

Draft Programme/ Matters and Issues for Hearings

TIMING: In order to make the best use of time each day will run as a “Rolling Programme” with no set timings for agenda items. Hearings will start each day at 10:00 am and will continue through the day with mid morning, lunch and afternoon breaks.

NOTE: Some items/ questions relate to matters that the Council has already addressed in CS2 with suggested changes. In these cases the examination will consider whether the matters addressed by these proposed changes go to soundness and thus whether they will need to be translated into Main Modifications.

TUESDAY 15 MAY

1 Legal and Procedural Questions

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 1.1 | Procedural Questions:
Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the LDS?
Has it been prepared in compliance with the SCI?
Has it had regard to the Council’s Sustainable Community Strategy for the area?
Has it been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal?
Has the CS been prepared in accordance with the Habitats Directive?
Have all the procedural requirements for publicity been met? |
| 1.2 | Has the Council submitted robust evidence to demonstrate that it has met the Duty to Co-operate? |

2 Overall spatial strategy

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 2.1 | Is the spatial strategy soundly based, to address the key issues for Eastbourne? |
| 2.2 | Is it clear what other strategic options were considered and why they were dismissed? |
| 2.3 | In the light of the creation of the adjacent South Downs National Park, is the Plan clear and consistent in defining the area to which saved Local Plan Policies will apply and the area to which Eastbourne Plan policies apply? |
| 2.4 | Is there robust evidence to demonstrate that a minimum of 70% of the borough’s housing provision can be delivered on previously developed land? |
| 2.5 | Does the overall strategy take account of the sequential approach to flood risk? |
| 2.6 | Should the strategy allow for a sustainable urban extension? |
| 2.7 | Is the overall strategy sufficiently flexible to respond to changing circumstances such as non delivery of essential infrastructure? |

3 Economic Development

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 3.1 | Is the approach to the employment land supply consistent with and informed by CS16 and CS17? Are sufficient sites identified for employment use? |
| 3.2 | How does the Plan take forward the change identified in the Eastbourne – Hailsham Triangle study? |
| 3.3 | Other than Sovereign Harbour, where will employment growth take place? How does this part of the strategy inform/ translate into neighbourhood policies? |
| 3.4 | What is the intended mechanism for identifying sites and land for employment as set out in Policy D2? (3 rd bullet)? How does this part of the policy relate to the sites listed in paragraph 4.2.13? |
| 3.4 | Is there potential for small scale extensions to the built up area at Eastbourne Park to contribute towards the supply of employment land? |
| 3.5 | Does the Plan rely entirely on development at Sovereign Harbour to broaden the Borough’s economic base? |
| 3.6 | Sovereign harbour– is the proposed 30,000 square metres of office space at Sovereign Harbour too ambitious? |

WEDNESDAY 16 MAY

4	Housing
<u>Note</u>	Questions raised in the Inspector’s <u>letter to the Council dated 13 March</u> and any response from the Council will be dealt with before the following questions.
4.1	Is the level of housing proposed deliverable and is the evidence that supports the housing trajectory robust?
4.2	Policy D5 states that proposals for housing must take account of need identified in SHMA with regard to size/ type/ tenure? How will this policy operate? How can it be applied to conversions and windfall sites?
4.3	The heavy reliance on windfall sites to provide approximately 37% of the Borough’s housing, from year 6 of the housing trajectory, is inconsistent with government advice in PPS3. Is there robust evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified?
4.4	The Plan defines windfall sites as “previously developed sites that have unexpectedly become available” (Appendix A). Is it logical for the plan to include precise figures for the number of units to be provided by “unexpected” sites?
4.5	Is it appropriate for the Key Diagram to show windfall sites?
4.5	In the light of heavy reliance on windfall sites, especially conversions, is the Plan capable of addressing the particular need for larger family accommodation and affordable housing referred to in paragraph 1.3.2 as a Key Issue for Eastbourne?
4.6	Is there robust and up to date evidence to justify restricting future residential at Sovereign Harbour to 150 units?
4.7	Is there compelling evidence to justify the decision to abandon each of the undeveloped local plan greenfield housing allocations?
4.8	Are the affordable housing threshold and percentage contributions justified? Are they supported by affordable housing viability evidence?
4.9	As the Plan expects a significant proportion of Eastbourne’s housing supply to be delivered through windfall conversions, has the viability of securing contributions to affordable housing from such development been assessed?
4.10	Is the subdivision of the Borough into market value areas based on robust evidence?
4.11	Should Policy D6 specify the need which it seeks to meet? What is the justification for failing to provide for additional pitches in accordance with Policy H7 of the SE Plan?
4.12	Is D6 consistent with Circular 01/2006 and the DCLG Good Practice Guide?

THURSDAY 17 MAY

5	Retail
5.1	Is the classification of Sovereign Harbour as District centre consistent with National Planning Policy? Has the designation been subject to SA? (Consider the Council’s proposed Main Modification to address this question)
6	Consideration of Omission Sites
A detailed agenda for the sites that require consideration at the hearings will be set after receipt of written statements	
6.1	Pevensey levels at Mountney Bridge
6.2	12 Acres at Langley Sports Club/ Eastbourne Football Club
6.2	Land N of Hammonds Drive – proposed employment sites (Eastbourne Park)
6.3	Former railway sidings at land N of Bedfordwell Road Depot
6.4	Provincial House
7	Sustainability
7.1	Table 4 – is the sustainability neighbourhood rating of neighbourhood 14

	(Sovereign Harbour) justified?
7.2	Is there local evidence to justify the sustainability (CSH level 4 and BREEAM "very good") requirements in Policy D1?
8	Other Matters
8.1	Has a landscape impact assessment been carried out or is there other evidence to support the preclusion of wind turbines from Eastbourne Park in Policy D11?
8.2	Is Policy D10 consistent with national planning policy (preserve <u>and/or</u> enhance)
8.3	Does Policy D9 place undue restrictions on the provision of essential infrastructure in green space areas?
9	Infrastructure
9.1	Do Policy D7 and paragraph 5.1.11 provide a clear explanation of the way in which developer contributions will be sought before and after the proposed introduction of CIL?
9.2	Does policy E1 do what paragraph 5.1 (yellow box) says it will, ie set out the different mechanisms for securing social and physical infrastructure?
9.3	How can paragraph 5.1.7 be amended to ensure that it is consistent with the CIL Regulations?
9.4	Does the Infrastructure Delivery Plan include adequate sewerage provision for the level of new development proposed in the Plan.
10	Monitoring and Implementation
10.1	PPS12 states that monitoring will provide the basis on which contingency plans within the strategy will be triggered. Does the monitoring framework in Appendix B provide measurable targets and identifiable trigger points for intervention and action should the strategy fail to deliver?
10.2	Are the contingencies listed in paragraph 2.1.14 in sequential order and if so what is the reasoning behind this order?
FRIDAY 18 MAY	
	Contingency for overrun or earlier hearings