

## **BRISTOL CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION INSPECTOR'S HEARING AGENDA**

### **Agenda regarding Superseded Policies and the Proposals Map (new session suggested for Tuesday 29 June after Issue 5)**

*In this Agenda I summarise my understanding of the position relating to superseded policies and the Proposals Map to assist the Council in advance of the discussion.*

1. I made some preliminary comments and questions under Item 10.1 of my final list of examination issues and questions (13 May 2010). In response to my request, the Council has prepared a schedule showing which policies in the Core Strategy replace (or contribute to the replacement of) the Local Plan policies already listed in Appendix A of the Core Strategy. This is helpful. Should such a list (eg the Table organised by Local Plan policy indicating the reasons for replacement) be included as part of the Core Strategy?
2. Under my other issues, I raise some questions about the implications of the Core Strategy's policies/proposals for other saved local plan policies. The list may therefore need to be amended in the light of those discussions.

#### *Proposals Map*

3. Firstly, is the Council's current Proposals Map, the Proposals Map enclosed with the Local Plan (December 1997) (CDE48)? Have there been any formal changes to the December 1997 printed version of this map? My understanding is that the extant Proposals Map is the starting point for signalling any changes arising from the adoption of each DPD in turn (deletions/additions of designations, new allocations and so on) rather than there being no Proposals Map within the LDF at present. Does the Council have different understanding?
4. In its response in relation to the Proposals Map, the Council indicates that: *no changes to the Proposals Map would arise from the adoption of the Core Strategy* and that *none of the Local Plan policies which are to be replaced support relevant notations on the Proposals Map* (BCC Issue 10.1 paragraph 2 and 3). I do not understand how this is the case.
5. Policies to be replaced SB2, CC1, CC9, EC2, and EC3 (there may be others) all seem to support specific notations on the Local Plan's Proposals Map. The list of superseded policies includes policies which the Council regard as redundant, one of which at least (L6) currently supports specific designations on the proposals map. If all these policies (or other policies which are the sole support for a Local Plan notation) are replaced when the Core Strategy is adopted, the related notations/designations will be left stranded on the Proposals Map, without policy support. I see this as a matter which is likely to cause confusion and make the submission proposals maps which eventually accompany the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD and the City Centre AAP more complex than they need be.
6. Several regulations in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations (2004) (as amended) impose requirements relating to the Proposals Map. (I do not refer to them all here). Reg 13 (4) states that only if it includes a site allocations policy, a DPD must include a submissions proposals map showing the changes which will result to the adopted proposals map if the DPD is adopted. If that were the only requirement relating to proposals maps then I would understand why the Council consider that no changes are needed to the proposals map because the Core Strategy is not making any site specific

allocations. However Regulation 24, in describing proposed submission documents, indicates that if the adoption of the DPD would result in changes to the adopted proposals map then a map showing those changes should be submitted. In my view, *changes* seem broader than the *site allocations* referred to in Regulation 13. Regulation 14(4) indicates that when first adopted the proposal map must illustrate geographically the application of the policies in any DPD adopted at the same time and an old policy which applied at that time. The implication is that it should not show policies which no longer exist. Some issues relating to proposals maps are set out in the PINS *Examining Development Plan Documents: Learning From Experience* (September 2009) (paragraphs 52-57) [http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/appeals/local\\_dev/index.htm](http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/appeals/local_dev/index.htm)

7. My preliminary view is that designations on the Proposals Map should be changed at the time that the DPD most relevant to initiating that change is adopted. This enables anyone concerned about the removal of a designation from the Proposals Map to make representations on the soundness of the DPD triggering that change (which might be because the DPD omits a previous policy). If the tidying up of notations on the Proposals Map is left to a later DPD there may no longer be the relevant hook to make a meaningful representation about a change which was initiated at an earlier (eg Core Strategy) stage.

8. What is the Council's understanding of the position?

9. I would also highlight that the Proposals Map currently contains notation relating to policies which are no longer saved (eg A2 and M22). In my view, these spent notations should be removed at the first opportunity that other changes are required as a result of the adoption of a DPD.

10. The Proposals Map is a distinct Local Development Document and its content is not a matter on which I can make any recommendation. My concern in discussing this issue is to assist the Council in ensuring clarity in the spatial expression of development plan policies and to ensure that I have fully understood the implications of the Core Strategy's proposals and how they will be delivered, if necessary, in subsequent DPDs.

*End of session*

**Simon Emerson**  
**INSPECTOR**  
**21 June 2010**