

EX20

EXAMINATION HEARINGS

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 20 NOVEMBER 2013 at 10.00 am

Matter 8 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT

Issue: Whether the approach to protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment is justified and consistent with national policy.

Green Infrastructure (CS 8 and CS 21)

- 8.1 Is the requirement to protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity in and around new development (clause 6c of policy CS 8) realistic, achievable and in accordance with national policy?
- 8.2 Do clauses 2 and 3 of policy CS 21 properly reflect the intention of the plan to balance any loss of urban greenspace against the other benefits?
- 8.3 What is the intention of clause 2.e of policy CS 21 – is it sufficiently clear and capable of implementation?
Is it appropriate and practical to take into account “potential” special qualities in clause 3 of the policy?
- 8.4 Are the local greenspace standards identified in the KLPCS justified by the evidence?
How will the quantitative and accessibility standards be applied to particular development proposals (will assessments have regard to provision in individual Substantial Residential Areas)?
- 8.5 Why does the KLPCS not identify whether it is proposed to make Local Green Space designations and, if so, give guidance on the criteria to be used to select sites?
- 8.6 Is the requirement to provide two replacement trees for every tree lost (clause 10.c of policy CS 21) unduly prescriptive and onerous?

Historic Environment (CS 20)

- 8.7 Is clause 1.b of policy CS 20, which seeks to prevent demolition and/or development which adversely affects historic assets subject to statutory designation, consistent with national policy and legislation?

- 8.8 KLPCS paragraph 8.19 refers to supplementary policy criteria in a Design Quality and New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) – why will such policy criteria not be included in a part of the Local Plan?

Matter 9 SUSTAINABILITY, DESIGN AND QUALITY OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

Issue: Whether the policies towards the sustainability, design and quality of built development are justified and consistent with national policy.

Housing size and design (CS 17)

- 9.1 Is the approach to a mix of dwelling sizes in policy CS 17 over-prescriptive and likely to represent a constraint on delivery of market housing?
- 9.2 What is the justification for the policy CS 17 requirement that housing should comply with Building for Life (BfL) and Lifetime Homes standards?
Is it correct to say that BfL standards are part of Government policy (CS 17 4a) and mandatory (paragraph 7.21)?
- 9.3 Have the viability consequences of the design standards in clause 4 of policy CS 17 been properly taken into account, especially for developments in low value areas?
- 9.4 In light of imminent changes to national housing standards, as announced by DCLG in a recent consultation¹, is policy CS 17 adequately “future-proofed”?

Design Quality (CS 19)

- 9.5 Does clause 3 of policy CS 19 require all new development to address flood risk mitigation and, if so, is this necessary and consistent with national policy?
- 9.6 Should policy CS 19 include a reference to the need to address mining legacy issues?

Sustainable and Low Carbon Development (CS 22)

- 9.7 In light of imminent changes to national housing standards, as announced by DCLG in a recent consultation², is policy CS 22 adequately “future-proofed”?

¹<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/housing-standards-review-consultation>

²As above

- 9.8 Clauses 3 and 4 of policy CS 22 “encourage” rather than require the meeting of sustainable construction standards, so is it necessary for applicants to demonstrate any non-compliance with these standards, especially in light of the findings of the viability study? Why is “viability” not included in clause 5 of the policy (as it is in clause 7)?
- 9.9 Does clause 7 of policy CS 22 apply borough-wide or only in Priority Zones?
How will a “major development proposal” be defined – is there sufficient clarity in the KLPCS?
Is the requirement to include decentralised renewable and low carbon energy systems (if viable and feasible) consistent with national policy?
- 9.10 Is it appropriate for the detailed requirements mentioned in clause 10 of policy CS 22 to be set out in Supplementary Planning Documents rather than a part of the Local Plan that is subject to examination?

2.00 pm or later

Matter 10 TRANSPORT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Issue: Whether the policies towards sustainable transport and resource management are justified and consistent with national policy.

Transport

- 10.1 Policy CS 7 includes various references to carbon emissions: clause 1 seeks to reduce carbon emissions; clause 2 requires new development to be “inclusive of emerging new technologies that will mitigate or minimise carbon emissions and improve air quality”; clause 3 supports the roll out of infrastructure for low carbon emission vehicles. How is it intended that these objectives will be implemented, particularly the clause 2 requirement of new development?
- 10.2 Is there sufficient recognition in policy CS 7 of the safeguarding requirements of Liverpool John Lennon airport?

Flood Risk

- 10.3 Is the approach to flood risk in policy CS 24 justified by the evidence and consistent with national policy?

Minerals

- 10.4 Is the minerals evidence base sufficiently up-to-date to enable a robust assessment of future need and supply to be undertaken?
Has a recent Local Aggregate Assessment been carried out to determine whether a steady and adequate supply currently exists?
- 10.5 Is the strategic approach to minerals in policy CS 25 consistent with national policy?
How does the Council intend to “facilitate” a supply of minerals, and what consideration will be given to the maintenance of landbanks of mineral reserves?
Should the policy include a reference to mineral resources “of local and national importance”?
Is the reference to the economic importance of mineral deposits relevant and justified?
- 10.6 The minerals evidence base (LC05) identifies a Minerals Safeguarding Area around the clay extraction operation at Cronton. Why doesn't clause 2 of policy CS 25 specifically propose the identification of this area in the Site Allocations and Development Policies plan?
- 10.7 Is it appropriate to leave the identification of Minerals Safeguarding Areas to a later Local Plan when the KLPCS is proposing specific sites for development?
Has there been any investigation to establish whether the sites considered for development are in potential Minerals Safeguarding Areas?