The Planning Inspectorate

3/25 Hawk Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

Direct Line 0117-372 8732
Switchboard 0117-372 8000
Fax No 0117-372 8804
GTN 1371-8732
e-mail: bartosz.bartkowiak@pins.gsi.gov.uk
http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk

Mr Martin Reeves,
Chief Executive,
Coventry City Council,
Council House,
Earl Street,
Coventry,
CV1 5RR.

Your Ref:

Our Ref: PINS/U4610/429/3

Date: 11 February 2010

Dear Mr Reeves,

Coventry Core Strategy Development Plan Document

As you know, I was appointed by the Secretary of State to carry out an independent examination of the Coventry Core Strategy Development Plan Document, which was submitted on 30 June 2009, pursuant to section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the 2004 Act).

I held a pre-examination meeting on 22 September 2009 and conducted the examination itself by way of written exchanges and hearing sessions, as well as accompanied and unaccompanied site visits, between 10 November and 4 December 2009.

The purpose of the independent examination is set out in section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and falls into two parts. The first is whether the submitted DPD has been prepared in accordance with certain statutory requirements under the Act and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (the 2004 Regulations).

The second part is whether the DPD is sound. In making an assessment of soundness I have applied the 3 tests set out in paragraphs 4.51 and 4.52 of Planning Policy Statement 12 – Local Spatial Planning (PPS 12).

With this letter is an Interim Report regarding the City Centre only, as discussed at the Examination, containing my conclusions and recommendations, as well as the reasons why I have come to those conclusions, as required by section 20(7) of the 2004 Act. I conclude that the submitted DPD is sound in respect of the policies and proposals for the City Centre, including policies SG19 and SG20. However, I have made four recommendations for minor changes of wording in response to representations received and arising from the debates at the examination hearings to ensure clarity and consistency.

In arriving at these judgements on the soundness of this part of the DPD I have had regard to all the representations which were made on it in the 6 weeks

following submission, in accordance with regulation 29 of the 2004 Regulations, along with subsequent written submissions and oral contributions made at the hearing sessions. However, as the purpose of the examination is to consider whether the submitted DPD is sound, rather than to consider "objections", I do not list or refer directly to individual representations in the Interim Report.

This Interim Report is being submitted before the publication of the Secretary of State's formal response to the Panel Report on the Regional Spatial Strategy Phase II Review but I am satisfied that the conclusions therein are consistent with my own in respect of the future of the city centre. Consequently, this Interim Report should enable the Council to progress the City Centre Area Action Plan.

Yours faithfully,

Nigel Payne

Inspector.