

# **WOLVERHAMPTON LOCAL PLAN STAGE 1 EXAMINATION HEARINGS**

## **AGENDA – DAY 4**

Monday 28 September 2026 at 9.45 am

**Venue:** Virtual sessions – please see the examination website for the link to join

### **MATTER 5 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

### **MATTER 7 – Infrastructure and Delivery and Viability**

#### Please note:

- All participants are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the hearing statements (and any additional evidence) produced by the Council and other parties in respect of the matters addressed at this session. These are available on the examination website.
- Most references to questions refer to those posed by the Inspectors in their Schedule of Matters, Issues and Questions (already circulated).
- The hearings will run until around 1pm, with a mid-morning break. It will be a rolling programme.

### **Matter 5: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (Policy HOU5)**

#### **Issue**

Whether the Local Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the provision of accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

#### **Discussion points**

#### Gypsy and traveller accommodation need, requirement and supply

1. Based on the December 2024 Planning policy for traveller sites (PPTS) Annex 1 definition of gypsies and travellers what is the identified unmet need for gypsies and traveller pitches for the period 2024-2042? Is this figure based on up-to-date evidence?

2. Should the Plan set out a need and requirement figure for gypsy and traveller pitches for the Plan period as it does for bricks and mortar housing? If not, does the approach accord with PPTS?
3. The Council's preferred growth option (G2) in the SA includes exporting 19 pitches through the DtC, but the Plan says this is not the case. Can the Council explain this inconsistency. Is this approach justified and effective?
4. Does the Plan accord with paragraph 10 of PPTS? If not, why not?
5. Table 6 in the Plan shows the supply of gypsy and traveller pitches up to 2032. Does this need updating to cover the whole of the Plan period up to 2042?
6. Table 6 appears to include in the supply calculation 44 existing pitches that are already occupied. Is this the case and if so, is this approach justified and effective?
7. Does the Council have a 5 year supply of gypsy and traveller sites? If not, what is the shortfall and how will it be remedied?
8. Does the Plan identify a supply of specific, deliverable sites, or broad locations for growth for years 6-10? If not, why not and what are the implications of this for the gypsy and traveller community?
9. Are there any potential problems with deliverability of the site at the former Bushbury Reservoir (GT1)? Is there evidence that the site is deliverable? What has prevented it coming forward in the past?
10. Was the Council's 'call for sites' exercise adequate in relation to gypsy and traveller sites?
11. Has any need for gypsy and traveller transit site provision been suitably assessed?
12. Should consideration be given to providing sites within housing allocations?

#### Travelling showpeople accommodation need, requirement and supply

13. Based on the December 2024 Planning policy for traveller sites (PPTS) Annex 1 definition of travelling showpeople what is the identified unmet need for travelling showpeople plots for the period 2024-2042? Is this figure based on up-to-date evidence?
14. Should the Plan set out a need and requirement figure for travelling showpeople plots for the Plan period as it does for bricks and mortar housing? If not, does the approach accord with PPTS?

15. Does the Plan accord with paragraph 10 of PPTS in respect of travelling showpeople? If not, why not?
16. Do the Council have a 5 year supply of travelling showpeople sites? If not, what is the shortfall and how will it be remedied?
17. Does the Plan identify a supply of specific, deliverable sites, or broad locations for growth for years 6-10? If not, why not and what are the implications of this for the travelling showpeople community?
18. Was the Council's 'call for sites' exercise adequate?
19. Should consideration be given to providing sites within employment allocations?

#### Policy HOU5

20. Does policy HOU5 accord with PPTS?
21. Is policy HOU5 too restrictive?

### **Matter 7: Infrastructure and Delivery**

#### **Issue**

Whether the Plan's approach to infrastructure provision and delivery is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

#### **Discussion points**

22. Is the Infrastructure Delivery Plan based on proportionate, up-to-date and robust evidence? Does it make clear what strategic infrastructure improvements are required to support the Plan's development strategy and delivery trajectory?
23. Are there any funding gaps in relation to sites that are expected to come forward in the first 5 years of the Plan? If so, what are they and how will it affect delivery?
24. Does the viability evidence remain sufficiently up to date and robust to demonstrate that the infrastructure requirements identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan can be delivered without undermining the viability of the Plan's policies and allocations?

#### Policy DEL1 – Infrastructure Provision

25. This policy sets out how the Council will secure infrastructure provision from future planned development and where viability evidence will be required.
- a. Criterion 1 uses the term 'should be supported by' infrastructure when referring to new development, rather than 'must be supported by' infrastructure. Does this mean that in some cases development would be permitted without necessary infrastructure? If so, how would a decision-maker determine this? How does this wording relate to criterion 2?
  - b. Criterion 2 will only permit development if necessary infrastructure, amongst other things, is provided. Is this negatively worded policy justified and consistent with national policy and is the Plan clear on what material circumstances or considerations are, to allow exceptions? Is it clear when necessary infrastructure will be provided?
  - c. Criterion 3 states that the six infrastructure requirements listed are to be set out in other documents including supplementary planning documents and masterplans. Have these documents been produced and if so, where can these be found? Is this approach justified and effective? Is it clear what status these documents have and how do their provisions relate to the infrastructure and policy requirements referenced in paragraph 4.19?
  - d. Are criteria 4 and 5, which relate to viability, justified and effective? Does the policy provide sufficient flexibility for any viability challenges that may arise?
- a. It has been suggested that Policy DEL1 reference rail, the historic environment, police infrastructure and the preparation and implementation of a Community Infrastructure Levy charging scheme. Are modifications to the wording of the policy or the supporting text necessary for effectiveness?
  - b. Overall, is the policy effective and does it serve a clear purpose without unnecessary duplication?

#### Policy DEL2 – Balance Between Employment Land and Housing

26. This policy relates to windfall development on previously developed land. Are the criteria within the policy justified and effective? Does it serve a clear purpose or does it unnecessarily duplicate other policies in the Plan?

#### Policy DEL3 – Promotion of Fibre to the Premises and 5G Networks

27. Is this policy effective and consistent with national policy on setting out 'how high quality digital infrastructure...is expected to be delivered and upgraded over time...' and prioritises 'full fibre connections to existing and new developments...' (NPPF para 118)?