RUNNYMEDE 2030 LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Agenda for Stage 3 Hearing

Thursday 14 November 2019, commencing at 09:30

In ID19 I have set out 5 main questions for consideration as part of Stage 3 of the examination. These are listed below for convenience. I have taken account of all the statements submitted in response to ID19 and RBCLP_59. The hearing session will enable further consideration of the responses to my main questions, RBCLP_59 and the supplementary questions that I identify in italics below.

At the end of the session there will also be a short discussion about the next steps in the examination and the estimated timescale for its completion.

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?

   a) Has sufficient account been taken of the Smart Motorway programme, and how would the potential for any significant change to the programme in the future be addressed?

   b) Should the potential traffic impact of proposals (including proposals outside of Runnymede) that may come forward after the end of the Plan period have been 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?

   c) Are the project costings and timeframe realistic and based on proportionate evidence including the design of the whole scheme and its component parts?

   d) Has there been adequate assessment of the potential environmental and other effects of the mitigation measures?

   e) The Council has identified a number of potential solutions to ‘what if’ scenarios e.g. if the HIF or MRN bids/(expression of interest prove unsuccessful and/or it seems that slippage against the 2024 deadline for completion of the mitigation works is inevitable. It has proposed that contingency measures could be included in a review
of the Plan that is expected to be underway in any event by the end of 2021. Overall, are there reasonable prospects that the necessary improvements to the highways infrastructure will be delivered in a timely fashion?

f) Does Policy SD6 require modification to include specific reference to the A320 and M25 mitigation works, to set an appropriate context for the site-specific policies? Is there a need for consequential modifications to other policies e.g. SD3?

g) Is the policy framework sufficiently clear about how any A320-dependent sites could be brought forward in advance of completion of the A320 mitigation scheme?

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?

h) Is the total cost estimate for the scheme of about £44M reasonable, based on current knowledge (allowing a factor for unknowns), including the evidence in the HIF bid?

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?

i) Can the intended relationship between the revised trajectory for housing delivery on allocated sites and the dates for completion of the different phases of the A320 mitigation works be clarified? Is the Plan sound while not setting a level of development that could come forward in advance of the mitigation scheme? And linked to my previous question, will the role that is to be played by transport
assessments in enabling development to come forward make for a sound Plan?

j) In seeking to maintain housing delivery rates at LGV in the short term while avoiding unacceptable impacts on the highway network, is the assumption about the timing of completion of committed employment development at Longcross North reasonable and likely to be effective? Does it affect the soundness of the Plan, including the provision for employment?

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 examination, does the Plan make sound provision for sustainable transport, particularly public transport and active modes of travel?

k) Should the Plan contain more detail about the strategies and mechanisms for delivering improvements in sustainable transport/active modes of travel, for example, drawing on the updated information in paragraphs 5.4-5.7 of RBCLP_60?
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