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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This statement has been prepared on behalf of Muse Developments Limited (‘Muse’).

1.2 Muse supports the fundamental aim and purpose of the Runnymede Local Plan in seeking to identify sites sufficient to accommodate the identified levels of growth for the plan period.

1.3 Muse is in the process of preparing a detailed planning application for the development of the land at Thorpe Lea Road West, Egham (Site Allocation SL8). As part of this process, Muse has engaged in a series of pre-application discussions with the Council and other key local stakeholders. Muse has also requested and received a Screening Opinion from the Council pursuant to the EIA Regulations.

1.4 The entirety of site (SL8) is identified as having capacity to deliver a minimum of 250 residential units within the period 2019-2024. Both the target capacity of the site and the delivery phasing are supported as a matter of principle by Muse. Muse can confirm that it will deliver a development of 220 homes on land currently within its control, which confirms that the majority of the 250 homes proposed is viable. The small residual housing requirement is capable of being delivered on the remainder of the allocated site.

1.5 Muse will attend the Stage 2 Hearings Examination in support of the proposed allocation of the site at Thorpe Lea Road, Egham.

1.6 For clarity, we can confirm that Muse supports the Council in its case regarding Matter 8 of the Stage 2 Hearings Examination, specifically:

- The site is able to deliver 220 dwellings and 2 travellers pitches following a robust design evolution process taking into consideration environmental considerations which has concluded that development within the AQMA can be accommodated and would not have an adverse impact on human health or on existing air quality.
- The proposed development would be delivered within the first five years of the plan period.
2 MATTER 8: HOUSING LAND SUPPLY

2.1 We respond to the specific matters arising in relation to Matter 6 below.

Question 8.1 – Is the plan based on robust evidence about the housing land supply for the period up to 2030? In particular:

a. Is the estimated supply from extant planning permissions, windfalls and prior approvals justified and based on reasonable assumptions? Does the methodology avoid the risk of double-counting? Is the approach to lapse rates for planning permissions robust? Should lapse rates be applied to site allocations?

2.2 No comment.

b. Is there a sound basis for the expected contribution from Class C2 older people’s accommodation to the Class C3 housing supply?

2.3 No comment.

c. Are the estimates of site capacities (for the site allocations/opportunity areas, SLAA sites and estates regeneration) robust, taking account of viability, infrastructure and any other delivery constraints?

2.4 Technical analysis and assessment has already taken place for allocation SL8. A site layout has been achieved which has taken into consideration the constraints across the site and sought to meet all requirements of the allocation. Within the parameters of the larger part of the allocation (land within Muse ownership) and in line with relevant policy requirements, the site is able to achieve 220 dwellings and 2 traveller pitches. In the context of SL8, the Council has adequately justified and evidenced its Local Plan.

2.5 The policy allows for the introduction of built form within the Air Quality Management Area where it can be demonstrated that development within the AQMA would not have an adverse impact on human health or on existing air quality. A suitable design solution has been achieved and agreed with the Council and other statutory consultees on this part of the site that allows for the introduction of a higher quantum of development on land in Muse’s control.

d. Is it realistic to expect that the shortfall in delivery of the housing requirement from the start of the Plan period will be made up within five years of the Plan’s adoption? If not, how should the Plan address this matter?

2.6 Muse Developments can confirm that its development at Land west of Thorpe Lea Road will be delivered within the first five years of the plan period and will therefore contribute towards making up the shortfall of housing.
e. Is it justified to add a 20% buffer to the housing land supply to guard against any under-delivery of sites?

2.7 No comment.

Question 8.2 - Overall, is the most recent housing trajectory founded on credible evidence about the deliverability and achievability of the proposed development on the identified sites and other sources of supply within the expected timescales? Can there be reasonable confidence that a rolling 5-year supply of deliverable sites will be maintained from the date of the Plan’s adoption?

2.8 Muse Developments can confirm that in line with the site allocation, 220 units will be delivered on its land in the first five years of the Plan and therefore the information contained within the most recent housing trajectory is credible. The application is anticipated to be submitted imminently and would therefore be delivered within the identified timescale 2019-2024.

2.9 The remaining land within the allocation, but outside of Muse’s control has the potential to contribute towards a rolling 5-year supply of deliverable sites later in the plan period.