

## Erewash Core Strategy Review Examination

### Matters, Issues and Questions

#### Introduction

1. Ahead of the forthcoming Hearings, responses are invited from participants on the Matters Issues and Questions (MIQs) contained within this document. The MIQs are based on the main issues identified by the Council and other relevant issues raised by representors. Further information about the examination of the Plan can be found in the accompanying Examination Guidance Note. The deadline for providing responses to the MIQs is **12:00 midday on Thursday 30 November 2023**.
2. In preparing responses to the MIQs participants should be aware of the Council's response to the Inspector's Initial Questions and the documents that have been added to the Examination Library following submission of the Core Strategy Review for examination. This includes:
  - EBC01 Council's Response to INS01 Inspector's Initial Questions
  - EBC04 Erewash Borough Council Local Plan Viability Assessment September 2023
  - EBC05 Green Belt Technical Paper September 2023
  - EBC06 Infrastructure Delivery Schedule for the Erewash Core Strategy Review
  - EBT1.1 Erewash Local Plan Development Assessment V5.2 (replacing EBT1)
  - EBT1.1a 111083 Erewash Local Plan Assessment Figures Document V5.2 (replacing ETB1a)

## **Main Matter 1: Procedural/ Legal Requirements**

### **Issue**

**Whether the Council has complied with relevant procedural and legal requirements.**

### **Questions**

#### ***Plan Preparation and Scope***

1. Has the preparation of the Core Strategy Review been in accordance with the Local Development Scheme in terms of its form, scope and timing?
2. How did the Council engage with interested stakeholders on the allocation of land contained in Policy 1.4 of the Core Strategy Review? Was this appropriate?
3. Has the preparation of the Core Strategy Review complied with the Statement of Community Involvement?
4. How does the Erewash Core Strategy Review relate to existing plans and how will they be affected by the adoption of the Core Strategy (adopted Erewash Core Strategy and made Neighbourhood Plans)?

#### ***Sustainability Appraisal***

5. How has the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) informed the preparation of the Core Strategy Review at each stage? How has the SA been reported? Has the methodology for the SA been appropriate?
6. What options were considered through the SA for the following:
  - a. The overall scale of housing and other growth
  - b. The broad distribution of development across the Borough
  - c. Potential allocation sites
  - d. Policy approaches
7. What were the conclusions of the SA in relation to these options and how have they informed the preparation of the Core Strategy Review?
8. What are the overall conclusions of the SA?
9. How have the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive been met?

### ***Habitats Regulations Assessment***

10. How was the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) carried out and reported and was the methodology appropriate?
11. What was the basis for determining that an Appropriate Assessment was not required and is this a justified conclusion?

### ***Other Matters***

12. Do the strategic policies look ahead a minimum of 15 years from adoption, to anticipate and respond to long term requirements and opportunities as required by paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework?
13. Does the Core Strategy Review include policies designed to ensure that the development and use of land in the Borough contributes to the mitigation of, and adaption to, climate change in accordance with the legislation? If so, which?
14. Has the Council had regard to the other relevant specific matters set out in Section 19 of the 2004 Act (as amended) and in Regulation 10 of the 2012 Regulations?
15. How have issues of equality been addressed in the Core Strategy Review to ensure that due regard is had to the 3 aims outlined in s149 of the Equality Act 2010 in terms of those who have a protected characteristic?

## **Main Matter 2: The Duty to Co-operate**

### **Issue**

#### **Whether the Council has complied with the duty to co-operate in the preparation of the Core Strategy Review.**

Please Note: The duty to co-operate relates to the preparation of the Core Strategy Review as far as they relate to strategic matters, as defined in S33A (4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It covers the time up to, but not after the submission of the Core Strategy Review for examination. Issues of soundness will be dealt with under other matters.

### **Questions**

#### ***Housing Provision***

1. What are the inter-relationships with other authorities in terms of migration, commuting and housing markets?
2. How have these been taken into account in preparing the Core Strategy Review and specifically in terms of Objectively Assessed Need for housing (OAN) and housing provision?
3. Who has the Council engaged with in terms of overall housing provision and what form has this taken?
4. Paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework identifies that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries the strategic making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. This includes the strategy being informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need. How has this been demonstrated?
5. Should the Core Strategy Review seek to address any housing needs from the wider Housing Market Area? If not, what are the reasons for this and is it justified.
6. In the Statement of Common Ground with the Derby Housing Market Area it was agreed that housing distribution is a strategic cross boundary issue between Erewash Borough and Derby Housing Market Area but that the Derby HMA were not able to progress any further wording for the Statement of Common Ground at the time of writing. Has there been any further updates since this time? Do the parties still take the same view?

7. In the Statement of Common Ground with Derby City Council reference is made to education, affordable housing and highways matters. In response to the Inspector's initial questions Erewash Borough Council identified that further engagement with the City Council would seek to agree to resolve the outstanding matters. What is the most up to date position of the parties on this matter?
8. The Statement of Common Ground with Amber Valley Borough Council and Derbyshire County Council identify a number areas of disagreement. Have any of the matters identified been resolved? Is it considered that the remaining matters of disagreement relate to matters of soundness rather than the Duty to Co-operate?
9. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that Inspectors will expect to see that strategic policy making authorities have addressed key strategic matters through effective joint working and not deferred them to subsequent plan updates or are not relying on the Inspector to direct them. If agreements cannot be reached, the PPG advises that plans may still be submitted for examination but states that comprehensive and robust evidence of the efforts made to cooperate, and any outcomes achieved, will be required. Has the Council's approach been consistent with advice contained in the PPG?

### ***Economic Growth/ Employment Land Provision***

10. What are the cross boundary issues relating to economic growth and employment land provision?
11. Who has the Council engaged with on economic growth/ employment land matters? When did this engagement take place and what form did it take? What was the outcome of this engagement?
12. What is the position of other authorities in terms of the Council's approach to these issues? What specific concerns were raised through duty to co-operate discussions or representations on the Core Strategy Review and have they been resolved?

### ***Other Strategic Matters***

13. Are there any other strategic matters and if so how have they been addressed through co-operation and what was the outcome?

### ***Overall***

14. Overall, has the Council engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in maximising the effectiveness of the preparation of the Core Strategy Review?

## **Matter 3: The Spatial Strategy**

### **Issue**

**Whether the Core Strategy Review is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the Spatial Strategy.**

**Relevant Policies:** 1, 2

### **Questions**

1. Does the Core Strategy Review have a vision, strategic objectives and provide a clear and cohesive framework for the future growth and development of Erewash?
2. Will the spatial strategy contribute to achieving sustainable development, including a sustainable pattern of development, as set out in paragraph 11a of the National Planning Policy Framework and if so, how?
3. What were the options for accommodating growth and how were they considered? Have all reasonable alternatives been considered?
4. What is the basis for the conclusions on each of the growth options and are these justified?
5. How was the settlement hierarchy in Strategic Policy 1 derived? Is the methodology used to determine the hierarchy appropriate and sufficiently robust?
6. How has the level of development anticipated in different settlement categories in Strategic Policy 1 been arrived at? Does the settlement hierarchy appropriately reflect the role and function of these settlements?
7. Has the potential for development in the urban area, the use of previously developed land and increased densities been optimised?
8. On a strategic, Boroughwide level, does the scale of housing growth required and the limited opportunities within existing built-up areas provide the exceptional circumstances to justify altering the Green Belt?
9. What factors were taken into account regarding the suitability of each of the rural villages/ settlements to accommodate growth? What is the basis for the conclusions in each case and are these justified?
10. How were different sites considered for inclusion as allocations? What process did the Council follow in deciding which sites to allocate?

11. How did the Council consider the viability and deliverability of sites in deciding where to allocate development?
12. How did the Council consider the infrastructure requirements of the proposed development in the Strategy and how did this inform the site selection process?
13. In overall terms, is the Spatial Strategy appropriate and justified, particularly in terms of the range and mix of locations identified for growth? Is it effective and consistent with national policy?

## **Matter 4: The Green Belt**

### **Issue**

#### **Whether the approach to the alteration of the Green Belt and development within it is justified and consistent with national policy.**

Please Note: This matter concerns the principle and overall approach to the Green Belt. Detailed matters relating to individual site allocations and the specific implications for the Green Belt are dealt with in Matter 6.

#### ***Principle of Green Belt Release***

1. What proportion of new housing allocated in the Core Strategy Review would be on land currently designated as Green Belt?
2. What is the capacity to accommodate housing development in the Borough on non-Green Belt land? How has this been assessed and is this robust?
3. How is this affected by the spatial strategy?
4. How is it affected by other constraints?

Paragraph 141 of the NPPF identifies that before exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries a strategic policy making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has fully examined all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for housing. Have all opportunities to maximise the capacity on non-Green Belt land been taken? As such:

5. How has the Council sought to make as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land?
6. How has the Council sought to optimise the density of development?
7. Has the Council assessed whether there is any realistic potential to accommodate some of the development needs of the Borough in other authority areas, reducing the need to alter the Green Belt? How has this been assessed/ investigated?

#### ***Green Belt Review***

8. The Council has produced Green Belt Technical Paper (EBC05). Was the Council's approach to assessing Green Belt appropriate? What are your reasons for this view?
9. How has the assessment of Green Belt land informed the Core Strategy Review and specifically proposals to alter the Green Belt to accommodate development needs?
10. How has the Council assessed the suitability of land parcels and their contribution towards the purposes of including land in the Green Belt?



### ***Exceptional Circumstances***

11. Are there exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt in the Borough in principle? If so what are they? If not, how could housing and employment needs be met in other ways?

## **Matter 5: The Housing Requirement/ Overall Housing Provision**

### **Issue**

**Whether the Core Strategy Review has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the housing requirement and overall housing provision.**

**Relevant Policies: 1**

### **Questions**

Paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework identifies that to determine the number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance (the PPG) unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach that also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals.

1. What is the minimum number of new homes needed over the plan period calculated using the standard method? Has the calculation of Local Housing Need been undertaken appropriately using the standard method and correct inputs reflecting the methodology and advice in the PPG?

The PPG advises that there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method. Circumstances where this may be appropriate include situations where there are growth strategies for an area, where strategic infrastructure improvements are proposed or where an authority is taking on unmet housing needs from elsewhere.

2. In response to the Inspector's Initial Questions, the Council concluded that there are no circumstances that justify a higher housing figure. Is this conclusion reasonable and supported by evidence?
3. The Core Strategy Review identifies a minimum housing requirement of 5,800 net dwellings over the period 2022-2037. Is this justified? If not, what should the housing requirement be?
4. Will the proposed supply of dwellings set out in Strategic Policy 1 incorporate a sufficient 'buffer' to allow for non-delivery as well as providing choice and flexibility in the supply of housing land?
5. Would at least 10% of the housing requirement be accommodated on sites no larger than one hectare as set out in paragraph 69 of the National Planning Policy Framework? Does this include sites that have already been completed?
6. In overall terms is the approach to the housing requirement justified?

## **Matter 6: Housing Allocations**

### **Issue**

**Whether the proposed housing site allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.**

**Relevant Policies:** 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6

**Please note: In responding to the questions below the Council should identify and address specific key concerns raised in the representations.**

### **Questions**

1. Strategic Policy 1.1 sets a threshold of 200 or more homes. How was this figure determined?
2. In Strategic Policy 1.1 is the requirement to provide at least one off-street parking space per new dwelling served by an electric vehicle charging point justified?
3. Should Strategic Policy 1.1 include any of the following requirements? What are the reasons for this?
  - a. Sustainable surface water management and the drainage hierarchy
  - b. Overhead lines?
  - c. Public transport requirements?
  - d. Historic environment, heritage assets or their settings?
4. Does the policy effectively protect ecological assets?

Taking each of the following proposed site allocations individually in turn:

5. Strategic Policy 1.2 South Stanton
  - A. What is the background to the site allocation and how was it identified?
  - B. What is the basis for the scale of development proposed and is this justified?
  - C. What is the background to the specific policy requirements? Are they justified and consistent with national policy? Do they provide clear and effective guidance on constraints and suitable mitigation?
  - D. What are the highways implications of the allocation and how will any impacts be mitigated?
  - E. Does the policy identify appropriate and necessary infrastructure requirements? How will these be provided and funded? Is this sufficiently clear?

- F. Are there potential adverse effects not covered above? If so what are they and how would they be addressed and mitigated? (The Council's response should address key issues raised in the representations).
- G. What evidence is there to demonstrate that the allocation is viable and deliverable within the plan period? What is the situation with regards land ownership and developer interest?
- H. How will the site be brought forward for development? What mechanisms will there be to ensure a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development, ensuring that infrastructure requirements are provided?
- I. What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?
- J. Overall, is the allocation justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?

6. Strategic Policy 1.3 Acorn Way

- A. What is the background to the site allocation and how was it identified?
- B. What would be the effect of developing the site on the purposes of the Green Belt?
- C. Are there exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt in this particular case? If so what are they?
- D. Should the policy set out what compensation measures will be expected where there is Green Belt release for development and how it will be calculated?
- E. What is the basis for the scale of development proposed and is this justified?
- F. What is the background to the specific policy requirements? Are they justified and consistent with national policy? Do they provide clear and effective guidance on constraints and suitable mitigation?
- G. What are the highways implications of the allocation and how will any impacts be mitigated?
- H. Does the policy identify appropriate and necessary infrastructure requirements? How will these be provided and funded? Is this sufficiently clear?
- I. What implications will the allocation have on Derby City with regards education and highways?
- J. Should the policy make provision to protect the playing field adjacent to the site allocation?

- K. Are there potential adverse effects not covered above? If so what are they and how would they be addressed and mitigated? (The Council's response should address key issues raised in the representations).
- L. What evidence is there to demonstrate that the allocation is viable and deliverable within the plan period? What is the situation with regards land ownership and developer interest?
- M. How will the site be brought forward for development? What mechanisms will there be to ensure a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development, ensuring that infrastructure requirements are provided?
- N. What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?
- O. Overall, is the allocation justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?

7. Strategic Policy 1.4 North of Spondon

- A. What is the background to the site allocation and how was it identified?
- B. What would be the effect of developing the site on the purposes of the Green Belt?
- C. Are there exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt in this particular case? If so what are they?
- D. Should the policy set out what compensation measures will be expected where there is Green Belt release for development and how it will be calculated?
- E. What is the basis for the scale of development proposed and is this justified?
- F. What is the background to the specific policy requirements? Are they justified and consistent with national policy? Do they provide clear and effective guidance on constraints and suitable mitigation?
- G. What are the highways implications of the allocation and how will any impacts be mitigated?
- H. Does the policy identify appropriate and necessary infrastructure requirements? How will these be provided and funded? Is this sufficiently clear?
- I. What implications will the allocation have on Derby City?
- J. Are there potential adverse effects not covered above? If so what are they and how would they be addressed and mitigated? (The Council's response should address key issues raised in the representations).

- K. What evidence is there to demonstrate that the allocation is viable and deliverable within the plan period? What is the situation with regards land ownership and developer interest?
  - L. How will the site be brought forward for development? What mechanisms will there be to ensure a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development, ensuring that infrastructure requirements are provided?
  - M. What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?
  - N. Overall, is the allocation justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
8. Strategic Policy 1.5 South West of Kirk Hallam
- A. What is the background to the site allocation and how was it identified?
  - B. What would be the effect of developing the site on the purposes of the Green Belt?
  - C. Are there exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt in this particular case? If so what are they?
  - D. Should the policy set out what compensation measures will be expected where there is Green Belt release for development and how it will be calculated?
  - E. What is the basis for the scale of development proposed and is this justified?
  - F. What is the background to the specific policy requirements? Are they justified and consistent with national policy? Do they provide clear and effective guidance on constraints and suitable mitigation?
  - G. What are the highways implications of the allocation and how will any impacts be mitigated?
  - H. Does the policy identify appropriate and necessary infrastructure requirements? How will these be provided and funded? Is this sufficiently clear?
  - I. Are there potential adverse effects not covered above? If so what are they and how would they be addressed and mitigated? (The Council's response should address key issues raised in the representations).
  - J. What evidence is there to demonstrate that the allocation is viable and deliverable within the plan period? What is the situation with regards land ownership and developer interest?

- K. How will the site be brought forward for development? What mechanisms will there be to ensure a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development, ensuring that infrastructure requirements are provided?
- L. What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?
- M. Overall, is the allocation justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?

#### 9. Strategic Policy 1.6 North of Cotmanhay

- A. What is the background to the site allocation and how was it identified?
- B. What would be the effect of developing the site on the purposes of the Green Belt?
- C. Are there exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt in this particular case? If so what are they?
- D. Should the policy set out what compensation measures will be expected where there is Green Belt release for development and how it will be calculated?
- E. What is the basis for the scale of development proposed and is this justified?
- F. What is the background to the specific policy requirements? Are they justified and consistent with national policy? Do they provide clear and effective guidance on constraints and suitable mitigation?
- G. What are the highways implications of the allocation and how will any impacts be mitigated?
- H. Does the policy identify appropriate and necessary infrastructure requirements? How will these be provided and funded? Is this sufficiently clear?
- I. Are there potential adverse effects not covered above? If so what are they and how would they be addressed and mitigated? (The Council's response should address key issues raised in the representations).
- J. What evidence is there to demonstrate that the allocation is viable and deliverable within the plan period? What is the situation with regards land ownership and developer interest?
- K. How will the site be brought forward for development? What mechanisms will there be to ensure a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development, ensuring that infrastructure requirements are provided?

- L. What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?
- M. Overall, is the allocation justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?



## **Matter 7: Housing Land Supply**

### **Issue**

**Whether the Local Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the approach to housing land supply.**

**Relevant Policies:** 1.1

### **Questions**

#### ***Total Supply***

1. What is the up-to-date situation regarding housing completions so far in the plan period?
2. For each of the following sources of housing land supply for the whole plan period in turn, what are the assumptions about the overall scale, lead in times, timing and annual rates of delivery? What is the basis for these assumptions, are they realistic and justified and supported by evidence?
  - a. Sites with planning permission and under construction
  - b. Sites with planning permission and not started (split by outline and full permissions)
  - c. Sites identified in land availability assessments
  - d. Sites identified in the brownfield register
  - e. Adopted Core Strategy allocations without planning permission
  - f. Windfall sites
  - g. Housing site allocations in the Core Strategy Review
3. What is the basis for a 6% non-implementation rate on deliverable and developable sites from the 2022 SHLAA? Is this justified and supported by evidence?
4. Would there be an adequate supply of housing land for the whole plan period?
5. Overall, would at least 10% of the housing requirement/ target be met on sites no larger than one hectare in order to comply with paragraph 69 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which, amongst other things requires local planning authorities to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare unless it can be shown that there are strong reasons why this target cannot be achieved?

#### ***5 Year Housing Land Supply***

6. What is the relevant 5 year period on adoption and what is the 5 year housing land requirement?
7. Based on the housing trajectory, how many dwellings are expected to be delivered in the first 5 years following adoption of the Core Strategy Review?

- 8 Where sites in the Strategy do not have planning permission is there clear evidence that housing completions will begin within 5 years, as is required by the NPPF?
- 9 What allowance has been made for windfall sites as part of the expected 5 year housing land supply and is there compelling evidence to demonstrate that windfall sites will come forward over the plan period, as is required by paragraph 71 the NPPF?
- 10 With reference to paragraph 74 of the NPPF, is a 20% buffer for the 5 year land supply appropriate?
- 11 What would be the supply for this period (in total and by each source of supply)?
- 12 Are the assumptions on sources of supply for this period realistic and justified?
- 13 What flexibility is there within the Core Strategy Review should some of the housing allocations not come forward in line with the expected timescales?
- 14 Would there be a 5 year supply of housing land of deliverable sites on adoption of the Core Strategy Review?

### ***Affordable Housing***

- 15 Are the policy requirements of the housing allocation policies with regards affordable housing still up to date following the publication of the viability study?
- 16 Based on the policy requirements of the Core Strategy Review how many affordable homes is the Core Strategy Review expected to deliver? How does this compare to the identified need? If need will not be met what alternative options has the Council considered?

## **Matter 8: Employment and Town, Local and Village Centres**

### **Issue**

**Whether the Core Strategy Review has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the approach to economic growth and town, local and village centres.**

**Relevant Policies:** 2, 2.1, 3

### **Questions**

#### ***Employment Land Requirement***

1. What is the employment land requirement figure?
2. Is the methodology used in the Employment Land Needs Study robust? Why?
3. Is the allocation of at least 40 hectares of employment land in Strategic Policy 2 justified compared with the assessed need set out in the Employment Land Needs Study?
4. Is the Plan making any contribution to strategic need? Is this justified?

#### ***Employment Site Allocation***

5. How were different sites considered for allocation for employment purposes? What site selection process did the Council undertake when deciding what land to allocate?
6. Was the site selection process robust? Was an appropriate selection of potential sites assessed and were appropriate criteria taken into account?
7. Are provisions in Strategic Policy 2.1 to link the site to the national rail network effective?
8. Is the site allocation supported by an effective assessment of the highway implications?
9. Overall, does the Plan allocate a sufficient amount, mix and choice of employment sites to meet future needs and has the Plan's economic strategy been positively prepared? Are the Plan's economic and housing strategies aligned?
10. Does the Plan set out a positively prepared, justified and effective strategy for the economy and for the vitality and viability of town, local and village centres?

## **Main Matter 9: Transport and Infrastructure**

### **Issue**

**Whether the approach to transport and infrastructure is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.**

**Relevant Policies:** 4 and 5

### **Questions**

1. What are the key infrastructure requirements of the Core Strategy Review?
2. Paragraph 104 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan making. How has this been done?
3. Paragraph 20 of the NPPF identifies that strategic policies should make sufficient provision for amongst other things new infrastructure including community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure). Is the Core Strategy Review consistent with this?
4. What mechanisms will there be to ensure necessary infrastructure is provided? How will the mechanisms be reviewed and kept up to date?
5. Should Policy 4 include requirements related to rail crossings?
6. Should policy 4 include reference to the Derby and Sandiacre Canal?
7. What evidence is there to support the requirement for the Kirk Hallam Relief Road? How will it be funded and when will it be delivered?
8. In overall terms, is the approach to transport and infrastructure appropriate and justified? Is it effective and consistent with national policy?

## **Main Matter 10: Delivery and Monitoring**

### **Issue**

**Whether the approach to delivery and monitoring is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.**

### **Questions**

1. How has viability been taken into account in preparing the Core Strategy Review and setting policy requirements? What are the conclusions in terms of the realistic delivery of the proposals within the Core Strategy Review? Are any amendments requirements required following the publication of the Viability Assessment (Sept 2023)?
2. Is the approach that the Core Strategy Review takes to viability and the application of policy requirements sufficiently flexible?
3. How will the Core Strategy Review be monitored? Will this be effective and how would any issues arising from monitoring be addressed?
4. Does the Core Strategy Review have sufficient flexibility to respond to changing circumstances? Which policies/ measures will ensure that?