

EX19

## EXAMINATION HEARINGS

### AGENDA

**TUESDAY 19 NOVEMBER 2013 at 10.00 am**

#### **Matter 6 RETAIL AND TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION**

***Issue: Whether the KLPCS is sufficiently clear, effective and robust to ensure timely delivery of town centre regeneration and appropriate amounts of retail floorspace.***

- 6.1 The KLPCS proposes indicative capacity figures for comparison and convenience floorspace which include extant planning permissions. Why isn't the scale of extant permissions mentioned in the KLPCS, especially as all of the capacity at Kirkby appears to be committed?
- 6.2 It appears that the capacity for convenience floorspace at Kirkby derives from planning permission for a convenience unit of between 4,750-7,000 sq m (paragraph 5.4.10, Planning for Retail in Knowsley (TR04)). Most very large convenience stores combine convenience with comparison goods – is it realistic to assume that the total provision will comprise solely convenience floorspace?
- 6.3 Is the scale of retail development in Kirkby town centre based on a sound analysis of need and consistent with the overall strategy?  
Is development of the scale proposed viable and likely to be achieved?
- 6.4 Is the expansion of Kirkby town centre proposed in policy CS 10 justified by evidence?  
Is there a realistic prospect of the Merseytram line to Kirkby town centre being implemented?
- 6.5 KLPCS paragraph 6.59 is positive about extending Prescott town centre boundary towards Cables Retail Park, but policy CS 14 refers to "potentially" extending this designation – why the discrepancy?  
Would a further town centre extension to include Cables Retail Park bring significant retail benefits?
- 6.6 How will the broad distribution of sites for retail development between the three town centres be managed?  
Are the floorspace figures a ceiling which would prevent town centre retail development which exceeds them?

- 6.7 How will the phased release of comparison goods floorspace be achieved in the absence of any phasing mechanism in the KLPCS?  
Given the substantial under-trading throughout the borough, why is a phased approach necessary?

## **2.00 pm or later**

### **Matter 7 PARTICULAR HOUSING NEEDS**

***Issue: Whether the approach to affordable housing, specialist needs and accommodation for travellers would contribute to the creation of inclusive and mixed communities and assist in re-balancing the housing market.***

#### Affordable housing

- 7.1 Is the borough-wide requirement for 25% affordable housing in policy CS 15 consistent with the objective of re-balancing the housing market?  
Is it appropriate for developments within or close to concentrations of predominantly social housing to provide this level of affordable housing?
- 7.2 Does the 25% affordable housing requirement adequately reflect the findings of the viability assessment, particularly for sites in regeneration areas?  
Is this level of provision likely to impede the deliverability of brownfield sites in lower value areas?  
The KLPCS refers to variations to the target occurring “only exceptionally” – is this a true reflection of the viability evidence?  
Should the KLPCS give examples of what might be regarded as “exceptional circumstances”?
- 7.3 Is the requirement in policy CS 15 that all affordable housing should be made available in partnership with Registered Providers necessary and consistent with national policy?
- 7.4 Is the tenure split between affordable rent and intermediate housing based on robust and up-to-date evidence?
- 7.5 Have the viability consequences of requiring affordable housing to comply with the size and design criteria of policy CS 17 been properly taken into account?

#### Gypsy and Traveller provision

- 7.6 What is the objectively assessed need for gypsy and traveller accommodation and what is the evidence base for the assessment?

- 7.7 Planning Policy for Traveller Sites requires planning authorities to set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address their accommodation needs. Why does the KLPCS not do this? In the absence of such targets, does not this part of the KLPCS fail the "positively prepared" test of national policy?
- 7.8 Policy CS 18 says that the Council will establish the level of need for gypsy and traveller accommodation and give due consideration to the number of pitches to be accommodated. How can this be robust without a process of target setting which is tested at examination?