

BRISTOL CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION INSEPECTOR'S HEARING AGENDAS

Agendas for the 2 hearing sessions on Monday 21 June (13.30 start as previously indicated)

Brief opening remarks by the Inspector (and Council if desired).

Compliance with Statutory and Regulatory Matters

1. The matters listed in a) to g) of my note of 13 May 2010 will be taken in turn. I have only a few points of clarification.
2. Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties (1465) and the Bristol Property Agents Association (1690) raise concerns about the adequacy/robustness of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Do these concerns question whether the statutory requirement to undertake SA has been met or are the concerns primarily that the conclusions of the SA on certain matters are questionable and would have been different if different parameters/judgement had been used (and essentially concern the merits of the spatial choices made)?
3. The statement from South West Transport Network (0829) on Issue 1 alleges that certain statutory requirements have not been met in relation to references to the *Network Rail Utilisation Strategy for the Great Western Region*. I do not understand how this relates to statutory/regulatory requirements of the Core Strategy. (Is the point being made part of the wider concern of this representor and others that the Core Strategy should promote greater use of and investment in the local rail network? If so this is to be considered under Issues 1 and 6)
4. Any other statutory or regulatory concerns?

End of session

Issue 1 Vision, Issue and Objectives

1. As previously indicated, discussion under this issue is intended as an overview of this part of the Core Strategy. Whether the substance of the plan is unsound and should be changed should primarily be debated under the relevant topic issue. If changes were to be made to the substance of the plan's proposals, then the wording of the vision or detailed objectives may need to be changed to be consistent. I list below the main concerns raised by participants. I expect discussion will be fairly brief.
2. References to the *Green Belt*. My preliminary view is that there is some inconsistency between the stated objective of protecting the Green Belt and the proposed contingency for development in the Green Belt. However, given that any development in the Green Belt needs to be discussed at the postponed hearing session in the context of the proposed abolition of the RSS, I suggest that the wording of the vision/objectives is best reviewed in the light of that later discussion and any proposed changes.
3. *Avonmouth*. Does the reference to the Avonmouth under *Delivering a thriving economy* do justice to its significance? Should its potential as a location for low carbon energy production be flagged under *Tackling climate change*?
4. *Rail*. Should rail – the Greater Bristol Metro (GBM) – be included under *A city of sustainable travel* (irrespective of whether more detail or specific proposals are

added in other parts of the Core Strategy)? Is the GBM part of the *transport vision for the West of England*?

5. *Peak Oil*. My preliminary view is that no further reference to *Peak Oil* is required in the Core Strategy for soundness. Any discussion?

6. Any other points?

End of session

Simon Emerson
INSPECTOR
17 June 2010