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. However, it is not intended to rehearse the discussions in the Stage 1 hearings.

Note 3: 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 8: Housing Land Supply** *(Table 2, Policy SD3, Appendix B, and relevant details of the individual site allocation policies). Note: The supply of sites for Gypsies and Travellers is considered under Matter 7)*

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?

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

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? [Note: the details of individual sites will be considered under Matters 6 and 7]
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?

e) Is it justified to add a 20% buffer to the housing land supply to guard against any under-delivery of sites?

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?

8.3 Does the Plan provide sufficient information about the housing implementation strategy? Should it include a housing trajectory in graphical and tabular forms?

Matter 9: Employment, Town Centres and Retail Policies (Policies IE1-IE13)

9.1 Together with the expectations for Longcross Garden Village in Policy SD10, do Policies IE1-IE3 provide a justified, positive and deliverable framework to meet the anticipated needs for employment development in the Borough up to 2030? Is the Plan sufficiently flexible to help meet the priorities of the economic development strategy as set out in paragraph 8.6?

9.2 In regard to Policy IE1 (Byfleet Road, New Haw), is the requirement for a minimum net addition of 20,000 sq m of floorspace likely to be compatible with measures that are yet to be defined to mitigate flood risk? Also, does the proposed modification (CD_001A) to the site boundary have any implications for the delivery of the allocation?

9.3 Is the designation of the Strategic Employment Areas and the provisions for their protection as such in Policy IE2 justified, positively prepared, consistent with national planning policy, and likely to be effective?

9.4 Do Policies IE3 and IE4 provide clear, robust guidance for employment development elsewhere in the Borough and for the visitor economy?
9.5 Overall, does the Plan set out a clear, justified and deliverable strategy for promoting the long term vitality and viability of the Borough’s network of town and local centres? In particular:

a) Are the measures for locating and managing town centre uses as set out in Policies IE5 and IE6 justified and likely to be effective? And do Policies IE12 and IE13 provide a sound planning framework for local centres and individual shops and parades in the Borough?

b) Are Policies IE7-IE10 based on robust evidence of retail and other town centre needs and are they likely to be delivered within the timings indicated in the policies? What is the practical distinction between these allocation policies and the development opportunities identified in Policy IE11? What is the basis for the timings set out in this policy?

Matter 10: Infrastructure Provision (Policies SD4-7, SL25-28, EE10-EE13)

10.1 Overall, does the Plan provide an evidence-based, integrated and effective policy framework for transport that will support the implementation of the spatial strategy and contribute to sustainable development?

10.2 [Note: Question 10.2 will be considered at a later date in the examination which will be confirmed in due course. This is to enable on-going work on this issue by the Council, Surrey County Council and Highways England to reach an appropriate stage for consideration] With regard to the Plan’s potential effects on the A320 and the strategic road network in particular, are there reasonable prospects that satisfactory mitigation can and will be provided in time, taking account of the proposed phasing of development sites? Are there effective mechanisms to ensure that any significant cross-boundary impacts are addressed and resolved?

10.3 Taking account of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and all the relevant policies of the Runnymede 2030 Plan, is there a reasonable basis for confidence that the other necessary infrastructure will be provided in a timely manner to implement the spatial strategy? How will any cumulative impacts of the proposed scale of development be mitigated?

10.4 With regard to Policy EE10 (subject to the modifications put forward in CD_001A), the site-specific policies and the prospects for additional SANGs identified in RBCLP_09, are the Plan’s provisions for the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area sound?
10.5 In the light of the other relevant policies and proposals in the Plan, does Policy EE13 provide a justified, effective framework for the minimisation of flood risk and support for strategic flood relief measures?

Matter 11: Sustainable development, design, renewable and low carbon energy, enhancement of the environment (Policies SD1, SD8-9, EE1-EE9, EE14-EE19)

11.1 Does the Plan as a whole make sufficient provision for inclusive design and accessible environments, consistent with national planning policy, including paragraphs 57, 58, 61 and 69 of NPPF 2012? Are there any amendments that it might be helpful to make to the Plan in the light of NPPF 2018’s policy on these issues? Is Policy SD1 consistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in NPPF 2018?

11.2 Are the requirements of Policies SD8 and SD9 justified, consistent with national planning policy, and deliverable?

11.3 Read in the context of the Plan as a whole, do Policies EE1-EE9 provide a sound framework for the protection the Borough’s natural and built environment and the health and well-being of individuals and communities?

11.4 Are Policies EE14-EE19 for management of development in the Green Belt justified, consistent with national planning policy, and likely to be effective?
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