

AGENDA FOR MATTER 1 – Legal and procedural issues, proposals map and key diagram
Tuesday 21 April at 10.00

Participants:

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Councils
John Beardsell (KJD for DED Johnson & RAH Perkins)
Gerry Hughes (GVA Grimley for RENEW)

Legal/procedural issues (a) – (h) were covered in the Councils' self assessment and at a question and answer session at the Pre Hearing Meeting. They will be dealt with again briefly in this session.

Any substantial points coming out of this agenda may more appropriately be discussed under subsequent Matters.

1. Does the CS contain any policies or proposals that are not consistent with national policy and, if so, is there local justification?
2. Does it contain policies that do not add anything to existing national guidance?
3. Is the Addendum necessary for soundness? Is it in fact an Erratum? Is there a need for further sustainability appraisal or consultation? Will be discussed under Matter 9.
4. Does the CS reflect the concept of spatial planning? Does it go beyond traditional land use planning by bringing together and integrating policies for development and the use of land with other policies and programmes from a variety of agencies/ organisations that influence the nature of places and how they function?
5. Has the consultation allowed for the effective engagement of all interested parties?
6. Remaining issues related to the Proposals Map and Key Diagram (Councils to prepare a list of amendments to circulate at the hearing).
7. Are the arrangements for defining detailed boundaries of areas shown in the key diagram appropriately delegated to future DPDs (see point 12 of CCD3)?
8. Are the diagrams in the CS that show the boundaries of sub areas misleading when they are to be defined in later plans. Should these be removed or made less detailed?

AGENDA FOR MATTER 2 – Overall strategy
Tuesday 21 April at 10.00

Participants:

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Councils
Patrick Downes/Simon Hawley (Harris Lamb for Bovale Homes)
Phil Butters/Simon Morris (Keele University)
Gerry Hughes (GVA Grimley for RENEW North Staffordshire)
Matt Gilbert (The Planning Consultancy for Wale Developments Ltd)
Stephen Stoney/Duncan Jenkins (Wardell Armstrong for Lands Improvement)

1. Is the chosen approach the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives?
2. Is there a clear audit trail showing how and why the preferred strategy/approach was arrived at? Why is the submitted CS so different in structure from the Revised Preferred Options CS?
3. Are there any cross boundary issues, if so, have they been adequately addressed?
4. Is it clear how the policies will meet the objectives? Are there any obvious gaps in the policies, having regard to the Strategic Aims?
5. Does the CS provide clear and suitable guidance for the next level of DPDs?
6. Should the six sub area spatial strategies become policies to improve clarity and guidance for decision making?
7. Does Policy SP1 provide sufficient strategic guidance and spatial direction? Points for discussion:
 - a. Clarify the list of locations in point 1? See Councils' suggestion in M4/CHD;
 - b. Guide the location of development in areas other than those listed in point 1 (as there are weaknesses and problems in other areas too) or can this be achieved through sub area policies?
 - c. Provide more detailed criteria for choosing between competing areas of brownfield land or is this adequately covered by point 6?
 - d. For clarity list the neighbourhoods within the areas of intervention identified by RENEW;
 - e. Make clear that no significant change is proposed to the Green Belt boundary as part of the CS;
 - f. Avoid overlap with SP2.

AGENDA FOR MATTER 3 – Transport
Wednesday 22 April at 10.00

Participants:

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Councils
David Nock Highways Agency
Staffordshire County Council

1. Is the strategy in line with national and regional guidance?
2. Have the priorities for transport infrastructure been prepared?
Should point 3 of SP3 list what is essential infrastructure?
3. Should new road proposals be specified in a policy and shown on the Key Diagram to ensure support for land acquisition if needed eg. Potteries Way completion and Etruria Valley link road.
4. If the sub area strategies were made into policies would this overcome this concern or should the items be specified in SP3?
5. Is it clear who would provide or fund essential infrastructure and when it would come forward? Should there be a closer link between the CS and the Strategic Infrastructure Planning and Delivery document at EB/061? For example is there a delivery strategy for the Etruria Valley link road?
6. Is the strategy in accordance with and supported by the Local Transport Plan?
7. Is the strategy about park and ride sufficiently clear both in terms of locations and timetable for providing them?
8. Are there any major items of transport infrastructure that are high risk and would impede the overall strategy if they were not delivered?
9. What are the implications for the trunk road network?
10. Bearing in mind that the overall level of growth is set by the RSS, is it satisfactory to leave detailed transport assessment to be dealt with as part of subsequent site allocation DPDs?
11. Are improvements to the bus services based on realistic expectations for funding and timing?
12. Does the CS contain sufficient policy and proposals for improving access to jobs and services for those living in the rural areas?

AGENDA FOR MATTER 4 – Housing
Thursday 23 April at 10.00

Please bring CCD4 (including Appendix 2 which shows Newcastle's 15 year housing trajectory), CCD4d, EB/023 and EB/058). Hard copies of the Stoke spreadsheet (EB/058h) will be provided at the hearing.

Participants:

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Councils
Patrick Downes/Simon Hawley (Harris Lamb for Bovale Homes)
Phil Butters/Simon Morris (Keele University)
John Beardsell (KJD for RAH Perkins)
Gerry Hughes (GVA Grimley for RENEW North Staffordshire)
Matt Gilbert (The Planning Consultancy for Wale Developments Ltd)
Stephen Stoney/Duncan Jenkins (Wardell Armstrong for Lands Improvement)

Housing density and mix

1. With respect to Strategic Aims 1 & 4, has the need for higher value houses been quantified and where would they be provided? Can examples be provided of where they have been delivered already or sites that would be suitable?
2. Is this point adequately covered in para 5.14 and the sub area strategies for Stoke Outer Urban Area (5.156) and Newcastle and Kidsgrove Urban Neighbourhoods (5.212 and 5.226)?
3. Should the CS quantify the need for elderly person's or special needs housing and provide specific policies for this? Is it adequately covered by evidence in the SHMA?

Housing numbers

4. Is the CS consistent with the RSS targets? In RSS2 are these neither floors nor ceilings except for the rural area? Should a percentage contingency be identified, if so how much?
5. Is the demolition replacement rate of 0.6 justified by the evidence. Is there any conflict with the wording of RSS2?
6. Is there robust evidence demonstrating that the Councils can bring forward a 5 year and 15 year supply of land in accordance with PPS3?
7. Will the CS have the flexibility to provide for higher housing targets resulting from the RSS2 examination? Aspects to consider:
 - (a) Different scenarios such as 2,000, 4,000 or 6,000 additional dwellings;
 - (b) The NLP report (RSS/004) suggests there is identified capacity in the Major Urban Area;

- (c) The CS mentions this in the sub area strategy for Stoke Outer Urban Area (para 5.167);
- (d) Could future additional housing be assumed to be shared between Newcastle and Stoke on the existing 1:2 basis?
- (e) Is it likely to be required later in the plan period (the NLP report mentions the need to protect the fragile housing market in the earlier years)?
- (f) What circumstances would trigger a review of the CS? Possible wording might be: *'If the housing strategy in the CS is no longer in general conformity with the final RRS2 then it will be subject to early review'*.

Housing distribution

- 8. Is the distribution of new housing across the sub areas supported by the evidence?
- 9. Does the CS strike the right balance between (a) protecting the fragile market in the RENEW areas and (b) bringing forward attractive sites that will ensure targets for overall housing and affordable housing are met.
- 10. Does the CS provide a housing strategy that can continue to be relevant after government intervention has ceased?
- 11. Should the indicative housing numbers Newcastle & Kidsgrove Urban Neighbourhoods be put into larger groups to avoid detail that is not supported by evidence and to provide more flexibility?
- 12. If the housing numbers for Newcastle Town Centre are not supported by the evidence, how should this be dealt with?
- 13. How can it be assessed whether proposals will harm RENEW intervention? Should this test be required for proposals (a) outside and (b) inside RENEW areas? Are the policies clearly worded on this point including how RENEW areas are defined? Relevance of the Scotia Road decision.
- 14. Does the Core Strategy include the remedial action to be taken if there is a shortfall against plan targets (para 38 of CCD4)? What would be the options and the triggers?

Affordable housing

- 15. Are the thresholds and percentages in CSP6 justified by up to date evidence of need and viability?
- 16. Should the policy be reworded to allow more flexibility if viability is an issue for individual proposals?
- 17. Are there any current proposals/investigations into the direct provision of affordable housing by the Councils or other agencies?

AGENDA FOR MATTER 5 – Rural areas
Wednesday April 29 at 14.00

Participants:

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Councils
Betley, Baltersley and Wrinehill Parish Council
Keele University

1. Does the CS carry forward the RSS objective for rural renaissance including employment and enterprise?
2. Does the CS include appropriate policies for the future development of Keele University?
3. Are the CS policies and proposals 'rural proofed' to ensure there are no unexpected negative impacts on the rural areas?
4. Is the identification of the three Rural Service Centres based on robust and credible evidence?
5. Will the focus of new housing on these Rural Service Centres be adequate to provide for the needs of the rural areas?
6. Do the Rural Service Centres have identified capacity for housing? Will there be a need to extend village envelopes into the Green Belt?
7. Should some development be allowed on previously developed land in rural areas other than in the Rural Service Centres?
8. Does the CS contain sufficient policies and proposals relating to improving access to jobs and services in the rural areas?
9. Is there enough reference to tourism as a source of employment in rural areas?
10. How will the local need for affordable housing on Rural Exception Sites be identified and assessed?
11. Has sufficient regard been paid to evidence regarding open space, sport and recreation in rural areas in accordance with PPG17?

**AGENDA FOR MATTER 6 – Employment
(Rural employment issues are included in Matter 5)
Tuesday April 28 at 10.00**

Participants:

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Councils
Patrick Downes/Simon Hawley (Harris Lamb for Bovale)
Phil Butters/Simon Morris (Keele University)

1. Does the CS clearly show how much employment land would be provided over the plan period, how it would be distributed and who would bring it forward?
2. Should policy SP2 specifically refer to the provision of the employment land portfolio and the protection of employment land and premises, carrying forward RSS phase 2 revision policies PA6, PA6A and PA6B?
3. Should a definition of employment uses be included in the CS?
4. Are the CS policies SP1 and SP2 unnecessarily restrictive in describing the uses that are accommodated on the Keele Science Park?
5. Will the portfolio of employment sites follow through the RSS requirements, including assessing whether it is still suitable for employment use or should be put to other beneficial use?
6. Are sites readily available in the appropriate quantity, quality and location?
7. Should there be more flexibility to allow greenfield land to be used for employment purposes or is the sequence of suitability clearly directed from policies of the emerging RSS?
8. Will more employment land need to be identified to balance higher new housing targets? If so, where should it be located?
9. Is there a need for the CS to identify a Major Investment Site?
10. Is there a need for the CS to identify a Regional Logistics Site?
11. Should the CS allow for offices in locations other than centres?
12. Should tourism be given more prominence as an employment generator?

**AGENDA FOR MATTER 7 – Centres and retail
(Rural service centres are included in Matter 5)
Tuesday April 28 at 14.00**

Participants:

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Councils
James Fennel (Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners for Capital Shopping Centres)

1. Is the hierarchy of centres generally in conformity with the RSS?
2. Does the CS contain policies to protect and enhance town centres?
3. Does the CS provide suitable guidance for future DPDs dealing with the two strategic centres?
4. Is there a need for the CS to be more specific in relation to the City Centre or can this be dealt with later in the AAP?
5. Are changes required to proposals for extension of the primary shopping core?
6. Does the CS clearly carry forward the provisions of the RSS Phase Two Revision in respect of the quantity, type and distribution of retail floorspace?
7. Is the distribution of new retail floorspace to smaller centres in the sub area strategies based on robust and credible evidence and in line with national and regional policies?
8. The monitoring target refers to 100% of new retail floorspace being in the City Centre and Newcastle town centre. Is this compatible with the retail allocations for smaller centres in the sub area strategies?
9. Should there be more flexibility to have retail and offices in locations other than centres?
10. Does the CS clearly carry forward the guidance of PPS6 regarding appropriate locations for town centre uses?
11. Should there be a retail park policy area?
12. Should there be more guidance regarding Waterworld and Festival Park?

**AGENDA FOR MATTER 8 - Sport, recreation, community facilities
and green space
Thursday April 30 at 10.00**

Participants

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Councils

1. Does the CS carry forward the guidance of PPG17 in respect of sport and recreation?
2. Is the evidence base for this subject robust and credible?
3. Will policy CSP5 ensure that new developments provide necessary elements of sport, recreation and green space?
4. How will the CS ensure that community facilities are provided as necessary to remedy deficiencies and serve new developments?
5. Should policy CSP10 refer specifically to sport and leisure in connection with contributions from developers and S106 planning obligations?
6. Is enough weight given to quality and accessibility as well as quantity of facilities?
7. Does it adequately cover the needs of the rural areas?

AGENDA FOR MATTER 9 - Design and environment
Thursday April 30 at 10.00

Participants

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Councils

1. Does policy CSP1 provide satisfactorily for the protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment in line with national and regional policies?
2. Does policy CSP2 explain how the historic environment will be preserved and/or enhanced?
3. Clarification is required on the use of the term 'green infrastructure' and relevance to the soundness of the CS.
4. Does the CS deal satisfactorily with the Ramsar sites and other designated areas?
5. With respect to the Addendum, is this merely an erratum? Is it already covered satisfactorily in CPS4 point 2? Would the CS be unsound if it were not changed in this way?
6. Should the CS be changed to refer to emerging RSS policy SR4 regarding air quality?
7. Does the CS meet the guidance of PPS9 regarding biodiversity?
8. Is a change needed to refer to geological conservation?
9. Do changes need to be made to the CS to ensure soundness in the light of the issues raised by Staffordshire County Council?

AGENDA FOR MATTER 10 - Climate change, energy, flooding and water
Thursday April 30 at 14.00

Participants:

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Councils
Matt Gilbert (The Planning Consultancy for Wale Developments Ltd)

Climate change and energy

1. Is policy CSP3 supported by a robust and credible evidence base?
2. Are its requirements too onerous? Is there evidence that they would undermine site viability and the ability to encourage new development in the plan area?
3. Should point 2 require only that new homes are in line with government requirements for the appropriate date?
4. Should more flexibility be incorporated into the policy wording?

Flooding

5. Is the level 1 SFRA adequate for the purposes of the CS?
6. Should policy CSP3 be amended in line with the Environment Agency representations to include a new point 9 about flood risk?
7. Should flood risk be referred to in SP1 point 6?
8. Does the CS give adequate guidance for future DPDs on the location of development in relation to flood risk?

Water

9. Are there any water supply constraints on development?

AGENDA MATTER 11 – Minerals
Thursday April 30 at 14.00

Participants:

Stoke on-Trent-Council
Staffordshire County Council

1. Is it appropriate for minerals in Stoke-on-Trent to be included in the CS rather than being dealt with jointly with the County Council?
2. Are there issues with Newcastle District eg,. Etruria Marls underlie Chatterley Valley, Rowhurst and Ravendale and were to have been proved and worked before it is developed under the Newcastle LP.
3. Does the CS provide a relevant, comprehensive and firm foundation for minerals planning in the future for Stoke-on-Trent?
4. Does it comply with national and regional guidance on minerals?
5. Is it satisfactory to rely on that guidance for dealing with future development?
6. Should mineral deposits other than Etruria Marl (eg. coal) be dealt with in policy CSP8 and the proposals map?
7. Does the schedule of proposed changes accurately include those suggested by QPA and GOWM?
8. A monitoring target refers to primary and secondary aggregates. Should the CS have a policy to deal with these?

**AGENDA FOR MATTER 12 – Delivery, flexibility and monitoring
Wednesday April 29 at 10.00**

Participants:

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Councils

John Beardsell (KJD for RAH Perkins)

Stephen Stoney/Duncan Jenkins (Wardell Armstrong for Lands Improvement)

1. Does the CS explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved?
2. Is it clear who is intended to implement each part of the strategy?
3. Where the actions required are outside the direct control of the local planning authorities, is there evidence that there is the necessary commitment from the relevant organisation to the implementation of the policies?
4. Are there realistic timescales related to the CS objectives?
5. Is the Strategic Infrastructure Planning document (EB/061) sufficiently comprehensive and does it clearly explain what would be the contingency action in the event of constraint (final column seems mainly to be descriptive).
6. Does the overall strategy depend on any large items of infrastructure that may be risky to deliver?
7. Does policy CSP10 provide appropriately for contributions from developers?
8. Should CSP10 include reference to other possible means of funding infrastructure such as the Community Infrastructure Levy?
9. Is the CS sufficiently flexible to deal with unexpected or changing circumstances, for example a larger housing target from the RSS review?
10. Does the CS contain targets and milestones which relate to the delivery of the policies, including housing trajectories?
11. Is it clear how these will be measured and are these linked to the production of the Annual Monitoring Report?
12. Are suitable targets and indicators present (by when, how and by whom)?
13. Do any monitoring targets need to be amended as a result of changes to the policies or text of the CS?
14. Does the CS include the remedial actions that will be taken if the strategies/policies are failing?