

AGENDA

14.00 hours on Wednesday 28 January 2009 in Committee Rooms A and B at Crawley Town Hall

Issue 6: Phasing and Delivery - Chapter 5

Whether the phasing provisions are sound and flexible, capable of dealing with slippages in the delivery of development proposals; and whether the infrastructure is clear, costed, realistically timed and capable of being funded

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. Are the minor phasing strategy changes advocated by Crest Nicholson at their ¶ 4 and Appendix accepted by the Council?
3. In the Viability Appraisals:
 - Have some of the infrastructure costs been underestimated? – see Crest Nicholson’s Appendix, especially education and health estimates.
 - Do the toolkit limitations listed in ¶ 53 of the explanation affect its applicability? Should some attempt be made to quantify them (see below)?
 - Has affordable housing revenue been overvalued (see Trench Statement)?
 - Have the Zone 1 and 2 homes been overvalued (see Trench Statement)?
 - Is there tipping in Zone 1 which will affect costs and house values?
 - Have the correct development costs been added (see Trench Statement, page 3)?
 - Is there a mathematical error in Table 14 (see Trench Statement)?
 - Should accumulated interest be included?
 - Has too optimistic an assumption about economic and housing recovery been made?
4. In the light of the debate on the above, should the viability appraisals be re-calculated?
5. Would the application of flexibility in some of the JAAP policies in order to achieve development viability result in a lack of conformity with CS policies?
6. Are the Councils right (¶ 2.10) that “the fundamental requirement is delivery of the development prior to 2026 to accord with the SEP”? Also discussed in Issue 1 – resolved?
7. *Councils:* Should the requirements in the Councils’ Statement at ¶s 2.12 (S106) and 2.26 (overage clauses) be in the JAAP?
8. *Councils:* In ¶ 5.11 should there be mention of a multi-nodal interchange as per ¶ 38 of Crest Nicholson’s Statement? (See also item 7 of the Issue 5 Agenda)
9. In ¶ 5.11 please could the *Council* propose at the hearing a suggested change concerning the informal open space? (see ¶ 2.38 Council and ¶ 40 Crest Nicholson)
10. Capon Grove is stated in Crest Nicholson ¶ 42 to be a Nature Conservation Area (restricted access). *Councils:* Should this be in the JAAP?
11. *Councils:* On page 69 ¶s 4.137 or 5.26 – should the information in ¶s 44 and 45 of Crest Nicholson’s Statement be included? (See also item 8 on the Issue 5 Agenda).
12. Any further points?