



**Local
Development
Framework**

**Runnymede Borough Council
Local Development Framework**

**Core Strategy
Development Plan Document**

**Objectives and Preferred Options
Summer 2005**

CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DTS)

1. Core Strategy – Objectives and Preferred Options

Introduction

1.1 The Runnymede Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy sets the broad strategy for the LDF and all the other Local Development Documents must comply with it. Under the new planning system the Core Strategy should include the following elements:

- A Long-Term Vision set within the context of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and the South East Plan
- A Spatial Strategy (illustrated by a Key Diagram)
- High Level Policies (Not Site Specific)
- Details of how the policies will be implemented
- Measures for monitoring their effectiveness

1.2 It also needs to establish a spatial planning framework that will enable the Council to set the framework for decisions on:

- Housing Provision
- Green Belt
- The Local Economy
- Transport and Movement
- Social Inclusion
- The Natural Environment
- Open Space
- Leisure and Social Facilities

The Guidance will be set within a framework that will satisfy the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal.

2. The Borough – A Spatial Portrait

2.1 Runnymede Borough lies in north-west Surrey some twenty miles south-west of Central London. It has three towns, namely Chertsey, Egham and Addlestone. Chertsey is a historic town with a famous abbey dating from Saxon times. While it retains its historic character, Chertsey is a thriving modern business centre. Egham lies close to the historic Runnymede Meadow, site of the sealing of the Magna Carta in 1215. Several modern office developments have recently been built around its attractive pedestrianised centre. Addlestone is the Borough's youngest centre, having only grown into a town in the 19th century. It is now a busy commercial centre and home to Runnymede Borough Council.

2.2 The Borough also contains a number of smaller villages and suburban centres including Virginia Water, Thorpe, Englefield Green, Woodham, New Haw, Ottershaw and Lyne. Its northern and eastern edges are formed by the Rivers Thames and Wey, across which are the towns of Staines and Weybridge. In the north-west the Borough contains part of Windsor Great Park, to the west it reaches the edge of Chobham Common and to the south extends almost to Woking. There are around 32, 000 households in the Borough, accommodation a 78,033 population.

2.3 Runnymede has an extensive green belt which makes the area an attractive location in which to live and work. Development restrictions and demand for housing are reflected in high property prices. Additionally, Runnymede has a strong local economic base with many commercial enterprises in the town centres, industrial estates and business parks. Leisure activities are market gardening activities dominate in the rural areas with some traditional farming. The local economy, in common with the rest of Surrey, is dominated by the service section which employs some 83% of the workforce while manufacturing accounts for just 5%.

2.4 The Borough is becoming a major location for 'knowledge' based sectors including information technology, telecommunications and advanced business services. This trend is set to continue with the completion of major office developments in the Chertsey Revitalisation Area and at the Hillswood Business Park near Chertsey. Local businesses also provide services in the distribution, catering, health, education and financial sectors. The healthy local economy can be attributed to a range of factors:

- A highly skilled workforce
- Relatively high levels of disposable income
- Excellent communications, being situated to the west of London, close to Heathrow and with direct access to the M3 and M25 motorways
- Attractive location with varied range of facilities and housing

One of the main issues that will influence future economic development in the Borough is the expansion of Terminal 5 at Heathrow. The retention of suitably located land to meet the demands generated by the Airport and associated activity will be a feature of policy guidance.

2.5 The Borough's road network is highly accessible with direct connections to the M25 and M3 (via M25). Public transport users are able to use the South West Train services providing direct, fast and frequent connections to London from Egham, Virginia Water, Chertsey, Addlestone and Byfleet and New Haw. A variety of bus operators provide services throughout the Borough and a Quality Bus Partnership operates in the north of the Borough providing a frequent service between key locations. However, delays occur to the local bus services at peak times due to traffic congestion.

2.6 The car is the preferred mode of transport in Runnymede. This is reflected in both the very high car ownership rates across the borough and the commuting data. The number of cars in the borough has increased at a faster rate than the increase in the population with over 84% of households owning at least one car in 2001 and more than half of those owning two cars.

2.7 One consequence of this dependency on the car is the volume of traffic on the road especially at peak times. Runnymede, in addition to 16,500 employees who live and work locally, has an influx of 27,000 commuters daily. Some 70% of workers travel to work by car (2001 Census). This creates huge pressures on the road network and infrastructure of the borough.

2.8 It is hoped to provide a viable public transport alternative to relieve traffic congestion during the next 5-10 years. A high quality rail service (known as 'AirTrack'), with a stop at Chertsey, would provide direct links to Heathrow, Woking and Guildford for residents, employees or visitors to Runnymede. The Business Partnership are working with the Borough Council (as a member of the AirTrack Forum) to ensure the success of the scheme.

- 2.9 Runnymede experiences relatively low levels of deprivation. There are however small pockets of deprivation. Parts of Egham, Chertsey St Anns and Chertsey Meads all feature in a number of different deprivation indicators.
- 2.10 From a health point of view, residents in Runnymede are generally in a state of good health. In the 2001 Census 73.7% of people stated that their general health was good, just over 20% of people said it was fairly good and 6.3% said it was poor.
- 2.11 In terms of education there is a fairly even range of different levels of qualifications across the borough. Over 23% of people gained a first degree or higher degree, which is higher than the percentage for England.
- 2.12 Crime in Runnymede is relatively low in comparison with the rest of England, with 4 domestic burglaries per 1000 population in Runnymede compared to 15 per 1000 nationally.
- 2.13 In terms of housing, there are a range of different tenures across the borough, however the most dominant tenure is Owner Occupier. In some wards this is significantly high, nearly 80%. One of the most prominent issues in Runnymede is affordability of homes. It ranks 28th out of 354 districts in terms of high house prices. This is of particular concern to those people in low-paid employment.
- 2.14 Runnymede has a good mixture and range of housing spread throughout the Borough. There are slightly more detached and semi-detached properties than flats and terraced houses, with more detached properties in Virginia Water, Foxhills and Thorpe and more semi-detached in New Haw, Egham and Addlestone. In general the condition of Runnymede's housing stock is in good repair. Although there are a number of properties that fail fitness standards (5% in 2003) these are mainly in the private rented sector.
- 2.15 Flooding is also of major concern with a significant proportion of properties in the Borough subject to some form of flood risk.

3. The Spatial Issues

- 3.1 In order for the Core Strategy to be effective, it is important to identify the main issues that must be considered. This is important in order to be able to define the objectives and to test the policies against what they are supposed to do. It is also important so that the Core Strategy Issues and Objectives can themselves be tested for compliance with the Council's adopted Sustainability Objectives. The main issues are drawn from four main sources:
 - 1. Existing Plans, Policies and Programmes at National, Regional, County and Local Level
- 3.2 At national level these are primarily the government's Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes. At regional level the current planning guidance is set out in Regional Planning Guidance Note 9 : South East England and in the consultation version of the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy, the South East Plan (SEP). In the SEP Runnymede is located within the London Fringe (or Central Arc) Sub-Region. Until the adoption of the SEP the Surrey Structure Plan will remain a material consideration for planning purposes. The County will also continue to produce the Minerals and Waste Local Plans and the Local Transport Plan (a context table setting out the main objectives derived from existing plans, policies and programmes is set out at Appendix (i)).

2. The Council's Strategic Plan and the Community Strategy

3.3 For the past eighteen years Council activity and service provision has been guided by the Strategic Plan (aka The Annual Leader's Statement). This has been refined substantially over the years, but still articulates priorities and new initiatives. This long term strategy:

- reflects Government priorities and national Performance Indicators
- recognises responses from specific customer and general residents' surveys
- addresses the content of new legislative responsibilities
- provides the context for implementing the Community Strategy and
- enunciates the political values and philosophies from within the majority administration

3.4 The public consultation and general engagement exercise that created the Council's first Community Strategy in 2003 demonstrates how the Council's previous policy objectives are well attuned to the concerns, aspirations and needs of the Runnymede community. In turn, the Council has ensured that the committee based Service Plans and the Five Year Financial Strategy have provided the performance management and delivery mechanisms for the various aims and targets, from not only the previous Leader's Position Statement, but also the wide range of strategies and plans now required to be prepared by local authorities.

3.5 By establishing links with the Community Strategy, the Council Strategy looks beyond 2010 to 2015. The key issues/Aims in the Council Strategy and Community Strategy are as follows:

Access to Affordable and Decent Housing

3.6 The Council's ambition is for Runnymede to be an attractive place to live and work which is accessible to all. Access to decent and affordable housing is crucial in tackling social exclusion and deprivation, maintaining a vibrant economy, and in promoting security, prosperity and well being for all. Reducing homelessness and helping vulnerable people to live independently are also important and contribute to enhancing the quality of life in the Borough.

Access and Transport

3.7 Accessibility will be achieved by more choice in methods of transport and by safer and more convenient modes of travel – improving access to jobs and services. The lead agency on transport is the Highways and Transport Authority and the Council will work with the agency in tackling congestion and pollution making the Borough more attractive to local residents and businesses.

Community Safety

3.8 The Council's objective is for residents to feel safe and secure in their local communities by reducing the fear of crime and increasing reassurance. The Council wants to achieve its ambitions for safer communities by:

- tackling anti-social behaviour
- building stronger links with the police and the local community to combat crime and drug and alcohol abuse
- tackling domestic violence and providing more support for victims, and

- making our roads safer by reducing casualties through traffic calming and enforcement measures.

A Sustainable community

3.9 Quality of life is at the heart of sustainable communities. Whilst the need to maintain economic growth and prosperity remains the cornerstone of the policy approach, it is emphasised that this needs to be integrated with social well-being and the need to protect the environment. At the heart of achieving sustainable communities is the simple idea of ensuring a better 'quality of life' for everyone, now and for future generations. The four elements of sustainable communities are:

- social progress which recognises the needs of everyone
- effective protection of the environment
- prudent use of natural resources; and
- maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment

Economic Prosperity

3.10 Creating an environment where local business can prosper and an attractive place for employers and employees by providing support and opportunities for local business through partnerships. The Council also aims to boost economic prosperity by tackling congested roads and by providing housing for key workers. Whilst enjoying good employment levels, the Council also aims to provide further opportunity in employment and skills to tackle social exclusion and enhance economic prosperity.

Young People

3.11 Opportunities for young people are an important element in developing the future of the Borough – residents' priorities include addressing issues important to young people and providing activities and youth facilities. The Council and community believe the voice of young people should be heard.

Promoting Leisure and Culture

3.12 The Council aims to promote Runnymede's culture and heritage and support the development and progress of community sports facilities and activities for its residents, visitors and young people. The Council aims to enhance the local environment by developing outdoor facilities, encouraging healthy lifestyles by supporting sports facilities and promoting local arts and culture. The Council wants its residents to have pride in their local area and to enjoy and value the opportunities the area offers.

Healthy and Vibrant Community

3.13 The Council has always taken a key role in enabling the provision of services for vulnerable people. For many years several discretionary services have been provided by the Council, these include Day Centres, Community Meals, Careline (community alarm), Dial A Ride (community transport). In addition the Council also provides core funding to a wide range of key voluntary organisations.

3. Key Thematic Findings and Indicator Results from the Runnymede State Report 2004

3.14 The first Runnymede State Report was published in November 2004. It brings together a large amount of data across the wide spectrum of environmental, social and economic issues. The data is based around key sustainability indicators and provides a snapshot of the state of the Borough at the time. For some of the data it is already possible to establish current trends and identify particular problem areas.

The report also includes some comparative data to establish how Runnymede is performing against other local districts and against County, Regional and National averages. From this a number of key issues that the Core Strategy should address are identified. A summary of the key findings and implications for the Core Strategy from the Runnymede State Report is at Appendix (ii).

4. The Consultation Exercise : Autumn 2004 – What Did You Tell Us?

- 3.15 This was a wide consultation to gather initial views on some of the broad issues and options facing the Borough in the 21st Century. The views of a broad range of interested groups, residents and other stakeholders were sought with particular attention being paid to securing input from the hard to reach groups which in Runnymede are identified as the young and the elderly. The main thrust of the consultation was the use of a questionnaire. Over 430 questionnaires were completed and returned along with a number of letters commenting on the issues and promoting sites for development. A summary of the consultation implications for the Core Strategy Objectives is as follows:

Long Term Vision

- 3.16 The most popular option for meeting future development requirements was an infrastructure constrained approach concentrating development in areas with good access to services/public transport. The other very popular option was the re-use of employment sites for housing. The options of increasing densities throughout the urban area and concentrating new development in the town centre also attracted significant support. The least popular options were the growth of new or existing settlements in the Green Belt and the use of the Reserve sites and Green Belt.

Green Belt

- 3.17 The vast majority of respondents wanted to see only minor changes or no changes at all to the extent of the Green Belt (85.2% of those who answered this question). Only 10% wanted definite changes to the Green Belt or a full review of its extent. This clearly demonstrates a high level of public support for maintaining the integrity of the Green Belt and the high value that local people place on it.

Movement

- 3.18 There was strong support for giving greater priority to improving public transport, walking and cycling facilities (over 90% either agreed or strongly agreed). The options of encouraging the adoption of Green Travel Plans and requiring developers of major sites to make contributions towards local transport improvements also received significant support. The only option that did not receive high levels of support was that of reducing private car parking in new development in accessible locations. This reflects people's desire for attractive and realistic alternatives to the car but the recognition that significant modal shift will take time and that under-provision of parking can create problems in certain locations.

Environmental Issues

- 3.19 The responses to this question demonstrate a strong level of support for all three of the identified measures: ensuring energy efficient development, encouraging biodiversity and reducing the loss of good quality agricultural land. Over 75% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with these measures. This indicates a high level of support for the environmental principles of sustainability and in particular the need to develop new policies to secure energy-efficient development through planning as well as through the building control procedures.

Affordable Housing

- 3.20 The questionnaires sought views on whether, in Runnymede, we should try to secure 40% of new housing as affordable housing (which is the target figure for Surrey in the recently adopted Surrey Structure Plan) or whether we should seek a higher or lower percentage. The most popular option was to match the 40% target. On the other options there is a marked discrepancy between the responses to the short and full questionnaires. The short questionnaire responses show almost equal amounts of people preferring a higher percentage and preferring a lower percentage. On the full questionnaire there are significantly more people preferring a higher percentage than a lower one. This may reflect some uncertainty amongst respondents on the concept of affordable housing. It is possible that some view the provision as that provided by Registered Social Landlords and the Council, whilst for others it is the sale of private housing at a cost lower than the market value. It may be appropriate to clarify this as part of further consultation exercises.

Local Economy

- 3.21 Views were sought on the priorities for sustainable development of the local economy and the role of tourism in the Borough. The most popular option for development for employment was that it should be restricted to sites with good access by public transport. There was also support for concentrating such development in town centres and restricting it to redevelopment of existing employment sites. There was significant support for the development of tourist attractions in the Borough, though somewhat less support for the need for additional hotel accommodation.

Town Centres

- 3.22 The full questionnaire asked for views on the future role and function of our town centres and local shopping parades. This produced very strong support for the retention of shops in town centres and for the safeguarding of local shopping parades. There was also very strong support for environmental and public transport improvement in town centres. There was somewhat less support for resisting major new retail development in Runnymede and relatively few responses to the provision of other facilities. There was a balance of responses against the provision of more restaurants/cafes/pubs/takeaways, though some did comment that their resistance was to more takeaways and pubs rather than better quality restaurants.

Other Priorities

- 3.23 The short questionnaire asked for people's views on what other issues should be addressed in the Local development Framework. The most frequently selected topic was flood protection, with nature conservation and biodiversity of next priority.

4. The Spatial Long Term Vision : The Preferred Approach

- 4.1 To capture the key priorities for the Borough and provide a summary of what the LDF is seeking to achieve over the next two decades, the following vision represents the preferred approach:

"To guide development in a way that reflects the social, economic and environmental aspirations of those who live or work in, and visit the Borough, whilst recognising the needs of future generations.

5. The Spatial Objectives

- 5.1 Taking the Issues identified from the evidence and views from the four sources listed above, together with the spatial vision, the following four key objectives are proposed:

Objective	Strategic Imperative	Relation to Local Plans/Strategies
Key Objective 1 To ensure that development required for the aspirations of our communities recognises the resource needs of future generations	PPS1, RPG9, Structure Plan, SE Plan	Community Strategy (Environment)
Key Objective 2 To maintain a level of economic prosperity that is consistent with social and physical infrastructure constraints	PPS1, RPG9, SE Plan	Leader's Position Paper (Economic Development Committee), Community Strategy (Economic Prosperity), Economic Strategy)
Key Objective 3 To ensure that social progress recognises the needs of everyone	PPS1, RPG9, SE Plan	Community Strategy (Access to Housing), Housing Strategy
Key Objective 4 To protect and enhance those aspects of the natural and built environment that make the Borough an attractive place in which to live, work or visit	PPS1, RPG9, SE Plan	Leader's Position Paper

These four Key Objectives are expanded and elaborated on to provide more specific and measurable objectives that have been used to help develop the preferred options and formulate the policies for the Core Strategy. The following tables set out a wider set of more detailed sub-objectives grouped around the key objectives above.

Objective	Strategic Imperative	Relation to Local Plans/Strategies	Measurement
Key Objective 1 To ensure that development required for the aspirations of our communities recognise the resource needs of future generations	PPS1, RPPG9, SE Plan, Surrey Structure Plan	Community Strategy (Environment)	Adopted Sustainability Indicators (Runnymede BC)
Sub Objective 1A Locational Priorities – To ensure that new development in Runnymede is focused on locations that perform best in sustainability terms and does not adversely affect sites that support the Borough's biodiversity or increase the risks of flooding	PPS1, PPG25, SE Plan – Policy CC7 & London Fringe Core Strategy, Structure Plan – North Surrey Sub-Area priorities	Community Strategy (Environment)	Assessment of sites against PPG3 criteria and RBC sustainability criteria
Sub Objective 1B To make more efficient use of land by maximising the re-use of previously developed urban land and the conversion and re-use of existing buildings	SE Plan – London Fringe Core Strategy, Structure Plan Policy LO1	Community Strategy (Environment)	% of new development on previously developed land. Amount of derelict land/vacant buildings
Sub Objective 1C To reduce the need for long-distance commuting by seeking to achieve a more equal balance between housing provision and employment	PPG13 (Objectives)	Community Strategy (Access)	Levels of in and out commuting, proportion of journeys to work by car
Sub Objective 1D To reduce per capita use of water and energy and increase the proportion of energy from renewable sources	PPS22, SE Plan Policy CC3	None identified	Per capita energy use
Sub Objective 1E To reduce traffic congestion and promote alternatives to car use	PPG13 (Objectives)	Community Strategy (Access)	Recorded levels of road traffic (SCC), levels of public transport usage
Sub Objective 1F To protect and enhance the Borough's heritage assets including historic buildings, monuments, areas, landscapes, archaeological remains and historic parks and gardens	PPG15, PPG 16, Structure Plan Policy SE5		Number of listed buildings etc at risk from neglect or redevelopment

Objective	Strategic Imperative	Relation to Local Plans/Strategies	Measurement
<p>Key Objective 2 To maintain a level of economic prosperity that is consistent with social and physical infrastructure constraints</p>	<p>PPS1 paras 1.15-1.17) Regional Economic Strategy</p>	<p>Leader's Position Paper 04/05 (Economic Development Cmtee) Community Strategy (Economic Prosperity) Runnymede Economic Strategy</p>	<p>Proportion of people of working age in employment, GVA per capita</p>
<p>Sub Objective 2A To promote 'smart' economic growth that seeks to increase productivity without significant increases in the workforce or in the requirement for additional employment</p>	<p>Regional Economic Strategy</p>	<p>Leader's Position Paper 04/05 (Economic Development Cmtee)</p>	<p>Proportion of workforce employed in 'knowledge' sector Educational/skills levels of working age population</p>
<p>Sub Objective 2C To promote town centres as the focus for development for a wide range of uses to reinforce their role and function</p>	<p>SE Plan Policy TC4, Structure Plan Policy LO3</p>	<p>Leader's Position Paper 04/05 (Economic Development Cmtee) Runnymede Economic Strategy</p>	<p>Monitoring of outstanding permissions/vacant commercial floorspace</p>
<p>Sub Objective 2D To develop tourism in Runnymede in a sustainable way that presents the Borough in the best possible way to visitors</p>	<p>SE Plan Policy TSR 4</p>	<p>Community Strategy (Leisure & Culture)</p>	<p>Visitor numbers to attractions etc</p>
<p>Key Objective 3 To ensure that social progress recognises the needs of everyone</p>	<p>PPS1, RPG9, SE Plan</p>	<p>Communities Strategy (Access to Housing) Housing Strategy</p>	<p>Provision of housing to meet identified need Indices of Deprivation (Aggregate)</p>
<p>Sub Objective 3A To provide suitable housing to meet the Borough's housing targets and identified housing needs (including affordable housing)</p>	<p>PPS1, SE Plan Policy H4</p>	<p>Community Strategy (Affordable Housing) Runnymede Housing Strategy</p>	<p>Housing Trajectory Delivery of Affordable Housing against identified needs</p>

Objective	Strategic Imperative	Relation to Local Plans/Strategies	Measurement
Sub Objective 3B To identify and provide for development needs for social/community, cultural and leisure purposes and protect existing facilities	PPS1	Leader's Position Paper 04/05 (Planning Committee) Community Strategy (Leisure and Culture)	Audit of social/community needs against provision
Sub Objective 3C To ensure that development is accessible, and has suitable facilities for people with disabilities	PPS1, Disability Discrimination Act 1995	Community Strategy (Access and Transport, Leisure & Culture), Surrey Design Guide	Monitoring of planning permissions; access audits/appraisals
Key Objective 4 To protect and enhance those aspects of the natural and built environment that make the Borough an attractive place in which to live, work or visit	PPS paragraphs 1.3-1.5	Leader's Position Paper 04/05	As listed below
Sub Objective 4A To ensure that the Green Belt continues to serve its statutory purposes, particularly its important function of defining the extent of the Borough's built-up areas	PPG2, Surrey Structure Plan (Spatial Strategy)	Community Strategy (Environment)	Extent of Green Belt
Sub Objective 4B To protect and enhance valuable urban and Green Belt open spaces that contribute to open space objectives for recreation, nature conservation and sports provision	SE Plan (Policy CC9 and London Fringe – Core Strategy)	Community Strategy (Environment & Leisure & Culture)	Open Space Audit
Sub Objective 4C To achieve high design quality in new developments	PPS1 – Annex C	Surrey Design Guide	Number of development schemes eligible for entry to the Design Award Scheme
Sub Objective 4D To ensure that development meets the costs of infrastructure and other requirements that it generates through appropriate planning contributions	ODPM Circular 01/97 – Planning Obligations (Annex B); SE Plan (London Fringe) Policy LF2; Surrey Structure Plan Policy DN1	Leader's Position Statement 04/05 (Planning Committee)	Contributions received via planning obligations/legal agreements
Sub Objective 4E To provide an appropriate framework to enable people to improve, adapt and extend their homes in a sustainable and appropriate manner	PPS1	None identified	Options include appeal data/customer satisfaction survey results

6. The Spatial Strategy

- 6.1 Runnymede has a strong economy, good communications and a quality of natural environment that makes it an attractive place in which to live and work. The Spatial Strategy will need to guide the employment and housing growth, identified in the Surrey Structure Plan, in a way that maintains and, where possible, enhances the environmental and social qualities for existing and future generations.
- 6.2 Whilst the spatial framework for the LDF will initially be informed by the Surrey Structure Plan, setting the context for the period to 2016, early consideration will need to be given to the South East Plan providing guidance for the period to 2026. This creates a potential difficulty in that the Structure Plan has been approved, whilst the South East Plan has to satisfy a number of requirements before formal adoption. Guiding development over a 20 year period in the LDF will be a significant task and extends the 10 year timeframe hitherto commonplace for the old style local plans.

7. The Spatial Options

- 7.1 The Surrey Structure Plan emphasises that for the period to 2016 new development will continue to be focused in urban areas and the green belt will be strongly defended. A key aspect of the guidance is focused on managing change in the urban area to ensure that development enhances the economic, social and environmental well being of the area. This emphasis upon the urban area is causing a certain amount of stress in the social and urban fabric. This manifests itself in a number of ways: increased traffic congestion, loss of open space, pressures on community facilities and services including school places and doctors' surgeries and increased levels of noise and environmental pollution. These issues are creating concerns about the quality of life in the urban area if the trend is continued. The emphasis of the Structure Plan is to positively manage the growth in urban areas to accommodate growth. However, the South East Plan, simply in terms of the 20 years timescale, is establishing growth aspirations for the region that are not approved but which will need to be reflected in the emerging LDF. There are some policy tensions in the Consultation Draft of the South East Plan in terms of the emphasis of growth in Runnymede that will need to be clarified before they can clearly set the spatial framework for the period to 2026. Nevertheless, it is important that the core strategy of the LDF recognises the issues in the South East Plan to enable the key policy areas to be considered as part of the consultation on the LDF.
- 7.2 To balance the guidance in the Surrey Structure Plan with that emerging in the South East Plan and enable genuine participation and involvement of the wider community and stakeholders, the Preferred Option consultation will identify whether there are genuine and reasonable alternatives for consideration. The Structure Plan confirms that development will be located in the urban area. It would therefore be unhelpful to put forward alternatives, outside the urban area, as it would unrealistically raise expectations. In this context the term Preferred Approach has been used with an appropriate supporting statement. Consideration is then given to the wider issues raised in the South East Plan. These are considered as part of the Preferred, Alternative or Rejected Options.
- 7.3 In summary the Council will invite comment on the basis of the following approach:
- The Preferred Approach – the position favoured by the Council
 - The Preferred Option – the option favoured by the Council
 - The Alternative Option – put forward by the Council to provide genuine choice
 - The Rejected Options – put forward by the Council to maintain an open debate

8. Core Strategy – Preferred Approach

- 8.1 The earlier consultation told us that the preferred long term vision for the Borough was one where future development was an infrastructure constrained approach concentrating development in urban areas with good access to services and public transport. Converting employment land for housing and building to higher density was also considered to make an important contribution to meeting future growth pressures. This is consistent with the Structure Plan advice set out in Policies LO1-LO8.
- 8.2 The Surrey Structure Plan, in paragraph 1.20 says that the key spatial and land use priorities for North Surrey are (in no priority order);
- protect the Metropolitan Green Belt and its function of separating communities;
 - restrict development to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings;
 - retain and improve the quality of all urban open land and urban fringe countryside;
 - protect floodplains and encourage restoration of mineral workings in the Lower Thames Valley;
 - consolidate the existing role of Staines and Epsom as major centres, recognising the limited opportunities for them to expand;
 - invest in other centres, particularly the continuing revitalisation of Addlestone, Chertsey and Leatherhead, to maintain their role in providing local services;
 - support investment in public transport infrastructure to improve orbital movement, access to London and to Heathrow Airport.

Policy L01 then sets the context for the location of development.

- 8.3 The Consultation Draft of the South East Plan (SEP) sets out a core strategy for the London Fringe Sub Region that is generally consistent with the views expressed in the Structure Plan and the early LDF consultation. The SEP Policy LF1 may change but it is a starting point to the debate. The SEP Policy LF2 will eventually set out the housing distribution for the London Fringe Sub Region on a district basis. The LDF will need to provide the detailed framework for delivering the housing.

Strategic Policies

Spatial Policy 1 – Sustainable Development Preferred Approach

To ensure that development required for the aspirations of our communities recognises the resource needs of future generations

The Plan will ensure:

- that new development in Runnymede is focused on locations that perform best in sustainability terms and does not adversely affect sites that support the Borough's biodiversity or increase the risks of flooding;
- the most efficient use of land by maximising the re-use of previously developed urban land and the conversion and re-use of existing buildings;
- a reduction in the need for long distance commuting by seeking to achieve a more equal balance between housing provision and employment;

- a reduction in per capita use of water and energy and increase the proportion of energy from renewable sources;
- the protection and enhancement of the Borough's heritage assets including historic buildings, monuments, conservation areas, landscapes, archaeological remains and historic parks and gardens;
- a reduction in traffic congestion by promoting alternatives to car use

Indicator	Source	Assessment of performance of Policy	Target (To Follow)
% of new development on Previously Development Land	RBC - Policy	Annual	
% of properties at risk of flooding	RBC - GIS	Annual	
% of vacant / derelict buildings	NLUD / RBC	Annual	
Number of people commuting in and out of Runnymede	ONS - Census	10 years	
% of Travel Plans with new development	RBC - Policy	Annual	
Number of buildings at risk	English Heritage/RBC	Annual	

Spatial Policy 2 : Economic Development Preferred Approach

To maintain a level of economic prosperity that is consistent with social and physical infrastructure constraints

The Plan will:

- promote 'smart' economic growth that seeks to increase productivity without significant increases in the workforce or in the requirement for additional employment
- ensure an adequate supply of suitable premises/land in sustainable locations to support business and industry in the Borough and preserve sustainably located strategic employment sites
- promote town centres as the focus for development for a wide range of uses to reinforce their role and function
- develop tourism in Runnymede in a sustainable way that presents the Borough in the best possible way to visitors

Indicator	Source	Assessment of Performance of Policy	Target (To Follow)
Number of Business in each Sector	ABI	Annual	
Vacancy Rates	RBC - Business Rates	Quarterly	
Floorspace (sq m)	RBC - Policy	Annual	
Satisfaction Surveys	Leisure - RBC	Every 3 years	
Number +of visitors to attractions	Leisure - RBC	Every 3 years	
Town Centre Health	SCC	As required	

Spatial Policy 3 : Social Development Preferred Approach

To ensure that social progress recognises the needs of everyone

The Plan will:

- provide suitable housing to meet the Borough's housing targets and identified housing needs (including affordable house);
- identify and provide for development needs for social/community, cultural and leisure purposes and protect existing facilities;
- ensure that development is accessible, and has suitable facilities for people with disabilities

Indicator	Source	Assessment of Performance of Policy	Target (To Follow)
Net Units Completed against Housing Trajectory	RBC - Policy	Annual	
Number of Affordable Units	RBC – Policy	Annual	
Average SAP rating in Runnymede	RBC – Housing	Annual	
Number of Un-fit Homes	RBC – Housing	Annual	
Satisfaction Surveys	RBC – Leisure	Every 3 years	
Number of developments that have considered Disabled Access Arrangements that comply with DDA 1995	RBC	Annual	

Spatial Policy 4 : Environmental Protection Preferred Approach

To protect and enhance those aspects of the natural and built environment that make the Borough an attractive place in which to live, work or visit

The Plan will:

- ensure that the Green Belt continues to serve its statutory purposes, particularly its important function of defining the extent of the Borough's built-up areas;
- protect and enhance valuable urban and Green Belt open spaces that contribute to open space objectives for recreation, nature conservation and sports provision;
- achieve high design quality in new developments;
- ensure that development meets the costs of infrastructure and other requirements that it generates through appropriate planning contributions;
- provide an appropriate framework to enable people to improve, adapt and extend their homes in a sustainable and appropriate manner.

Indicator	Source	Assessment of Performance of Policy	Target (To Follow)
% of Borough which is Green Belt	RBC - GIS	Annual	
Net increase in ha of open space that complies with standards as set out in Open Space SPD	RBC – GIS/Policy	Annual	
Number of Schemes eligible for Design Awards	RBC - Policy	Annual	
Contributions made through S106 Agreements	RBC - Legal	Annual	
Satisfaction Surveys	RBC – Leisure	Annual	

The Location of Development

In terms of growth the options and alternatives will focus upon:

- meeting a housing requirement that will provide 2032 dwellings over the period 2001 to 2016 in accordance with the Structure Plan;
- set the framework for housing requirements over the period to 2026 in accordance with the South East Plan;
- the retention of a sustainable economy;
- addressing the impact of growth on the social and physical infrastructure;
- protecting the natural environment

Indicators for Spatial Policies 5 & 6	Source	Assessment of Performance of Policy	Target (To Follow)
Net Completions against Housing Trajectory	RBC - Policy	Annual	
% of new development of Previously Developed Land	RBC - Policy	Annual	
Average Density of Net Completions	RBC - Policy	Annual	
Number of Affordable Units	RBC - Policy	Annual	

Distribution of Housing in Accordance with the Surrey Structure Plan

Strategic Policy 5 Housing Distribution Preferred Approach for Period to 2016

New housing development will be provided mainly by the redevelopment of existing urban land for the period to 2016.

The table below illustrates that, on the basis of current trends, it is possible to accommodate over 2032 units by 2016 through redevelopment of existing sites, sites with planning permission (over 1ha) and completions:

Table 1

Total Requirement 2001 to 2016	=	2032
Total Provision 2001 to 2016		
Completions (1.4.01-31.03.05)	=	818
Outstanding Planning Permissions over 1ha	=	342
Small/Medium Site Estimate @ 92.6p/a) 1.04.05-31.03.16	=	<u>1019</u>
	=	2179

Advantages
Development is directed to built-up areas – government advice
Protection of the Green Belt – government advice
The re-use of urban land – government advice
New sites distributed around the urban area
Disadvantages
Concerns over development in the urban area
Limited opportunities to meet affordable housing needs
Uncertainty of sites coming forward
Impact of local amenity
Uncertainty of social and physical infrastructure arising from incremental growth

Strategic Policy 5 Alternative Housing Option 1 For Period To 2016

New housing development will be provided in the urban area.

Development will be encouraged, in the first instance, by the redevelopment of urban land, and then by the release of 'reserve sites', that satisfy the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).

There will be an annual monitoring of the plan to identify if there is a projected shortfall in the housing requirements for the period to 2016. If there is a projected shortfall reserve sites will be released on the basis of a sequential release until the shortfall has been satisfied. The table below illustrates how the housing will be provided over the period to 2016. It is anticipated that the scale of development will also contribute towards the requirements identified in the South East plan for the period to 2026.

Table 2

Total Requirement 2001 to 2016	=	2032
Total Provision 2001 to 2016		
Completions (1/4/01 to 31/03/05)	=	818
Outstanding Planning Permissions over 1ha	=	342
Small/Medium site estimate (@ 92.6p/a) 1/04/05 to 31/03/16	=	1019
Reserve sites (to be confirmed following the SEA/SA)	=	XXX
		= 2179+ xxx

Advantages
Development is limited mainly to urban areas – government advice
Protection of the green belt – government advice
The certainty of sites coming forward – government advice
New sites distributed around urban area
May enable more affordable housing to be developed on reserve sites

Disadvantages
Likely to give rise to greater emphasis on car use if reserve sites developed
May be internal conflict identified by SEA/SA/ environmental appraisals
Difficult to limit redevelopment in the urban area or guide development in the urban area
May exceed the housing requirements
Uncertainty of social and physical infrastructure arising from incremental growth

Strategic Policy 5 Rejected Housing Option 2 For Period To 2016

Development will be encouraged, in the first instance by redevelopment in the urban area, and then by the release of 'reserve sites' or by the extension of development on land currently designated as green belt (sites to be identified) adjoining the main urban settlements

Redevelopment will be encouraged in the urban area. However, if sufficient land is not forthcoming to meet the annual identified need, then consideration will be given to the release of agreed reserve sites or designated green belt sites to satisfy the identified shortfall. This will require a SEA/SA comparison of the reserve sites with the identification of new housing sites on land currently designated as green belt.

This will require an annual monitoring of the plan to identify if there is a projected shortfall in the housing requirements for the period to 2016. If there is a projected shortfall sites will be released on the basis of a sequential release until the projected shortfall has been satisfied. The table below illustrates how the requirements for 2032 units will be met by 2016. It is anticipated that the scale of development will accommodate the requirements identified in the South East plan for the period to 2026.

Table 3

Total Requirement 2001 to 2016	= 2032
Total Provision 2001 to 2016	
Completions (1/4/01 to 31/03/05)	= 818
Outstanding Planning Permissions over 1ha	= 342
Small/Medium site estimate (@ 92.6p/a) 1/04/05 to 31/03/16	= 1019
Urban Extensions/Reserve Sites (to be confirmed following the SEA/SA)	= XX
	= 2179+ xxx

Advantages
The certainty of sites coming forward – government advice
Reserve sites/green field sites easier to develop and provide opportunity for affordable housing to be provided
Full option only available if the South East Plan guides development towards the green belt
Opportunities to provide housing mix
Constrained development in urban area protects local amenity

Disadvantages
Likely to give rise to greater emphasis on car use if reserve sites developed
May be internal conflict identified by SEA/SA/ environmental appraisals
Difficult to limit redevelopment in the urban area or guide development in the urban area
May exceed the housing requirements
Uncertainty of social and physical infrastructure arising from incremental growth

Strategic Policy 5 Rejected Housing Option 3 For Period To 2016

New housing development will be provided by redevelopment of urban land, and in a new settlement in the green belt on land to be identified which satisfy the requirements of an SEA/SA.

This will require the identification of one major site, on land currently designated as green belt, to accommodate sufficient dwellings to meet the requirement for the period to 2016. It is anticipated that the scale of development will also accommodate the requirements identified in the South East plan for the period to 2026 and will need to be phased. The table below illustrates how the requirements for 2032 units will be met by 2016.

Table 4

Total Requirement 2001 to 2016	= 2032
Total Provision 2001 to 2016	
Completions (1/4/01 to 31/03/05)	= 818
Outstanding Planning Permissions over 1ha	= 342
Small/Medium site estimate (@ 92.6p/a) 1/04/05 to 31/03/16	= 1019
New settlement (to be confirmed following an SEA/SA)	= XXX
	= 2032+ xxx

Advantages
The certainty of sites coming forward – government advice
Site easy to develop and provide opportunity for affordable housing to be provided
Option only available if the South East Plan guides development towards the green belt
Opportunities to provide housing mix
Opportunities to provide a range of social and physical infrastructure measures, including affordable housing

Disadvantages
Likely to give rise to greater emphasis on car use if reserve sites developed
May be internal conflict identified by SEA/SA/ environmental appraisals
Difficult to limit redevelopment in the urban area or guide development in the urban area
May exceed the housing requirements
Uncertainty of social and physical infrastructure arising from incremental growth

Distribution of Housing – Alternative Options to meet the emerging housing growth options set out in the South East Plan

If it is necessary to accommodate a higher rate of growth for the periods 2006 -2016 and 2016 – 2026, as a result of the requirements of the South East Plan, then it may be difficult to accommodate all the additional units in the urban area.

The draft proposed core strategy for the London Fringe sub region says in policy LF3 that the focus on development will be in the urban area.

Strategic Policy 6 Housing Distribution Preferred Approach For Period to 2026

New housing development will be provided by the redevelopment of existing urban land for the period to 2026 to meet the housing requirements.

The table below illustrates that, on the basis of current trends it is possible to accommodate over 2032+ units by 2026 through redevelopment of existing sites, sites with planning permission(over 1ha) and completions.

Table 5

Total Requirement 2001 to 2026	= 2032 +yyy
Total Provision 2001 to 2026	
Completions (1/4/01 to 31/03/05)	= 818
Outstanding Planning Permissions over 1ha	= 342
Small/Medium site estimate (@ 92.6p/a) 1/04/05 to 31/03/26	= 1944
	= 3104+

Advantages
Development is directed to built up areas – government advice
Protection of the green belt – government advice
The reuse of urban land – government advice
New sites distributed around the urban area

Disadvantages
Concerns about over development in the urban area
Limited opportunities to meet affordable housing needs
Uncertainty of sites coming forward
Impact of local amenity
Uncertainty of social and physical infrastructure arising from incremental growth

Strategic Policy 6 Alternative Housing Option 1 For Period To 2026.

New housing development will be provided mainly in the urban area.

Development will be encouraged, in the first instance, by the redevelopment of urban land, and then by the release of 'reserve sites', that satisfy the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).

There will be an annual monitoring of the plan to identify if there is a projected shortfall in the housing requirements for the period to 2026.

If there is a projected shortfall reserve sites will be released on the basis of a sequential release until the shortfall has been satisfied. The table below illustrates how the housing will be provided over the period to 2026.

Table 6

Total Requirement 2001 to 2026		= 2032+ yyy
Total Provision 2001 to 2026		
Completions (1/4/01 to 31/03/05)	=	818
Outstanding Planning Permissions over 1ha	=	342
Small/Medium site estimate (@ 92.6p/a) 1/04/05 to 31/03/26	=	1944
Reserve sites (to be confirmed following the SEA/SA)	=	XXX
		= 3104+ xxx

Strategic Policy 6 Rejected Housing Option 2 For Period To 2026

The policy will apply upon the adoption of the South East Plan

New housing will be provided by redevelopment in the urban area, on agreed reserve sites or by the extension of development on land currently designated as green belt (sites to be identified) adjoining the main urban settlements.

Redevelopment will be encouraged in the urban area. However, if sufficient land is not forthcoming to meet the annual identified need, then consideration will be given to the release of agreed reserve sites or designated green belt sites to satisfy the identified shortfall. This will require a SEA/SA comparison of the reserve sites with the identification of new housing sites on land currently designated as green belt.

This approach will require an annual monitoring of the plan to identify if there is a projected shortfall in the housing requirements for the period to 2026. If there is a projected shortfall sites will be released on the basis of an annual prescribed sequential release until the projected shortfall has been satisfied. The table below illustrates how the requirements for 2032 units will be met by 2026. It is anticipated that the scale of development will accommodate the requirements identified in the South East Plan for the period to 2026.

Table 7

Total Requirement 2001 to 2026	= 2032+ yyy
Total Provision 2001 to 2026	
Completions (1/4/01 to 31/03/05)	= 818
Outstanding Planning Permissions over 1ha	= 342
Small/Medium site estimate (@ 92.6p/a) 1/04/05 to 31/03/26	= 1944
Urban Extensions/Reserve Sites (to be confirmed following the SEA/SA)	= XXX
	= 3104+ xxx

Advantages
The certainty of sites coming forward – government advice
Sites easy to develop and provide opportunity for affordable housing to be provided
Full option only available if the South East Plan guides development towards the green belt
Opportunities to provide housing mix
Disadvantages
Concerns about over development in the urban area
Limited opportunities to meet affordable housing needs
Uncertainty of sites coming forward
Impact of local amenity
Uncertainty of social and physical infrastructure arising from incremental growth

Strategic Policy 6 Rejected Housing Option 3 For Period To 2026

New housing development will be provided by redevelopment of urban land, and in a new settlement in the green belt on land to be identified which satisfy the requirements of an SEA/SA.

This will require the identification of one major site, on land currently designated as green belt, to accommodate sufficient dwellings to meet the requirement for the period to 2026. The scale of development will accommodate the requirements identified in the South East plan for the period to 2026 and will need to be phased. The table below illustrates how the requirements for 2032+ units will be met by 2026.

Table 8

Total Requirement 2001 to 2026	= 2032+ yyy
Total Provision 2001 to 2026	
Completions (1/4/01 to 31/03/05)	= 818
Outstanding Planning Permissions over 1ha	= 342
Small/Medium site estimate (@ 92.6p/a) 1/04/05 to 31/03/26	= 1944
New Settlement (to be confirmed following the SEA/SA)	= XXX
	= 3104+ xxx

Advantages
The certainty of sites coming forward – government advice
Sites easy to develop and provide opportunity for affordable housing to be provided
Option only available if the South East Plan guides development towards the green belt
Opportunities to provide housing mix
Opportunities to provide a range of social and physical infrastructure measures, including affordable housing

Disadvantages
Concerns about over development in the urban area
Limited opportunities to meet affordable housing needs
Uncertainty of sites coming forward
Impact of local amenity
Uncertainty of social and physical infrastructure arising from incremental growth