

Examination Hearings

20 September 2018 – 14:00

Agenda – Day 2 PM

Please note:

- All participants are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the hearing statements (and any additional evidence) produced by the Councils and other parties in respect of the matters addressed at this session. These are available on the examination website.
- Most references to questions refer to those posed by the Inspector in the schedule of Matters, Issues and Questions (already circulated)
- The hearing will run until around 17:00, with a mid-afternoon break.

Inspector's opening

Matter 8: Infrastructure, viability and delivery (Policies SH10, SH1, SH4, SH5, SH6, SH7, SH8, CA1, CA2, CA4, CA5, CA7)

Issue: Whether the policies of the Plan would be effective in enabling the provision of infrastructure necessary to support the level and type of growth proposed?

1. How is the Partnership proactively seeking ways to reduce the viability gaps identified within the *Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan Whole Plan Viability and Deliverability Study 2018* (SED10-01)? What mechanisms are being developed to deliver investment priorities and unlock stalled sites? What is the likelihood that the funding gap will be met through identified sources? What progress has been made towards land assembly and release of development sites?
 - The Councils' response to the MIQ identifies a range of intervention mechanisms that are being pursued by the Partnership to support the delivery of development within the Plan area, including the establishment of the Strategic Transport Infrastructure Programme. What is the role of the Delivery Group in setting priorities for wider investment and involvement by the Partnership and for seeking investment from other sources?
2. How have issues of viability been taken into account, including likely cumulative impacts of requirements, to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that the sites identified will come forward for development during the lifetime of the plan? Will the proposals provide competitive returns to

a willing landowner and developer sufficient to enable development to be delivered?

- Having regard to the Councils' response to the MIQ, for those sites identified in Aldrington Basin with a viability deficit, where the landowner would not be seeking to develop the site (AB1 and AB4), on what basis is there considered to be a reasonable prospect that those sites will come forward for development during the lifetime of the plan?
3. How has the need for site specific requirements been assessed, including the need for green infrastructure, environmental mitigation or compensation? Have they been identified as necessary to make a particular development acceptable in planning terms? Having regard to the Councils' proposed modifications, does Policy SH10(3) clearly identify the potential requirement for agreements with utility providers?
- Do the evidence sources listed in the Councils' response to the MIQ identify the need for infrastructure requirements on a site specific basis?
4. Has the scale of contribution required been clearly identified, so that a future developer will understand the extent and type of contribution expected? How is the issue of pooled contributions proposed to be addressed, in relation to Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010?
- Are the timescales within the Adur LDS for the production of updated interim guidance and an SPD on Infrastructure Provision in Adur likely to be met?
 - Is the Brighton & Hove Council Developer Contribution Technical Guidance considered to be up-to-date?
 - Given the potential viability issues identified with CIL in Adur, are proposed developments within the Plan reasonably likely to meet the full extent and type of contribution expected? If not, how are these contributions intended to be prioritised?
 - What mechanisms are used for the management of planning obligations, so that the requirements of Regulation 123 are met?
5. Are the infrastructure requirements needed to support the proposed development of the Plan area clearly set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plans for the ALP and B&HCP(1)? Are the timescales for delivery, costs and funding sources for each scheme confirmed, to enable the

delivery of the proposed development, for at least the first five years of the plan?

Matter 9: Monitoring and review

Issue: Whether the Plan provides an effective approach to monitoring and review?

1. Is the approach to monitoring clear and sufficiently detailed? Are suitable arrangements in place for reviews at appropriate times?
 - Having regard to Matter 4, to be effective, should the Plan include reference to a housing trajectory?
2. Does the Plan provide flexibility? What contingency arrangements and alternative strategies have been considered if development identified in the Plan does not proceed, or the rate of development anticipated is not met, including in relation to the provision of infrastructure?
3. Is there a need to identify a reserve of potential future development sites, should the proposed allocated sites in the Plan not come forward for development as anticipated?

General Matters

1. Review of proposed Main Modifications
2. Any other matters not covered in previous sessions

Any site visit arrangements and closing