

Examination into the West of Bewbush Joint Area Action Plan

**AGENDA**

All day from 10.00 hours on Tuesday 20 January 2009 in Committee Rooms A and B at  
Crawley Town Hall

**Issue 1: Principle of Development & Identification of the West of Bewbush site**

***Whether the JAAP will deliver the required numbers and a balanced range of housing based on the neighbourhood principle in the right location***

**Chapters 1 to 3 and policies WB 1 and WB 2**

The majority of the questions on the policies and supporting text relate to the tests of soundness requiring the JAAP to be justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Where the parties have clearly stated their respective positions on the questions and there is sufficient information for me, then there is no specific item on the agenda

1. Introduction.
2. Housing delivery concerns, in general only as any detailed examination of these matters will be considered under later issues:
  - bridging the railway - *Crest Nicholson to start*
  - remediating the landfill - *KTI Energy Limited to start*
  - transport (bypass and railway station) – *Crest Nicholson to start*
  - economic viability – *Council to start*
  - conflict of delivery timescale in the Core Strategies versus that in draft RSS GAT3?  
Which takes precedence? Effect on WB 1 and ¶ 6.3 delivery timescale? – *Council to start*
3. If the *Councils (to start)*, West Sussex and Crest are right that the WRR is unlikely to be built, the effect of the suggested changes is that (after 5 years) an informal park on the field west of the link road and south of Pondtail Shaw will be realised. Given this likely alternative, when and in what core phase would the park be laid out?

Alternatively, if the WRR does occur:

  - should the JAAP be clearer about what would happen in development terms? - ¶ 5.35 as suggested to be changed mentions “contingency development” What is this?
  - should the Horsham Core Strategy requirement (CP 6) for a landscaped western edge to prevent further expansion be explicitly stated?
4. In light of the Councils’ (to start) statement about the secondary access (¶ 2.20), should ¶ 3.10 in the JAAP be made clearer?
5. Should the possible alternative uses for the proposed Environmental Infrastructure Area (EIA) in the Councils’ ¶2.28 be included in JAAP ¶ 3.14 or explained in the Glossary?  
*Councils* – should the proposed changes include the substitution of an EIA on the Conceptual Masterplan?
6. Any further points?