

Southwark Borough Council Core Strategy Examination  
Hearing Session 2 21st July 2010 @ 10.00 Tooley St Offices

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Examination of Matter 3: Sustainable Development

Focus for Discussion:

***Does the CS provide the most appropriate strategy for sustainable development within the context of the Borough; is the approach in general conformity with the London Plan and evidenced adequately?***

- i. To what extent are the Core Strategy and SP1 in general conformity with both the London Plan and its draft replacement?
- ii. What evidence underpins SP 1 and is this base robust and credible? Is the approach of the CS in accord with, amongst others, PPS1 and 4? Is the approach adopted sufficiently flexible and thereby effective?
- iii. Is the spatial distribution of dev the most suitable option – have alternatives been considered adequately? Does SP 1 enable the positive redevelopment of other parts of the Borough?
- iv. Is there a need to cross reference more clearly the provision of necessary infrastructure?
- v. Is the SA requirement proportionate and flexible? Should it be based upon a development size threshold? Evidence base for this position? Alternatives considered (how so assessed)?
- vi. How does the CS seek to address issues of social deprivation?
- vii. Should SP 1 require a Social Impact Assessment – should there be a greater reference to neighbourhoods, local needs and to development within sustainable limits?
- viii. Are 'very high standards' measurable? If so, how?

3. Examination of Matter 4: Sustainable Transport

Focus for Discussion:

***Is the advocated approach to sustainable transport the most appropriate strategy within the context of the Borough? Does the evidence support sufficiently the premise that the approach will be effective?***

- i. To what extent is the Core Strategy and SP2 in general conformity with both the London Plan and its draft replacement?
- ii. Is the evidence base to SP 2 robust and credible?
- iii. When and how will land be safeguarded for planned public transport improvements? Are any implications for the proposals map resolved?
- iv. Is there a need to clarify how the transport assessment requirement would work in practice – what does '...in line with LP Policy 3C.1 ...' mean? Should there be a development size threshold?
- v. Is the strategy underpinning SP 2 adequate – should it seek to reduce car use by more than just limiting the provision of car parking? Eg examination of existing car park provision = target to reduce car use/ownership?
- vi. Should the provision of car parking be linked to the economic viability of development?
- vii. Does the CS address adequately issues relating to alternative forms of transport to the private car, eg cycling?
- viii. How does the CS relate to TfL business plan? Matters of disagreement?
- ix. Is there a need to cross reference CIL in the supporting text of SP2?

4. Other Matters

5. Close