

Plan E- Epsom Town Centre Area Action Plan Matters and Issues for Examination

Tuesday 21 September 2010, 10.00 - 17.00

Main Matter 1 - Context and Approach

Participant: Epsom and Ewell Borough Council (all)

1. Does the AAP satisfy the legal requirements, in particular:
 - 1.1. Has it been prepared in accordance with the Local Development scheme?
 - 1.2. Has it been prepared in accordance with the statement of community involvement and regulations?
 - 1.3. Has it been subject to sustainability appraisal?
 - 1.4. Has it had regard to national policy?
 - 1.5. Has it had regard to any sustainable community strategy for the area?
 - 1.6. Overall has it emerged from an open and transparent process that demonstrates how and why its elements were selected, in consultation with the public and other stakeholders?
2. Since the publication of the AAP the RSS has been revoked. What implications does this have for the AAP? Are any adjustments to text required? If so please state what they are.
3. Is the relationship to the Local Plan and any saved policies which will be superseded adequately explained?
4. Is the plan consistent with the Core Strategy?
5. I have a schedule of Pre-Examination changes. I also have suggested changes in response to GOSE issues- June 2010. Are any other changes proposed? Is it correct that appendix 4 would be removed from the AAP?
6. Is the Housing Trajectory to be attached to the plan? How is that to be incorporated into the document? Will it also incorporate a phasing table? Are the projected timescales realistic?

Participant (Item 7): Mr J Sharkey for University for the Creative Arts

7. What is the rationale for the town centre boundary and how was it formulated? Provide explanation that it is consistent with the Core Strategy and PPS4. What implications does the exclusion of parts of the

town centre shown on the Local Plan proposals inset map have? Has an updated proposals map been prepared?

Participant (Item 8): Mr J Sharkey for University for the Creative Arts

8. The University for the Creative Arts lies outside the Town Centre boundary. What implications do you see that having on decisions about development relevant to that institution, particularly the provision of student housing and any on site development proposals? Is there any factual evidence about the college, for example student and staff numbers and college floorspace that is relevant and if so why? Are there any future plans for the institution relevant to the AAP?

9. Is it a realistic vision for The Old Town and Market Place that through traffic will be substantially reduced? (The Vision) Please respond to the points made by Surrey County Council.

Main Matter 2 - Policy Matters

Participant: Epsom and Ewell Borough Council (all)

Participant (Item 1): Mr J Sharkey for University for the Creative Arts

1. Explain the use of the word "principally" in line 2 of policy E1. Where else would the policies apply? How does this policy relate to the plan area boundary? Should this policy include a wider mix of uses such as education and student housing? Would these uses be incompatible with policy E1 as drafted?

2. Housing capacity policy E2. Is there any need to include the upper figure of 775 residential units and how does the use of an upper figure comply with government policy? Should the policy refer instead to a minimum of 635 new residential units?

3. How has the housing yield in paragraph 4.16 been calculated?

Participants (Item 4): Mr S Clark, Steve Clark Associates and Ms K Benford, Planning Potential on behalf of Country and Metropolitan Homes

4. How has the Council arrived at the figures for housing provision on the key opportunity sites? Will the other town centre sites be capable of providing the remainder? What are the implications of building height restrictions on housing figures?

Participant (Item 5): Mr C Pittock, GL Hearn on behalf of Tesco Stores

5. Explain how the plans for retail growth in policy E3 comply with PPS4. Explain why projections beyond 2018 should be treated with caution and the implications of this for the policy. Should this be taken out of the policy and included in the text? What are the implications of breaking down the floorspace in the way that it is shown in the policy? Is the loss of trade to other centres and to Sainsburys in Kiln Lane something that the Plan should address? Give any material to demonstrate or otherwise that the policy E3 includes an accurate estimate of quantitative need. Is there a need for a qualitative element in policy E3?

Participant (Item 6): Mr C Pittock, GL Hearn on behalf of Tesco Stores

6. Policy E4. How has the core area been defined? Policy E4 does not include any definition of how 66% is measured. Is this number of units, length of frontage, floorspace or some other method? How is a significant break in the retail frontage defined? These explanations should be included in the explanatory text. Explain the penultimate sentence in paragraph 4.23. Justify why takeaways are more suited to being outside the primary and secondary frontages (paragraph 4.28).

7. Policy E5. Are the floorspace figures based on up to date evidence? What is the rationale for the floorspace figures and why is it a range?

8. Policy E6. Whether any other suitable locations need to be mentioned.

Participants (Item 9): Mr S Clark, Steve Clark Associates, Ms K Benford, Planning Potential on behalf of Country and Metropolitan Homes and Mr C Pittock, GL Hearn on behalf of Tesco Stores

9. Policy E7 whether this policy is overly prescriptive and whether it complies with national policy. The areas are not finely drawn. What implications would that have for development control and the clarity of the plan? Why have the boundaries been drawn in the way they have since the up to 16m areas do not follow any property boundaries on the ground? What is the reasoning for the boundaries? Is the roof height and angle justified? What are the implications of building height restrictions on housing density and floorspace provision figures? Reference has been made to another Inspectors views about a similar policy in Ashford. What implications does that have for my consideration? On what sites has there been pressure for taller buildings? What are the implications of paragraph 4.41 on redevelopment proposals?

10. Policy E8. What progress has there been on producing the Climate Change Strategy?

11. Policy E9. What is the meaning of "where appropriate" in the policy? How and where will this be defined? How will the financial contributions to

public realm improvements be assessed? Would the contributions comply with national policy? Should there be any reference to commercial viability in relation to developer contributions? What is the situation regarding any Supplementary Planning Document?

12. Policy E10. What is meant by “where appropriate?” How and where will this be defined? See also question 11.

13. Policy E11. Will it always be possible to provide rear servicing in new developments?

14. Policy E12. How does any town centre parking strategy link to new development? What progress has been made with this since the implementation section indicates a start by 2010? Will it contribute to limiting traffic growth? What is the rationale for the allocation of specific numbers of car parking spaces on specific sites in the absence of a strategy?

15. Policy E13. Surrey County Council have said that town centre traffic is unlikely to reduce, what are the Council's views on this? What progress has been made with modelling traffic schemes?

16. Town centre manager – what is the likelihood of this position being funded by the Council or others? What progress has there been with this?

Please note:

- 1. Surrey County Council will make a presentation on the traffic model used in relation to Plan E. This relates to Main Matter 1 (9) and Main Matter 2 (15) and these matters will therefore be heard together.*
- 2. Subject to progress on the day the University for the Creative Arts will be allowed to address the last question in Main Matter 3 (4) on Day One, after Main Matter 1 (8).*
- 3. If there is an over run on Day One, it will be to the start of Day Two.*

Wednesday 22 September
Committee Room 1, Town Hall 10.00

Main Matter 3 – Site Allocations

Participant: Epsom and Ewell Borough Council (all)

Participant (Item 1): Mr C Pittock, GL Hearn on behalf of Tesco Stores

1. Policy E14 - Depot Road and Upper High Street. What is meant by a small-medium sized food store and should this be clarified? In view of Tesco opposition to the size of store and mix of retail units, how will this be achieved? What is the current position regarding Tesco proposals? Are all the land owners on the site committed to redevelopment? What evidence demonstrates this? How has the number of car parking spaces been arrived at for the site and does the provision comply with national policy? Has any assessment been made of the capacity of the site to accommodate all the uses identified in the policy and how will this site come forward? Is it realistic to provide an on-site decentralised heat and power generation source?

2. Policy E15 - The Utilities site. Has the Council followed up the comments of Thames Water to see whether there is any possibility of release of their land within the plan period? What evidence is there that the gas utilities infrastructure could be relocated? Where are the gas pipelines? What impact does the location of these utilities have on the partial development of the site? Has any assessment been made of the capacity of the site to accommodate all the uses identified in the policy and how will the totality of this site come forward? Is it possible that some parts of the site will be more deliverable than others and what will the Council do in the event that partial proposals are submitted rather than a comprehensive scheme that would deliver all of the development? The site was subject to previous allocations in the Local Plan but most has not been redeveloped. Does this indicate that most of the site is not deliverable? Is it realistic to provide an on-site decentralised heat and power generation source?

3. Policy E16 - Station site. How can the retention of 27 car parking spaces adhere to a unified town centre parking management strategy when that is yet to be formulated? If development accords with planning permission already granted, is 5.34 be correct? Is it realistic to provide an on-site decentralised heat and power generation source? Is that part of the scheme granted planning permission?

Participants (Item 4): Mr J Sharkey for University for the Creative Arts and Mr S Clark, Steve Clark Associates

4. Policy E17 - Opportunities sites. Are the site boundaries as defined on the proposals map correct? What parking standards will be used in calculating provision on these sites? Is there an indication that any of

these schemes will go ahead? Should residential uses include student housing or institutional uses?

Any further questions, mop up session, conclusion of Hearings part of the Examination.

General Points

The Council should provide a comprehensive list of responses to representations made and any changes and errata proposed in response. The Council should keep also a list of any changes proposed as the Examination progresses.

Please Note: If there is an over run on Day Two, it will be to the following day.