced in the supporting text and not in the Policy itself? Is the policy positively prepared in relation to advertisements and shop fronts?
2.	Is LP 2 positively prepared, justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy, particularly in relation to criteria 5, 6 and 7?
3.	Are LP 3, 4 and 7 positively prepared, justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy?
4.	What is the evidence base underpinning the Views and Vistas referred to within LP 5. Does criteria 6 (a,b,c) make grammatical sense?
5.	Is LP 8 positively prepared, justified and capable of effective delivery?
6.	Is LP10 justified by the evidence and has it been considered for its effects upon development viability? Is the monitoring charge for CMS justified, consistent with national policy and how will it be implemented in practice?
7.	What is the justification for LP11 and is it consistent with national policy? Is the EA satisfied with the content of the policy? Should the policy include reference to SPD?
Green Infrastructure	
8.	Is the evidence base supporting Policies LP12, LP13 ⁷ and Local Green Space (LGS) robust? Are Policies LP12 and 13 clear in their intention/wording and means of delivery? How is the approach to LGS designed to work in practice? What evidence underpins the policy formulation in this regard?

⁷ A reference to LP13 has been inserted to provide clarity to the question.

	Does the plan contain adequate reference to the River Crane?
9.	Is the Local Plan's approach to Green Belt and MoL justified, consistent with national policy and in conformity with the London Plan? Are alterations to the Policies Map necessary?
10.	What is the justification for LP 14 and the designation of Other Open Land of Townscape Importance? Is the policy consistent with national policy?
11.	What evidence supports the approach of LP 15 and is Natural England satisfied fully with its content?
12.	Is LP16 B (3) justified, consistent with national policy and will it be effective in delivery?
13.	What is the justification for LP 17? Has it been considered adequately for its effect upon development viability?
14.	Is LP18 justified and flexible in operation? Are criterion C and D warranted and capable of implementation?
15.	Is LP 19 justified as a whole and are the criteria warranted and capable of implementation?
	Climate Change
16.	How will LP 20 be effective in operation?
17.	Is LP 21 justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy? Is the EA satisfied with its content? Should there be reference to the Water Framework Directive within the Plan? Does the Plan refer adequately to Groundwater Source Protection Zones
18.	Is LP 22 positively prepared, justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy? Are the detailed criteria necessary within planning policy?
19.	Is LP 24 justified by the evidence base? Should SPD be referenced within policy? Has the policy been assessed for its effect upon development viability? Is the approach towards Arlington Waste Works justified?

20.	Are issues of land contamination, remediation and water/air quality acknowledged sufficiently by the Plan?

d)Any Other Business

e)Close

Wednesday 11th October - 09.30

Hearing 6 11th October - Morning

ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT; BOROUGH CENTRES

Does the local plan provide the most appropriate and robust strategy towards the economy and the Borough centres with due regard to cross border issues? Is the approach evidenced adequately and consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan? Will the approach be effective?

Potential Participants

Richmond upon Thames Borough Council

073- GL Hearn On Behalf Of Evergreen Investment Retail Company.

095- Colliers On Behalf Of Greggs Plc.

187- Tim Catchpole Mortlake Brewery Community Group and East Sheen Society

295- Boyer Planning (Philip Allin) On Behalf Of Twickenham Plating Ltd, Percy Chapman & Sons Ltd, Electroline Ltd

Agenda

a)Welcome

b)Factual updates and clarifications

c)Focus for Discussion:

	Borough Centres
1.	Is the approach to retail provision within the Borough over the plan period robust (evidence relating to capacity/needs) and in line with the London Plan?
2.	What evidence supports Policy LP 25 and how will it be implemented effectively?

	<p>How has the centre hierarchy been defined?</p> <p>Is the 200m² threshold contained in criteria 2 justified?</p>
3.	<p>Does the Plan take an evidence based approach to the identification of key and secondary retail frontages (LP 26) which is suitably robust? Are these recognised in the Policies Map?</p> <p>Does the Plan take a positive and justified approach towards retail activity in the Borough centres and towards local shops and services? Will LP26 (A) prove inflexible in practice?</p> <p>What evidence supports the Plan's intentions with regard to 'over concentration' of uses? Is this consistent with national policy and the London Plan?</p> <p>Does LP 26 allow for banks/building societies to locate reasonably in retail frontages?</p> <p>Is LP 26 criteria F (2 years of marketing) and Appendix 5 justified?</p>
	Economy
4.	<p>What robust evidence justifies Policy LP 40 and how will it be implemented effectively, with due regard to viability?</p> <p>Does the policy provide adequate flexibility for potential changing circumstances over the plan period?</p> <p>Does the plan contain flexibility in Policy LP41 by recognising that affordable workspace could be provided by its design or its rent?</p>
5.	<p>What robust evidence supports Policy LP41 and how will it be implemented effectively? Is the Borough wide approach to office floorspace justified and consistent with national policy and in conformity with the London Plan?</p> <p>Is the sequential approach to redevelopment justified?</p> <p>Are the Key Office Areas identified through a robust evidence base?</p> <p>Is the provision of affordable office space justified and should the policy contain a reference to SPD?</p>
6.	<p>What robust evidence supports Policy LP42 and how will it be implemented effectively? Is the Borough wide approach to industrial floorspace justified?</p> <p>Is a 2 year marketing period justified and will it be effective in</p>

	implementation? Is the approach towards locally important industrial land and business parks supported adequately by the evidence base, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan?
7.	What robust evidence supports LP 43 and the provision of visitor attractions and accommodation? Is the approach aligned adequately with the London Plan?

d) Any Other Business

e) Close

Wednesday 11th October - 14.00

Hearing 7 11th October - Afternoon

TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE, MONITORING AND OTHER MATTERS

Does the Plan address adequately transport issues and the provision of necessary infrastructure to support the delivery of the strategic objectives and the vision? Are the Plan's monitoring targets justified adequately and of a level of detail that is appropriate to a Local Plan? How will the effectiveness of the Plan be managed?

Potential Participants

Richmond upon Thames Borough Council

026- Indigo Planning On Behalf Of Beechcroft Development Ltd.

224- Howard Potter (LP44)

274- Lichfields On Behalf Of St Paul's School (Question 7)

288- Transport for London

Agenda

a) Welcome

b) Factual updates and clarifications

c) Focus for Discussion:

1.	Is Policy LP44 justified by the evidence base and in general conformity with the London Plan?
2.	Is the Local Plan's approach to transport related matters accepted by Transport for London?
3.	Are the standards of LP 45 justified and consistent with national policy? Are they in general conformity with the London Plan?

4.	With due regard to all infrastructure (transport, resources, services etc) is the Infrastructure Delivery Plan up to date? Does it specify clearly what is required, where, when and how it may be funded and delivered?
5.	How have risks and contingency been robustly addressed in the production of the Plan? Where is the supporting evidence?
6.	How will the effectiveness of the Plan and its individual policies be measured/assessed? Should there be monitoring indicators for each policy/objective? Are the arrangements for managing and monitoring the delivery of the Plan clear and will they be effective? Should the Plan include clearer timescales to assist monitoring, thereby providing milestones to assess policy effectiveness?
7.	Do the changes to the Policies Map reflect the Plan adequately? Are the changes proposed to the Policies Map sufficiently clear and comprehensive? Is the Policies Map informed by the evidence adequately?
8.	Is the approach of the Plan towards S106 obligations consistent with national policy?
	Other Matters to include: ⁸ Continuation of discussion relating to Question 9 at Hearing 4 including an update from the Council relating to OSNI: 9. SA 17 – is the allocation justified by the evidence base, particularly in relation to the identified land uses and the garden designation as OOLTI (Other Open Land of Townscape Importance) and OSNI (Other Site of Nature Importance)? Will the allocation be capable of effective implementation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matters arising • Schedule of changes/modifications • Timescale of next steps

d)Any Other Business

e)Close

⁸ Additional item added following Hearing 4 on 28.9.17

Thursday 12th October - 09.30

Hearing 8 12th October
Site Allocations

Potential Participants***Richmond upon Thames Borough Council***

066- Peter Eaton

181- Max Millington (SA24)

187- Tim Catchpole Mortlake Brewery Community Group and East Sheen Society

191- Henrike Mueller (SA24)

199- Una O'Brien

202/299- Paul Velluet (SA19)(ODPG)

224- Howard Potter (SA24)

Agenda

a)Welcome

b)Factual updates and clarifications

c)Focus for Discussion:

1.	SA24 – is the allocation justified by the evidence base with due regard to alternatives and in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The accessibility of the site; • The need for a secondary school; • The capacity of the site for mixed use development including housing; • The presence and use of the sports field; • The presence of heritage assets; • The deliverability of the redevelopment.
2.	SA19 – is the allocation justified by the evidence base with particular regard to the presence of heritage assets? Is it sufficiently flexible to ensure effective implementation?
3.	SA20 – should the allocation provide more detail on the opportunities and constraints within the site, eg storey heights, capacity?
4.	SA22 – is the allocation justified by the evidence base? Are the heritage assets and presence of MoL recognised adequately?
5.	SA23 – is the allocation justified by the evidence base with due regard to the presence of MoL and the consideration of alternatives?
6.	SA26 – is the allocation justified in relation to the presence of MoL?

7.	SA28 – is the allocation justified by the evidence base with due regard to the accessibility of the site and the consideration of alternatives?
----	---

13th October – contingency day.

CLOSING STATEMENT BY COUNCIL

CLOSING REMARKS BY INSPECTOR