Note 1: It is implicit that in answering the following questions, if respondents identify a soundness deficiency in the submitted Plan they should make clear how the Plan should be changed.

Note 2: Policy and paragraph references are a guide to the main parts of the Plan that will be considered under each Matter but other parts of the Plan may also be relevant.

**Matter 1: Legal requirements, the Duty to Co-operate and the Plan period**

1.1 Is the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (the Plan) compliant with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations (as amended)? In particular, is the Plan compliant with the Local Development Scheme and the Statement of Community involvement?

1.2 Is the Habitats Regulation Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) adequate? Does the SA demonstrate that the Plan has been tested against all reasonable alternatives?

1.3 Does the Plan as a whole accord with s19(1A) of the Act by including policies that are designed to secure that the development and use of the land in the Borough contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change?

1.4 Has the Council engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis with all relevant organisations on the strategic matters that are relevant to the Plan’s preparation, as required by the Duty to Co-operate?

1.5 Is the Plan period (2015-2030) justified? If not, how should this be rectified?
Matter 2: **Objectively assessed need for housing and employment land provision** (Policy SD2 and paragraphs 5.22-5.27)

[Note: the soundness of the detailed policies for housing, employment and town centre uses, including types of housing, will be considered in Stage 2 of the hearings]

2.1 Does the objectively assessed housing needs figure of 7507 dwellings (2015-2030) (500dpa) form a justified, positively prepared basis for setting the Plan’s housing requirement figure? In particular:

a) Taken together, are the Runnymede-Spelthorne Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2015 and the 2018 Partial Update an appropriate starting point for setting the housing requirement for Runnymede?

b) Does the fact that an update of the SHMA 2015 has not been requested by Spelthorne Borough Council at this time give rise to any substantive difficulty in considering the evidence base for Runnymede’s OAN figure?

c) Are the demographic assumptions (including future trends in household formation and migration), the account taken of affordability and market signals, forecast growth in employment, commuting patterns, the need for affordable housing, the role of students in the local housing market, the potential impact of Heathrow expansion, Brexit and any other relevant factors adequately considered, and are the conclusions justified?

d) What are the implications for the Plan of the 2016-based household projections, published in September 2018?

2.2 a) Are the Borough-wide targets for the provision of employment land as set out in Policy SD2 based on robust evidence of need and demand?

b) Are they consistent with the proposed level of growth in housing?

c) In terms of the proposed quantity and type of provision, would they make an appropriate contribution to meeting overall economic development needs in the wider area that includes Runnymede?

2.3 If the Plan is unlikely to meet the identified needs within the relevant time period, how should this be addressed?
Matter 3: Overall Spatial Strategy (Policy SD2, Paragraphs 5.8-5.13, 5.19-5.21. 5.28-5.36)

[Note: This deals with the soundness of the overall spatial strategy apart from the justification for review of the Green Belt which will be considered under Matter 4. The remaining SD and other policies, including the site-specific implications of policies and proposals in the Plan, will be considered in the Stage 2 hearings]

3.1 Is the Plan’s overall framework for the roles that will be played by various parts of the Borough in meeting development needs and protecting and, where possible, enhancing the environment sound? In particular:

a) Is the broad apportionment of housing, economic and other development to the various centres and locations throughout the Borough consistent with the Plan’s spatial vision and objectives?

b) Is it based on robust evidence, consistent with national planning policy, and is it deliverable?

c) Does it take proper account of potential impacts on the natural environment, landscape, flood risk, air quality and other matters and provide for mitigation where necessary?

d) Have the strategic infrastructure constraints and needs been adequately assessed and is there reasonable confidence that they will be addressed in a timely manner?

Matter 4: Green Belt Boundaries and Exceptional Circumstances (paragraphs 5.8-5.13)

[Note: This considers whether, at a high level, there are exceptional circumstances to redefine Green Belt boundaries through the Plan. At a detailed level, the justification for the proposed site allocations in the Green Belt, as well as other changes to its boundaries, will be considered in the Stage 2 hearings]

4.1 Having regard to the Green Belt’s purposes and subject to consideration of the implications of the Plan’s specific proposals, do exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries in the Borough? In particular:

a) Does the Plan’s strategy make as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, including estates regeneration and surplus public land where appropriate?
b) Does the strategy seek to optimise the density of development in line with national planning policy to make the most effective use of land?

c) Is it clear that the Plan has been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development?

4.2 Having regard to the proposed releases of land from the Green Belt, does the Plan promote sustainable patterns of development?

4.3 Are there adequate reasons in this case for not identifying safeguarded land as part of the Green Belt review? Are the consequences for the permanence of the Green Belt boundaries acceptable?

4.4 Does the proposed release of land from the Green Belt take adequate account of the effects on broader purposes that it may serve e.g. provision for outdoor sports and recreation, access to the countryside, protection and enhancement of landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity?
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