RUNNYMEDE 2030 LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS FOR STAGE 3 HEARING

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: It is not intended to rehearse the discussions in the Stage 1 and Stage 2 hearings. Any written statements should not duplicate content that has already been submitted to the examination.

1. Have the Plan’s implications for traffic growth on the Borough’s critical highways infrastructure, specifically the A320 and the connections with the M25, been adequately assessed?

2. Taking account of planned development in and around the Borough, are there reasonable prospects that satisfactory mitigation can and will be provided in time to avoid unacceptable impacts on the operation of the A320 and M25? Does the submitted Plan provide appropriate guidance about how this will be achieved?

3. Overall, can there be reasonable confidence that the level of development proposed in the Plan can be viably delivered while making an appropriate contribution to the completion of the necessary mitigation measures for the A320 and M25?

4. A revised trajectory and supporting information for development of Longcross Garden Village (LGV) is presented in RBCLP_56, and for all the A320-dependent sites in RBCLP_52, having regard to the Council’s and Surrey County Council’s priorities for improvement of the A320 and safe conditions on the local road network.

   i) Is the revised trajectory based on reasonable assumptions and sound principles to seek to maintain housing delivery rates at LGV and the other A320-dependent sites while avoiding unacceptable impacts on the highway network?

   ii) Apart from the distinction drawn between A320-dependent sites with or without planning permission, what is the basis for the estimated number of completions on these individual sites by 2023/2024, and by the end of the Plan period?
5. The updated evidence confirms that the proposed mitigation works for the A320 and M25 will only go some way towards negating the entire traffic impact of the Plan’s proposals. In this light, and bearing in mind the suggested changes to the Plan that have already been put forward during the course of the examination, does the Plan make sound provision for sustainable transport, particularly public transport and active modes of travel?