

Adur District Council

# **THE ADUR LOCAL PLAN 2016**

## **ISSUES AND QUESTIONS**

- including timetable

January 2017

## **INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE ADUR LOCAL PLAN 2016 (ALP)**

**Venue:** The hearing sessions will be held in the **QEII Room, The Shoreham Centre, 2 Pond Road, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5WU**, commencing on Tuesday 31<sup>st</sup> January 2017 at 9.30am.

**Council:** Adur District Council 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 **midday on Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> December**. This deadline relates to the receipt of the 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 ALP is unsound;
- which soundness criterion it fails;
- why it fails (point to the key parts of your original representations);
- how the ALP 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](mailto: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 31<sup>st</sup> January - 9.30**

## **Introduction by the Inspector**

## **Opening Statement by the Council**

## **Issue 1 : The Duty to Co-operate (Legal Requirement) and the Council's Broad Spatial Strategy (policy 2)**

### *Potential Participants*

#### *Adur District Council*

*DMH Stallard for New Monks Farm Development Ltd (Rep 20 & 64)*

*CPRE (Rep 21)*

*Home Builders Federation (Reps 32 and 71)*

*Gladman Developments (Mathieu Evans) (Rep 59)*

*ECE Planning for Landstone (Old Salts Farm omission site) (Reps 17 and 72)*

*Thornton Architecture & Design for Cobbetts Development Ltd (Shoreham Gateway omission site) (Reps 34, 60 )*

*ECE Planning for Cobbetts Development Ltd (Rep 66)*

*Boyer Planning for Hyde New Homes (New Salts Farm omission site) (Reps 15 & 61)*

*Turley for Persimmon Homes South Coast Ltd (Reps 26 and 62)*

### Questions

- 1.1 Has co-operation between Adur District Council and other nearby local planning authorities been a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking? What evidence is there of effective co-operation (NPPF<sup>1</sup> paragraph 181) and of joint working on areas of common interest being diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities (NPPF paragraph 178)? Is there a long-term commitment to co-operation?
- 1.2 Have cross-boundary strategic priorities and matters been identified? If so are they clearly reflected in the ALP (NPPF paragraph 156)?
- 1.3 Are any mechanisms in place to enable the unmet housing needs of the District to be met elsewhere?
- 1.4 Is the ALP based on a sound process of sustainability appraisal and testing of reasonable alternatives, and does it represent the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances? Has the strategic site selection process been objective and based on appropriate criteria? Is there clear evidence demonstrating how and why the preferred strategy was selected?
- 1.5 Are all the components of the Council's spatial strategy (policy 2) justified and compatible with the principles referred to in paragraph 17 of the NPPF? Will the policies and proposals in the ALP contribute to the sustainable growth of the District?
- 1.6 Is the relationship between the ALP and any future Neighbourhood Plans sufficiently clear? Do the policies of the ALP provide sufficient and appropriate 'hooks' on which to 'hang' neighbourhood plans?

**Tuesday 31<sup>st</sup> January - 14.00**

**Issue 2: Planning for Economic Growth (policy 4); Protecting and Enhancing Existing Employment Sites (policy 26); the Visitor Economy (policy 27); and Retail (policy 28)**

***Potential Participants***

***Adur District Council***

***RPS Planning & Development (Karen Calkin) (Rep 16)***  
***Savills for Brighton City (Shoreham) Airport (Rep 19)***  
***CPRE (David Johnson) (Rep 21)***

---

<sup>1</sup> National Planning Policy Framework

**DMH Stallard for New Monks Farm Development LTD (Rep 20)**

## Questions

- 2.1 The NPPF confirms the importance that is to be attached to building a strong competitive economy (e.g. paragraph 19). Has the Council attached sufficient weight to achieving this objective? If not what more should be done?
- 2.2 Policy 4 refers to provision being made at the 3 identified employment locations 'for a range of accommodation types'. Firstly how would a decision-taker know what 'type' of accommodation would be acceptable on a particular site and secondly how would the Council ensure, over the course of the plan period, that a satisfactory 'range' would be achieved?
- 2.3 Policy 4 (fourth sub-section) refers to the provision of additional employment floorspace from a number of sources. How will the Council ensure that this objective will be achieved?
- 2.4 Are all the elements of policy 26 (Protecting and Enhancing Existing Employment Sites and Premises) reasonable and justified?
- 2.5 Does the Plan do sufficient to encourage the regeneration and enhancement of the main town centres (NPPF paragraph 23)?
- 2.6 How will policy 27 (the Visitor Economy) be delivered?
- 2.7 Are all the requirements of policy 28 (Retail, Town Centres and Local Parades) reasonable and justified?

**Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> February - 9.30****Issue 3: Housing Provision (policy 3); Housing Mix and Quality (policy 21); Affordable Housing (policy 22), Density (policy 23) and provision for Gypsies Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (policies 24 and 25)*****Potential Participants******Adur District Council******National Farmers Union (NFU) (Tom Ormesher) (Rep 3)***

***DMH Stallard for New Monks Farm Development Ltd (Rep 20)***  
***CPRE (David Johnson) (Rep 21)***  
***Home Builders Federation (James Stevens) (Rep 32s and 71)***  
***ECE Planning for Landstone (Old Salts Farm omission site) (Reps 17 and 72)***  
***Thornton Architecture & Design for Cobbetts Development Ltd (Shoreham Gateway omission site) (Reps 34, 60 )***  
***ECE Planning for Cobbetts Development Ltd (Rep 66)***  
***Savills for Brighton and Hove City Council (Mill Hill omission site) (Rep 54)***  
***Boyer Planning for Hyde New Homes (New Salts Farm omission site) (Reps 15 & 61)***  
***Turley for Persimmon Homes South Coast Ltd (Reps 26 and 62)***

### Questions

- 3.1 Does the figure of 6,825 dwellings (325 dwgs a year) for the period 2011-2032 accurately reflect full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing? Is the figure based on up-to-date and reliable evidence?
- 3.2 Having identified the need for housing over the plan period (6,825 dwellings), has the Council undertaken the appropriate assessments in order to justify its conclusion that the District cannot meet all that need (or a greater proportion than the 3,609 dwellings proposed) within its own boundary. Have those sites identified in the SHLAA, that were rejected by the Council, been appropriately assessed? (see also question 7.1)
- 3.3 Has an adequate assessment of potential brownfield development sites been undertaken?
- 3.4 Does the plan identify a supply of deliverable sites, sufficient to provide five years worth of housing, with an additional buffer of 5% (or 20% as appropriate)?
- 3.5 Does the plan identify a supply of deliverable sites for years 6 to 10 and where possible for years 11 to 15?
- 3.6 Should the submitted plan include a housing trajectory?
- 3.7 Is the calculation of the windfall allowance robust and justified?
- 3.8 Is there enough flexibility embodied in the Council's approach so that it could react quickly to any unforeseen change in circumstances? (see also question 18.2)
- 3.9 Has the relationship between economic growth in the District and the provision of new housing been adequately addressed?
- 3.10 Are the requirements of policy 21: Housing Mix and Quality, reasonable and justified? Has the Council properly addressed the housing needs of the elderly and people with disabilities?

- 3.11 Does the plan make appropriate provision for affordable housing in accordance with national policy? Are the proposed percentages, as set out in policy 22, viable, deliverable and justified?
- 3.12 Is the preferred mix of tenure (as set out in policy 22) viable, deliverable and justified?
- 3.13 Is the proposed minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare reasonable and justified (policy 23)?
- 3.14 Is the Council providing sufficient support for people wishing to build their own homes?
- 3.15 Is the Plan based on up-to-date and reliable evidence of the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, and does it make deliverable provision to meet such needs (policy 24)? Are all the requirements of policy 24 reasonable and justified?

### Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> February - 14.00

#### **Issue 4: Land at West Sompting (policy 6)**

##### ***Potential Participants***

##### ***Adur District Council***

***CPRE (David Johnson) (Rep 21)***

***Turley for Persimmon Homes South Coast Ltd (Reps 26 and 62)***

***Sussex Wildlife Trust (Rep 25)***

##### Questions

- 4.1 Are all the requirements of policy 6 reasonable, justified, viable and deliverable?
- 4.2 There is a reference in policy 6 to a 'landscaped buffer' along the western boundary. In policy 5 (New Monks Farm) the reference is to 'strategically sited areas of woodland to the north and east of the development area to provide a distinctive green edge, screening views of the new development'. Should there be a greater level of consistency between the two policies in this respect?
- 4.3 Have issues of flood risk in relation to this site been adequately addressed? (see also question 13.5). Has the advice in the NPPF (for example paragraph 100) been followed?

- 4.4 A number of concerns have been raised relating to the traffic impact of the proposed development. Can the Council satisfactorily demonstrate that the highway implications of the development have been (and will be) appropriately addressed?
- 4.5 What assessment has been undertaken regarding the impact of the proposed development on existing infrastructure, for example schools, community facilities (including sports pitches), health services and utilities?
- 4.6 Is it sufficiently clear what new infrastructure is required, who is going to fund it and how it relates to the anticipated rate and phasing of development (PPG<sup>2</sup> paragraph 018 under Local Plans)?
- 4.7 Does the Council have a fall-back position if the development does not come forward as anticipated?

### Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> February - 9.30

### Issue 5: New Monks Farm, Lancing (policy 5)

#### *Potential Participants*

#### *Adur District Council*

*County Councillor Mike Glennon (Rep 2)*

*DMH Stallard for New Monks Farm Development Ltd (Rep 20)*

*CPRE (David Johnson) (Reps 21 and 58)*

*DMH Stallard for New Monks Farm Development Ltd (Rep 38)*

*Adur Floodwatch Group (Bill Freeman) (Rep 55)*

*Nexus Planning for Albemarle (Shoreham) LLP & Longbow Investment No.3 S.A.R.L. (Rep 65)*

*Sussex Wildlife Trust (Rep 25)*

#### Questions

- 5.1 Are all the requirements of policy 5 reasonable, justified, viable and deliverable?
- 5.2 How will the suggested phasing be secured?
- 5.3 Have issues of flood risk in relation to this site been adequately addressed (see also question 13.5)? Has the advice in the NPPF (for example paragraph 100) been followed?

---

<sup>2</sup> Planning Practice Guidance



- 5.4 What assessment has been undertaken regarding the impact of the proposed development on existing infrastructure, for example roads, schools, community facilities (including sports pitches), health services and utilities? How will it be decided what is an 'appropriate stage of development' with regard to the provision of a new A27 access? (last bullet point)
- 5.5 Is it sufficiently clear what new infrastructure is required, who is going to fund it and how it relates to the anticipated rate and phasing of development (PPG paragraph 018 under Local Plans)?
- 5.6 Would any element of the proposed development have a detrimental impact on the setting of the WWII Trainer Drone Scheduled Monument?
- 5.7 Does the Council have a fall-back position if the development does not come forward as anticipated?

**Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> February – 14.00 (finish by 17.00)**

## **Issue 6: Shoreham Airport (policy 7)**

### ***Potential Participants***

#### ***Adur District Council***

***Savills for Brighton City (Shoreham) Airport (Rep 19)***

***DMH Stallard for New Monks Farm Development Ltd (Rep 20)***

***CPRE (David Johnson) (Rep 21)***

***Nexus Planning for Albemarle (Shoreham) LLP & Longbow Investment No.3 S.A.R.L. (Rep 65)***

***Sussex Wildlife Trust (Rep 25)***

#### Questions

- 6.1 Are all the requirements of policy 7 reasonable, justified, viable and deliverable?
- 6.2 When will the Development Brief be required (second paragraph)?
- 6.3 What mitigation measures will be required in order to retain ecological value? Will their delivery have any implications in terms of the viability and delivery of the policy?
- 6.4 Should there be a definition of 'workplace travel plans' in the Glossary?
- 6.5 Does the Council have a fall-back position if the development does not come forward as anticipated

## **Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> February – 9.30**

### **Issue 7: Countryside and Coast, including local green gaps (policies 13 and 14)**

#### ***Potential Participants***

##### ***Adur District Council***

***DMH Stallard for New Monks Farm Development Ltd (Rep 20)***

***Boyer Planning for Hyde New Homes (Refs 15 and 61)***

***Thornton Architecture & Design for Cobbetts Development Ltd (Shoreham Gateway omission site) (Reps 34, 60 )***

***ECE Planning for Cobbetts Development Ltd (Rep 66)***

***ECE Planning for Landstone (Old Salts Farm omission site) (Reps 17 and 72)***

***Savills for Brighton and Hove City Council (Rep 54)***

***Sussex Wildlife Trust (Rep 25)***

#### Questions

- 7.1 Has the Council achieved the correct balance between meeting housing needs and protecting the setting of settlements within the District?
- 7.2 Is the identification of the ‘countryside and coast’ and ‘local green gaps’ (policy 14) justified?
- 7.3 Is the prevention of the coalescence of settlements a reasonable and justified objective?

## **Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> February – 9.30**

### **Issue 13: Pollution, Water Quality, Flood Risk and Drainage (policies 35 – 37)**

#### ***Potential Participants***

##### ***Adur District Council***

***Adur Flood Watch (Bill Freeman) (Rep 11)***

***Thornton Architecture & Design for Cobbetts Development Ltd (Shoreham Gateway omission site) (Reps 34, 60 )***

***ECE Planning for Cobbetts Development Ltd (Rep 66)***

***ECE Planning for Landstone (Old Salts Farm omission site) (Reps 17 and 72)***

***Boyer Planning for Hyde New Homes (New Salts Farm omission site) (Reps 15 & 61)***

## Questions

- 13.1 What is the timetable for the completion of the Shoreham Tidal Walls Project?
- 13.2 Are all the requirements of policy 35 (Pollution and Contamination) justified? How will the Council ensure that 'new development in Adur will be located in areas most suitable to the use of that development' (e.g. extensions or redevelopment of existing buildings)?
- 13.3 How will it be decided whether or not air quality/noise assessments are 'appropriate'?
- 13.4 Are all the requirements of policy 36 (Water Quality and Protection) justified? Will policy 36 have any implications in terms of the viability and delivery of the Council's proposals for development, as set out in the ALP?
- 13.5 Are all the requirements of policy 37 (Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage) justified? Does the policy reflect advice on flooding in the NPPF (e.g. paragraph 100)? Will policy 37 have any implications in terms of the viability and delivery of the Council's proposals for development, as set out in the ALP?

## **CLOSING STATEMENT BY COUNCIL**

## **CLOSING REMARKS BY INSPECTOR**