RUNNYMEDE 2030 LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

MATTERS AND QUESTIONS FOR STAGE 2 HEARINGS
(Matters 5-7 only)

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.

Note 3: The questions below seek to focus on the relevant details of the site allocations and other policies. It is not intended to rehearse the discussions in the Stage 1 hearings.

Note 4: In the light of on-going work by the Council, Surrey County Council and Highways England, the implications of the Plan for the A320 and the Strategic Road Network will be considered at a later date to be confirmed. Please see the latest Programme for the Examination.

Matter 5: Longcross Garden Village (Policies SD3, SD10 and supporting text)

5.1 Overall, is the geographical extent of the proposed allocation and quantity of development justified? Is it based on a clear, robust, consistently applied site selection process, properly informed by the Green Belt review, sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment? Are there exceptional circumstances that are sufficient to justify the proposed alterations to the Green Belt boundary?

5.2 Is the expected rate of housing completions within 5 years of the adoption of the Plan (740 dwellings, 2019/20-2023/24 (SD_023G, July 2018)) and the target of at least 1700 completions by 2030 justified by robust evidence, including progress to date on master planning, outline and full planning permissions, and market evidence of achievability and deliverability? Have any potential barriers to delivery been identified? Is there sufficient flexibility to address them?

5.3 Are the detailed requirements of Policy SD10 justified and deliverable? Do they strike the right balance between specificity and flexibility as appropriate? In particular:
a) Do they provide a clear, achievable policy framework to help deliver a high quality, distinctive garden village?

b) Is the mix of uses, including employment and local facilities and services, justified and deliverable at the right time?

c) Does the evidence justify the proposals for a range of residential accommodation, including the percentage of housing that is affordable, and are there reasonable prospects that it will be delivered over the Plan period? What number of outlets is currently proposed?

d) Can further detail be provided about how and when the policy requirement for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation will be met? Should provision be made for more than 10 pitches, given the potential level of unmet need in the Borough?

e) With regard to criterion e) of Policy SD10, are the requirements sufficient to provide for sustainable transport choices, and are they realistic and achievable over the Plan period? Can there be reasonable confidence that criterion h), including the Council’s proposed minor modification 44 (CD_001A), will be effective in this regard?

f) Based on the Plan’s requirements, will the proposed development provide satisfactorily for the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, especially in regard to the SPA and SAC?

g) Are the proposals viable?

5.4 Overall, do the Plan’s proposals for Longcross Garden Village align with the key principles that guided its identification as a Locally-Led Garden Village by the Government in 2017? Are they an appropriate reflection of the TCPA’s principles as set out in paragraph 5.90 of the Plan?

**Matter 6: Other Allocations for Housing and Mixed Uses (Policies SD3, SL2-SL18 and supporting text)**

6.1 Have the other site allocations in Policy SD3 and detailed in Policies SL2-SL18 emerged from a thorough, objective assessment of all potential sites, including review of Green Belt boundaries, sustainability appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment where necessary? In particular:
a) In selecting the allocations, has the Council applied suitable methodologies in a consistent way? If not, what are the weaknesses in the evidence base, do they fundamentally undermine the plan-making process, and which of the allocations may be unsound?

b) Is it clear why the Council has decided to allocate the specific sites and not others?

c) Is the proposed development of each of the allocated sites consistent with the Plan’s spatial vision and objectives and with national planning policy?

6.2 With regard to the specific characteristics of each of the allocations, are there exceptional circumstances that are sufficient to justify the proposed alterations to the Green Belt boundary?

6.3 Is each of the allocated sites viable and likely to be delivered within the expected timescale? Does the evidence, including any up-to-date information, support the housing trajectory for the individual sites?

6.4 Taking account of each of the Policies SL2-SL18, are the specific requirements for development of the sites justified, consistent with national planning policy, and likely to be effective? And in particular, do they make sound provisions for the number and types of dwellings, pitches for Gypsies and Travellers, the range of infrastructure required, flood protection, acceptable noise standards and air quality, and protection and enhancement of the natural environment?

6.5 With regard to paragraph 5.30 of the Plan and the proposed changes to the Policies Map, are there exceptional circumstances for the removal of Thorpe Village from the Green Belt? In the light of NPPF (July 2018) and paragraph 136 in particular, should the Plan be modified to clarify that detailed amendments to the Green Belt boundary of Thorpe village may be brought forward through the neighbourhood plan, and if so, how should the scope of any proposed boundary changes be guided by the Plan? Would it be justified to make any consequential modifications to the Plan, for example, to provide guidance for other neighbourhood plans that may be brought forward?

**Matter 7: Detailed Policies for Housing (Policies SL19, SL20, SL22-SL24 and supporting text)**

7.1 Are the minimum space standards set out in Policy SL19 justified by the local evidence?
7.2 With regard to the overall mix of dwellings, is Policy SL19 justified and likely to be effective in requiring provision that is generally in accordance with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment or any similar evidence? Is the predominant need in new market housing for two- and three-bedroom dwellings likely to be addressed by the Plan’s allocations?

7.3 Is the estimated annual affordable housing need of 471 dwellings and the 80:20 tenure split (affordable rent/social rent: other forms of affordable housing) robust? In this light, and taking account of the market signals adjustment and the viability evidence, is the Policy SL20 target of 35% affordable housing provision from market schemes justified and likely to be achieved?

7.4 How will the overall 30% target in Policy SL20 be achieved over the Plan period? Can this be demonstrated in an affordable housing trajectory in the Plan?

7.5 Would it be justified and effective for development management purposes to update references to affordable housing so that they are more closely aligned with definitions in NPPF 2018?

7.6 With regard to Policy SL22, what is the current balance between the identified need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and the existing and planned supply for the period to 2023/2024 and to 2030? To what extent is this figure dependent on authorised sites being returned to occupation by households that meet the planning definition? What is the potential for modest expansions of authorised sites and redevelopment of previously developed land to assist in meeting Gypsy and Traveller needs? How will the Council seek to address any unmet needs including for transit sites over the Plan period?

7.7 In relation to Gypsy and Traveller households that do not meet the planning definition, and taking account of the Council’s evidence in RBCLP-02, can it be demonstrated that their housing needs have been assessed and will be provided for within the Plan period?

7.8 How will the unmet need for Travelling Showpeople accommodation be addressed within the Plan period? Is it sufficient to rely on the criteria in Policy SL22? Are there other measures that should be taken in order to meet any shortfall?
7.9 Taken together with other relevant policies in the Plan, will Policy SL23 and SD8 help to ensure that the accommodation needs of the elderly and those with particular needs will be addressed over the Plan period? Also, does Policy SL23 provide a positive and effective framework to meet the need for student accommodation? Is the Plan’s approach consistent with the evidence of these types of housing need?

7.10 Are the site-size threshold and other requirements for self- and custom-build housing as set out in Policy SL24 justified and likely to be effective?