Inspector Document ID1

Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy examination			
Inspector's request for information			
	Concern	Requirement	
1	Housing supply		
	<ul> <li>2011 census data in SHMA update – does this need updating to take account of census results in April 2013?</li> <li>SHMA appears to rely solely on projected household change. Has the effect of economic growth on inward migration been taken into account (SHMA Practice Guidance Chapter 4 stage 2)</li> <li>Clarification is required: CS para 4.18 states that there is a need for 7,500 new market and affordable homes. However SHMA indicates (para 9.16) that affordable need exceeds realistic levels of housing delivery.</li> <li>Does housing target take account of cross boundary impacts eg any unmet</li> </ul>	A <u>background/ topic paper</u> is required to explain how the figures in Policy KS3 flow from the up to date evidence; to confirm that the effects of economic growth have been taken into account; and to justify failure to meet objectively assessed need.	
	<ul> <li>need from neighbouring LPA's?</li> <li>Justification for CS objective of "reducing local need" rather than to "meet objectively assessed need"</li> </ul>		
2	<ul> <li>Housing Trajectory</li> <li>Clarification is required to explain background to Table 2 and to explain what detailed information on sites feeds into the trajectory</li> <li>Reliance on CUE needs justification</li> </ul>	Background/ topic paper on housing delivery	
	(see 4 and 6)		
3	<ul> <li>Gypsy and Traveller accommodation</li> <li>Provision for G &amp; T/ TS accommodation should be treated in the same way as other housing. What is the need? How will sites be allocated to meet the need?</li> <li>What is the relationship between criteria based policy and the Dorset G&amp;T joint DPD?</li> </ul>	A note is required to clarify how GT/T sites will be allocated.	
4	<ul> <li>Christchurch Urban Extension <ul> <li>Deliverability issues:</li> <li>A35 junction improvements</li> <li>undergrounding of overhead power cables</li> <li>SANG location/ agreement of all stakeholders (DTC page 22 para 3.4.16 says the SANGs strategy includes an area within the administrative control of NFNPA)</li> <li>SANG/ minerals extraction relationship</li> <li>relocation of allotments</li> </ul> </li> <li>Is the housing trajectory, which shows delivery commencing in 2013/14, realistic?</li> </ul>	Paper to set out: infrastructure requirements/ project planning/programming/ risks and contingencies	
5	Other site allocations	Confirmation that management flood	
	The draft IDP para 2.23 states that further information on how flood risk	risk has been addressed on all	

	<ul> <li>will be managed for strategic sites will be set out in the Site Allocations DPD. This is not acceptable. The CS needs to demonstrate that flood risk has been addressed in all site allocations.</li> <li>BA2 Business park allocation - how will phasing be decided/ by whom?</li> </ul>	Project planning information is required
6	<ul> <li>Draft IDP/ deliverability (effectiveness) of the CS</li> <li>The draft IDP (SD20) appears to be incomplete. In the absence of a coordinated implementation/ delivery section in the CS, the IDP should identify any infrastructure that is required to deliver the CS policies and (especially) allocations.</li> <li>The IDP should show how the timing of infrastructure relates to the delivery of the CS, especially allocations.</li> <li>The IDP should include an analysis of risks to delivery of essential infrastructure/ to implementation of the CS and contingency measures</li> </ul>	The CS should have an implementation/ delivery section or should be supported by an IDP which demonstrates the programme for the delivery of essential infrastructure.
7	Monitoring	A robust monitoring framework is needed.