

**REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH COUNCIL****OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SCRUTINY REVIEW PANEL****4 August 2008****Held at 6.30 p.m. in the Front Committee Room at the Town Hall, Reigate**

Present: Councillor M.A. Brunt (Chairman)

Councillors Mrs. L.J. Brunt, S.A. Kulka, D.J. Pay and M.J. Selby.

Officers in support: Steve Clark, Interim Head of Policy;  
Bev Hindle, Head of Policy; and  
Chris Phelan, Scrutiny Support Officer.

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None.

**2. NOTES OF THE MEETING ON 29 JULY 2008**

The notes of the Scrutiny Panel held on 29 July 2008 were received as a correct record.

**3. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (LDF) - CORE STRATEGY**

The Panel concluded its review of the Preferred Policy Approach Options. The Panel's methodology; evidence reviewed; findings and recommendations are set out in the attached report for consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**4. DATE OF THE NEXT AND FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE PANEL**

It was noted that the Panel may or may not need a further meeting depending on whether the Panel Members were content with the draft report setting out the Panel's response to the consultation exercise.





**Reigate & Banstead**  
BOROUGH COUNCIL  
Banstead | Horley | Redhill | Reigate

**F**

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

### **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (CORE STRATEGY) SCRUTINY REVIEW PANEL (2008)**

<p><b>REPORT OF THE PANEL ON THE LDF CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION DRAFT</b></p>
---

#### **1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION**

The Local Development Framework, will replace the existing Development Plan framework, the Borough Plan and the Surrey Structure Plan. It will consist of a number of Plans, the most important of which is the Core Strategy, which sets out the context for all the other Plans that make up the Local Development Framework. A number of Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents will provide more detailed policy guidance. The Redhill Area Action Plan details a range of policies and proposals to implement the regeneration objectives for the town.

It was important that the evidence base to support the Core Strategy ensured that the adopted plans and policies were based on objective evidence to give it a robust and credible base to enable the Plan to be found sound by the Planning Inspectorate. Further work had been commissioned to strengthen this element of the Core Strategy.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee was consulted on the Local Development Framework in 2006 and provided its comments to the Executive at that time. These were taken into account in the latest Core Strategy Preferred Options that the Executive published for consultation on 10 July 2008.

The Panel considered the consultative draft of the LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation published by the Executive on 10 July.

## 2. SUMMARY OF PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS/CONCLUSIONS

<b>Preferred Policy</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Recommendations/Conclusions</b>	<b>Detail at Para</b>
Approach 1	Spatial Location of Development	That the Executive provide clarification on the relationship between Urban Open Land and this Preferred Policy Approach.	8.1.2
Approach 2	Sustainable Development Principles	(i) That the Executive be aware of the recommendation that the County Council review the accessibility mapping, before it approves the Core Strategy,	8.2.2
		(ii) That the Core Strategy should explicitly state that the Policy Approach would be supplemented by specific surveys on individual applications when required,	8.2.5
		(iii) That the Executive ensure that a transparent, open, robust and accessible system be put in place to maintain the evidence base.	8.2.6
Approach 3	Plan Monitor Manage Option	That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be consulted on the Supplementary Planning Document on Infrastructure Contributions and also on the Annual Monitoring Report.	8.3.1
Approach 4	Protecting and Enhancing our Valued Landscapes and Natural Environment	That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee LDF Review Panel be provided with electronic copies of examples of the evidence base that supported the Preferred Policy Approach.	8.4.3
Approach 5	Green Infrastructure	That the Executive examine how the evidence base could be maintained and managed, inclusive of any resource implications to achieve this, to ensure that there was a sustainable future for the implementation of the Core Strategy.	8.5.3
Approach 6	Sustainable Construction	(i) That the Executive be advised that there could be a future budget pressure on resources to ensure that sufficient monitoring capacity was provided for in the Council,	8.6.5
		(ii) That consideration be given to establishing baseline statistics of water	8.6.7

		consumption for future monitoring purposes.	
Approach 7	Development, Protection of Character and Heritage and Urban Design	That further consideration be given to retaining the LDF Scrutiny Panel to undertake reviews of the Supplementary Planning Documents and the Annual Monitoring Report as part of the consultative process.	8.7.2
Approach 8	Economy	That the supporting text for the Core Strategy should provide for flexibility in relation to the changing nature of our economy.	8.8.1
Approach 9	Regional, Town and Local Centres	(i) That the Preferred Policy Approach be revised so that it does not detract from other areas of the Borough,	8.9.1
		(ii) That the supporting text in the Core Strategy be clarified to confirm the evidence documents relate to weekdays and not weekends and provide an appropriate link with the Preferred Policy Approach 18 (Travel Options).	8.9.3
Approach 10	Regeneration	The proposals in this section were supported without comment.	8.10.1
Approach 11	Housing Delivery	The proposals within this section were supported noting that discussion were ongoing regarding the volume of housing that the Government was seeking in the area.	8.11.1
Approach 12	Strategic Location of Housing	The proposals in this section were supported without comment.	8.12.1
Approach 13	Providing the Appropriate Type and Housing Mix	That the Executive consider how the Preferred Policy Approach could achieve the delivery of a better mix of housing with appropriate amenity facilities for residents.	8.13.1
Approach 14	Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showmen	That the Executive consider the advantage of being proactive with site provision to ensure that pitches provided are in the most suitable location.	8.14.1
Approach 15	Affordable Housing	That the Executive consider building flexibility into the approach to allow for affordable houses or a financial contribution to be provided.	8.15.1
Approach 16	Community Facilities and	That the Executive consider the merit in linking this Policy Approach with the Open	8.16.1

	Infrastructure	Spaces Strategy.	
Approach 17	Parks and Recreation Improvements and Accessibility	That consideration be given to identifying the location of sites for cemetery provision in the future.	8.17.1
Approach 18	Travel Options	(i) That the Preferred Policy Approach be revised so that it indicates that the improved travel options would be reviewed and enhanced for the variety of provision stated.	8.18.1
		(ii) That the wording be adjusted so that specific locations are not identified, providing a Borough wide recognition of the need to enhance public transport interchange facilities	8.18.2
Approach 19	Accessibility	That the wording relating to non-car travel be adjusted to acknowledge that its intention is to support environmental sustainability travel principles without giving the impressions that the Policy Approach is anti-car.	8.19.2
Approach 20	Parking	That the Executive consider how the evidence base will be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure it is current.	8.20.1
Approach 21	Aviation	That the Executive consider how this Policy Approach can be linked to the Sustainable Development Policy Approach, given the linkages with noise, light and pollution issues that are known factors around airports.	8.21.1
Delivery and Implementation		The proposals in this section were supported without comment.	8.22.1

### 3. MEMBERSHIP OF THE PANEL

Councillor M.A. Brunt (Chairman); Councillors Mrs. L.J. Brunt, S.A. Kulka, D.J. Pay and M.J. Selby.

### 4. OFFICERS IN SUPPORT

- Steve Clark, Interim Head of Policy, Policy and Environment Directorate
- Bev Hindley, Head of Policy, Policy and Environment Directorate (latter part of process only); and
- Chris Phelan, Scrutiny Support Officer, Chief Executive's Department.

### 5. EVIDENCE REVIEWED BY THE PANEL

The Panel reviewed the following evidence to support its review:

#### **Core Documentation**

- The Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation document
- Summary of the evidence base for the relevant components of the Core Strategy.

#### **Evidential Supporting Documentation**

Document 1	Borough-wide Landscape & Townscape - Character Assessment
Document 2	Borough-wide Landscape & Townscape - Final Report
Document 3	Background Paper on Sustainable Construction
Document 4	Reigate and Banstead Local Development Scheme
Document 5	PPG17 Open Space Assessment
Document 6	Economic Market Assessment
Document 7	East Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Document 8	Gypsy and Traveller Assessment
Document 9	List of Regeneration Projects
Document 10	Summary of SE Plan Proposed Alterations
Document 11	Affordable Housing Viability Study
Document 12	List of Community Facilities
Document 13	Proposed Graduated Parking Areas
Document 14	Community Facilities and Infrastructure
Document 15	Sustainable Homes Document

**Annex 1** documents the methodology applied by the Panel in reviewing the Preferred Policy Approaches and how it reviewed the evidence documents referred to above.

**Annex 2** sets out the Preferred Policy Approach details for each of the elements of the Core Strategy as referred to in the findings of the Panel.

## **6. NUMBER OF MEETINGS OF THE PANEL AND ITS ACTIVITIES**

The Panel met 4 times between 23 July and 28 August 2008 as follows:

**Meeting 1** Considered the background to the Local Development Framework, identified its key components, confirmed the role of the Scrutiny Panel, agreed an approach and timetable for managing its business and identified further material/documents required to support the review.

**Meeting 2** Received the first batch of evidence (Documents 1-4) to support the review of the LDF Core Strategy and indicated comments for consideration at its final meeting.

**Meeting 3** Received the second batch of evidence (Documents 5-15) to support the review of the LDF Core Strategy and indicated comments for consideration at its final meeting.

**Meeting 4** Agreed Panel's report for submission to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

## **7. PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW AND THE ROLE OF THE PANEL**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee established the Scrutiny Panel to consider the LDF Core Strategy and other key components as appropriate so that it could review the consultation proposals and offer comments for consideration.

The main objective of the Panel was to examine the principles and planning processes that underline the Local Development Framework and specifically the Core Strategy. In general the Panel's aim was to establish that the Local Development Framework:

- was clear, focused, achievable, realistic and based on sound practices;
- had clear linkages with corporate and other plans that form the Policy Framework to establish that they are identifiable and designed to improve services in the Council's priority areas; and
- was being applied in a way that allows it to achieve the Council's goals, standards and priorities.

In addition the Panel sought to understand that the evidence base used by the Executive to support the Preferred Policy Approaches was robust enough to withstand future challenge.

## **8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL**

### **8.1. Preferred Policy Approach 1                      Spatial Location of Development**

8.1.1. In considering the Preferred Policy Approach for the Spatial Location of Development the Panel noted that strategic development in the Borough was proposed to be directed in a hierarchy of areas one of which was Reigate; Horley; and Banstead Village – as a focus for Town Centres.

8.1.2. The Panel expressed concern about this broad approach particularly as developments would need to take account of land designated as Urban Open Land which had various levels of protection. It was not clear how this related to the Spatial Location proposals. The Panel concluded by requesting that the Executive provide clarification on the relationship between Urban Open Land and this PPA as supporting text for the Core Strategy.

### **8.2. Preferred Policy Approach 2                      Sustainable Development Principles**

8.2.1. The Panel supported the key criteria set out in the Preferred Policy Approach.

8.2.2. The Panel noted that the Atkins report on the Borough Wide Landscape and Townscape Character Assessment referred to access to local facilities. This report recommended that the County Council review the accessibility mapping before the Core Strategy was submitted to Government to ensure that it was accurate. The Panel were assured that this was in progress and requested that the Executive be aware of this before it approved the Core Strategy.

8.2.3. In examining the Maps, which supported the accessibility proposals, the Panel identified that buses and trains had not both been taken into account in the public transport data. As a result the evidence base would be reviewed and the information for both buses and trains would be provided to the Executive for further review before it approved the Core Strategy.

8.2.4. The Panel also sought assurance regarding the rationale for the statements on walking to town centres and whether the condition or existence of footpaths had been taken into account in the evidence on sustainable access to town centres. The Panel recognised the general nature of the Policy Approach and that the Core Strategy was not intended to be used as a precise statement, as it could not document all the different specific detailed permutation of problems across the Borough. To be effective specific applications would require surveys to be conducted on appropriate applications to ascertain the relevance of the sustainable access statements.

8.2.5. The Panel requested that the Core Strategy should explicitly state that the Policy Approach would be supplemented by specific surveys on individual applications when required to ensure the Policy was flexible enough to cater for all circumstances.

8.2.6. A further example of where the Panel had some concern related to the information on air quality, as it was known that there had been recent changes to an Air Quality Zone in Merstham. As a result the Panel were assured that the evidence that supported the Core Strategy would be updated regularly. The Panel requested that the Executive ensure that a transparent, open, robust and accessible system be put in place to maintain the evidence base.

### **8.3. Preferred Policy Approach 3 Plan Monitor Manage Option**

8.3.1. The Panel supported the proposal for the development of a Supplementary Planning Document on Infrastructure Contributions and requested that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be consulted on the SPD and also on the Annual Monitoring Report so that it could maintain its scrutiny role in relation to emerging policies at that level.

### **8.4. Preferred Policy Approach 4 Protecting and Enhancing our Valued Landscapes and Natural Environment**

8.4.1. The Panel were assured that there was sufficient evidence to support the Preferred Policy Approach in the form of large drawings documenting the Borough's Landscape and Natural Environment.

8.4.2. The Panel were also reassured that the same evidence base supported the built environment elements of the Preferred Policy Approach.

8.4.3. The Panel requested that they be provided with electronic copies of examples of the evidence base that supported the Preferred Policy Approach to be satisfied that it was complete and in an identifiable format for future use.

### **8.5. Preferred Policy Approach 5 Green Infrastructure**

8.5.1. The Panel supported the policies on Green Infrastructure. However concern was expressed about how the implementation would be balanced between development needs and ensuring that the right level of community facilities were provided.

8.5.2. It was noted that the Policy would be supported by SPDs on matters such as local design, which was informed by local biodiversity, amenity space, climate change and landscaping.

8.5.3. The Panel emphasised the need to continually maintain the evidence base to support the implementation of this Policy, which was likely to require an investment in technology and people to make it functional if it was to achieve improvements on climate change issues etc. The Panel concluded by requesting the Executive to examine how the evidence base could be maintained and managed inclusive of any resource implications to achieve this to ensure that there was a sustainable future for the implementation of the Core Strategy.

## **8.6. Preferred Policy Approach 6                      Sustainable Construction**

- 8.6.1. The Panel supported the approach to meet the standards in the Code for Sustainable Homes established by the Government and supported the stretching of the targets to be established. However it noted that the implications of this Policy Approach, once established, would result in higher and progressive payments from developers for different types of development.
- 8.6.2. Whilst the Panel acknowledged the rationale for the costs associated within the Code it was felt that further explanation should be available in the evidence documentation of the rationale applied to determining the figures so that the Core Strategy could withstand the rigours of challenge.
- 8.6.3. The Government had been requested to provide an explanation for this variance and when their response was available it would be circulated to the Panel.

### **On Site Renewables**

- 8.6.4. The Panel noted the proposal to have no less than 10% use of on-site renewable energy technologies for all new development. It questioned whether this was stringent enough and requested that plans be included to make progressive incremental increases to this target by inserting a statement in the Core Strategy and providing flexibility in Supplementary Planning Documents that would support this.
- 8.6.5. It was also noted that developers would be expected to put forward design statements when submitting planning proposals. This would assist the Council in measuring their implementation. However the Council may not have Officers with the skills to monitor such development. As a result the Panel recommended that the Executive be advised that there could be a future budget pressure on resources to ensure that sufficient monitoring capacity was provided for in the Council.

### **Code for Sustainable Homes**

- 8.6.6. The Panel reviewed the Code for Sustainable Homes and recognised the proposals related to water conservation/usage in developments and by residents. The Panel supported this approach.
- 8.6.7. However, the Panel expressed a degree of caution in relation to the monitoring of water consumption and requested that consideration be given to establishing baseline statistics for future monitoring purposes.
- 8.6.8. The Panel also cited this as an example where specialist staff would be required to measure the success of the implementation of the Code and that the Executive be advised accordingly.

## **8.7. Preferred Policy Approach 7                      Development, Protection of Character and Heritage and Urban Design**

8.7.1. The Panel recognised that the detail of the design factors would be documented in Supplementary Planning Documents.

8.7.2. The current process for approving the SPDs was noted and it was suggested that there would be advantages in the Overview and Scrutiny Committee reviewing the SPDs and the Annual Monitoring Report as part of the consultative process. It was agreed that this be a Recommendation from the Panel and that further consideration be given to retaining the LDF Scrutiny Panel to undertake that work.

8.7.3. Related to this the Panel considered that the consultation on some of the documents may be many months or years old before they were introduced and that consideration should be given to re-running consultation exercises as appropriate.

## **8.8. Preferred Policy Approach 8                      Economy**

8.8.1. The Panel supported the Policy to maintain and increase employment growth in the Borough through the Preferred Policy Approach. However it requested that the supporting text for the Core Strategy should provide for flexibility in relation to the changing nature of our economy. The Panel cited examples of increased home working which may lead to reduced density or changing employment requirements within the community which will utilise technological developments through the continually improved communication channels such as Broadband etc.

## **8.9. Preferred Policy Approach 9                      Regional, Town and Local Centres**

8.9.1. The Panel requested that the Preferred Policy Approach be revised so that it did not detract from other areas of the Borough. For example many areas had local shopping that appeared not to be recognised currently and appropriate linkages were requested to be made.

8.9.2. The Panel also sought an understanding of why the Preferred Policy Approach was specific to Redhill and Horley and were assured that this was because of the Redhill Town Centre Area Action Plan and numerous Horley related Supplementary Planning Documents, which were location specific and good practice to include.

8.9.3. The Panel noted that the evidence documents related to weekdays and not weekends. It was requested that this be clarified with supporting text in the Core Strategy and linking appropriately with the Preferred Policy Approach 18 (Travel options).

## **8.10. Preferred Policy Approach 10                      Regeneration**

8.10.1. The proposals in this section were supported without comment.

## **8.11. Preferred Policy Approach 11            Housing Delivery**

8.11.1. The proposals in this section were supported noting that discussions were ongoing regarding the volume of housing that the Government was seeking in the area. At present there appeared to be a disproportionate impact on the levels of housing that Reigate and Banstead was being requested to cater for compared to other areas in the South East. The Panel noted that the Executive Member for Planning and Housing was making appropriate representations to the Government to seek a more balanced approach.

## **8.12. Preferred Policy Approach 12            Strategic Location of Housing**

8.12.1. The proposals in this section were supported without comment.

## **8.13. Preferred Policy Approach 13            Providing the Appropriate Type and Housing Mix**

8.13.1. The proposals in this section were supported, however the Panel considered that an important aspect of the Preferred Policy Approach would be if it achieved the delivery of a better mix of housing with appropriate amenity facilities for residents to utilise. The Panel concluded that the Executive be requested to consider how this could be achieved.

## **8.14. Preferred Policy Approach 14            Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showmen**

8.14.1. The proposals in this section were supported noting that discussions were ongoing regarding the number of additional pitches that the Council would need to provide. The Panel noted that experience elsewhere had shown that there was advantage in being proactive with site provision to ensure that pitches provided were in the most suitable location. The Panel concluded that the Executive be requested to consider how this could be achieved.

## **8.15. Preferred Policy Approach 15            Affordable Housing**

8.15.1. The proposals in this section were supported with the request that flexibility be built into the approach to allow for affordable houses or a financial contribution to be provided. This would allow for distinct options for the different nature of applications for development of over 15 dwellings. The Panel concluded that the Executive be requested to consider how this could be achieved.

8.15.2. The difficulties associated with multiple applications on the same site were noted.

**8.16. Preferred Policy Approach 16            Community Facilities and Infrastructure**

8.16.1. The proposals in this section were supported with the request that the definitions of community facilities should be broad enough to allow for other facilities to be added to the list in the future. Additionally there would be merit in linking this Policy approach with the Open Spaces Strategy. The Panel concluded that the Executive be requested to consider how this could be achieved.

**8.17. Preferred Policy Approach 17            Parks and Recreation Improvements and Accessibility**

8.17.1. The proposals in this section were supported however the Panel noted that there appeared to be an omission from the Core Strategy as it did not seem to cater for future cemetery provision. The Panel requested therefore that consideration should be given to identifying the location of sites for cemetery provision in the future.

**8.18. Preferred Policy Approach 18            Travel Options**

8.18.1. The Panel requested that the Preferred Policy Approach be revised so that it indicated that the improved travel options would be reviewed and enhanced for the variety of provision stated. This would build in a request to allow for existing provision to be reviewed.

8.18.2. The Panel also recommended that the wording be adjusted so that specific locations were not identified providing a Borough wide recognition to the need to enhance public transport interchange facilities.

**8.19. Preferred Policy Approach 19            Accessibility**

8.19.1. The Panel recognised that this Preferred Policy Approach linked to the Inclusive Access SPD. A separate process would be followed for considering the SPD which would allow for the details to be thoroughly considered.

8.19.2. The Panel sought assurance that the reference to improving the highways in the Preferred Policy Approach was inclusive of all types of highway, for example Public Rights of Way. It was considered that the reference to promoting non-car travel would benefit from adjusted wording to acknowledge that its intention was to support environmental sustainability travel principles without giving the impression that the Policy Approach was anti-car.

## **8.20. Preferred Policy Approach 20          Parking**

8.20.1. The proposals in this section were supported noting that the Parking Categories to be utilised would be merged into 3 from the 4 identified in the evidence. The Panel considered that to ensure the workability of this Policy Approach that the evidence base would require regular review in the future to ensure that it was current. The Panel concluded that the Executive be requested to consider how this could be achieved.

## **8.21. Preferred Policy Approach 21          Aviation**

8.21.1. The proposals in this section were supported noting that there may be benefit in linking this policy approach with the Sustainable Development Policy Approach to provide a linkage with the noise, light and pollution issues that are known factors around airports. The Panel concluded that the Executive be requested to consider how this could be achieved.

## **8.22. Delivery and Implementation**

8.22.1. The proposals in this section were supported without comment.



## Local Development Framework Scrutiny Panel

### Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation

Analysis of Priorities and Evidence required, arising from the meeting of the Panel held on 23 July 2008

<b>Core Strategy</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Priority Order</b>	<b>Evidence Requested</b>	<b>Scrutiny at Panel meeting</b>	<b>Evidence information to review</b>
Preferred Policy Approach 1	<b>Spatial Location of Development</b>	High	Link to regeneration	4/8	Document 9
Preferred Policy Approach 2	<b>Sustainable Development Principles</b>	High	Local Travel information	29/7	Document 2
Preferred Policy Approach 3	<b>Plan Monitor Manage Option</b>	Low	Consider with SPD.	4/8	Document 4
Preferred Policy Approach 4	<b>Protecting and Enhancing our Valued Landscapes and Natural Environment</b>	High	Map of AONB, SACs, SSSI's	29/7	Document 1
Preferred Policy Approach 5	<b>Green Infrastructure</b>	High	Map of Nature reserves Old Borough Plan maps	4/8	Document 5
Preferred Policy Approach 6	<b>Sustainable Construction</b>	Low	Table of costs	29/7	Document 3
Preferred Policy Approach 7	<b>Development, Protection of Character and Heritage and Urban Design</b>	Low	Diagram of SPDs	29/7	Document 4
Preferred Policy Approach 8	<b>Economy</b>	High	Existing maps	4/8	Document 6
Preferred Policy	<b>Regional, Town and Local</b>	Low	Maps Not just 4 main	29/7	Page 14 of Core Strat

<b>Core Strategy</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Priority Order</b>	<b>Evidence Requested</b>	<b>Scrutiny at Panel meeting</b>	<b>Evidence information to review</b>
Approach 9	<b>Centres</b>		town centres but villages as well		Preferred Options
Preferred Policy Approach 10	<b>Regeneration</b>	Low	Consider with AAPs and SPDs	4/8	Document 9
Preferred Policy Approach 11	<b>Housing Delivery</b>	Low	Government delivery targets under consideration by Executive Member.	4/8	Document 10
Preferred Policy Approach 12	<b>Strategic Location of Housing</b>	High	Housing mix evidence Zoning information	4/8	Document 7
Preferred Policy Approach 13	<b>Providing the Appropriate Type and Housing Mix</b>	High	Consider with 12 above	4/8	Document 7
Preferred Policy Approach 14	<b>Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showmen</b>	Low	Evidence for number of spaces	4/8	Document 8
Preferred Policy Approach 15	<b>Affordable Housing</b>	High	Information on Development Implementation Policy; Reassurance that this can be achieved;	4/8	Document 11
Preferred Policy Approach 16	<b>Community Facilities and Infrastructure</b>	High	Map and list of community facilities in the Borough Policy detail to support eg Recycling facilities.	4/8	Document 12
Preferred Policy Approach 17	<b>Parks and Recreation Improvements</b>	Low		4/8	Document 5

<b>Core Strategy</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Priority Order</b>	<b>Evidence Requested</b>	<b>Scrutiny at Panel meeting</b>	<b>Evidence information to review</b>
	<b>and Accessibility</b>				
Preferred Policy Approach 18	<b>Travel Options</b>	Low	Understand travel options	29/7	Document 2
Preferred Policy Approach 19	<b>Accessibility</b>	Low	Consider with 18 above	29/7	Document 2
Preferred Policy Approach 20	<b>Parking</b>	High	Ensure that proposals are robust enough Graduated scheme	4/8	Document 13
Preferred Policy Approach 21	<b>Aviation</b>	Low	Consider with Sustainable Planning in relation to noise and light pollution	4/8	Refer to Executive
	<b>Delivery and Implementation</b>	High	Ensure robust	4/8	Document 14



## **Preferred Policy Approach 1**

### **Spatial Location of Development**

Sustainable levels, locations and forms of development will be sought in accordance with the Borough stated objectives of this strategy and the objectives and policies of the South East Plan and agreed NGP growth.

Therefore strategic development in the borough will be directed to the following hierarchy of areas in the Borough:

- Redhill – as the Primary Regional Centre and a Regional Transport Hub,
- Reigate; Horley; and Banstead Village – as a focus for Town Centres
- Regeneration in the areas of Redhill Town centre Horley Town Centre, Preston and Merstham.
- Two new neighbourhoods in Horley
- Other sustainable locations in the existing urban area

## **Preferred Policy Approach 2**

### **Sustainable Development Principles**

The Preferred Option will set out the following key sustainability criteria, against which all proposals will be assessed:

- Making efficient use of land, including the use of previously developed land and buildings, where possible.
- Ensuring that neighbourhoods are supported by effective services, infrastructure and transport options.
- Protecting and enhancing the quality of the natural and built environment in the Borough, whilst respecting the local character.
- Minimising the impact on natural resources, through energy efficiency, renewable energy production, waste reduction, reduced water use and by incorporating the principles of sustainable construction.
- Ensuring that new development can contribute to the creation of an overarching multi-functional Green Infrastructure Network (foot note/glossary) which links existing and planned communities and also respects the ecological and cultural heritage of the Borough. This is an overarching preferred option which links the contributions that a number of other topic specific Preferred Options make to the Green Infrastructure Network.
- Minimising the need to travel, whilst increasing opportunities to walk, cycle or use public transport.
- Mitigating against climate change vulnerability on landscape, biodiversity, built heritage as well as its impacts on water, waste and energy.

- Ensuring that development, both new and existing, has the potential to be adaptable to the potentially adverse impacts of climate change whilst at the same time contributing towards a reduction in carbon emissions.
- Encouraging sustainable lifestyles so we all 'live within our means'.
- Ensuring that the principles of sustainable design provide a healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environment for the local community.

### **Preferred Policy Approach 3**

#### **Plan Monitor Manage Option**

Sustainable levels, locations and forms of development will be delivered at a rate which reflects the adequacy of infrastructure and services to meet the needs of the development or along side the ability to provide new or upgraded infrastructure.

Develop an SPD on infrastructure contributions.

### **Preferred Policy Approach 4**

#### **Protecting and Enhancing our Valued Landscapes and Natural Environment**

Develop a detailed borough wide strategy for development which reflects the natural and built environment.

This will help to inform detailed criteria based development control policies and supporting SPDs.

Continue to protect and enhance the Borough's built and natural environment including:

- Nationally protected areas including AONBs, SSSIs and SACs
- Metropolitan Green Belt except if needed to be released to meet any future housing allocations.
- SNCIs and Local Nature Reserves
- Water courses, and flood plains, which may contain important habitats
- Biodiversity of wildlife species and habitats, including locally significant features such as ponds and veteran trees, ancient woodland, protected trees
- Urban Open Land except where a limited release would result in environmental or social improvements on for the area.
- Wildlife corridors and valuable site-specific features such as hedgerows and riverside habitats in line with our preferred option on green infrastructure.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 5**

### **Green Infrastructure**

The Council's preferred option for Green Infrastructure is to:

Ensure that an overarching green infrastructure strategy is established, which would incorporate local open space standards and requirements for developments to contribute towards the delivery of a comprehensive Green Infrastructure network. In particular the strategy would recognise the status of the Borough's regeneration areas and the need to ensure that both existing and new sustainable communities are reserved by a multi-functional Green Infrastructure.

The Council will need to work in partnership with the public, private and voluntary sectors, which will also necessitate achieving a range of targets in relation to:

- Climate change (amelioration and mitigation)
- Access to nature
- Nature Conservation
- Biodiversity
- Health and Well-being

These policies will be supported by SPDs on matters such as local design which is informed by local biodiversity, amenity space, climate change and landscaping.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 6**

### **Sustainable Construction**

The Council's Preferred Approach to Sustainable Construction is to ensure that All development must incorporate sustainable construction features to reduce the consumption of natural resources and to help deliver the Sustainable Community Plan's aims to promote zero and low carbon development and bring about environmental improvements in existing buildings.

New Developments must:

1i:- Up to 2010,

- a. in new homes: achieve the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3
- b. in all non-residential development: a Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) or an equivalent quality assured scheme, assessment must be carried out in order to achieve a Good standard.

1ii:- Between 2010–2013

- a. in new homes: achieve the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4

- b. in all non-residential development: a Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM), or an equivalent quality assured scheme, assessment must be carried out in order to achieve a Very Good Standard

1iii:- Between 2013–2016

- a. in new homes achieve the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5
- b. in all non-residential development: a Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM), or an equivalent quality assured scheme, assessment must be carried out in order to achieve an Excellent Standard

2:- Reduce carbon dioxide emissions through the use of on-site renewable energy technologies at no less than 10% for all new developments.

3:- Be carbon neutral which can be met through a combination of 1) and 2) above, subject to negotiation and agreement by the council any shortfall may be met by financial contributions to enable residual carbon emissions to be offset elsewhere in the Borough.

### **Preferred Policy Approach 7**

#### **Development, Protection of Character and Heritage and Urban Design**

Require Environmentally responsible design and construction practices in the Borough (waste, water, energy, air, adaptation to climate change, biodiversity etc.) including:

- The need for high quality design in all developments
- Proposals will need to demonstrate that the proposal has been laid out and designed to make the best use of the site and its physical characteristics
- A criteria based approach for encouraging stand alone renewable energy schemes; and
- Protecting and enhancing existing areas of biodiversity value and links between them where appropriate.

(To support the policies that are developed a SPD will be developed to provide guidance on design, density and graduated parking standards.)

Preserve to be in accord with conservation area legislation. Conserve and enhance historic features and areas of historic importance and special character, including:

- Listed Buildings (including locally listed);
- Archaeological Sites;
- Historic Gardens;
- Conservation Areas; and
- Identified Special Character Areas

The policies will be explained through SPD guidance such as; local character, examples of good local design, adapting to climate change.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 8**

### **Economy**

Seek to maintain and increase employment growth in the Borough, taking a positive approach to enable small business start-ups and encourage living and working within the Borough. Continue to safeguard suitably located existing employment sites, and encourage new sectors and opportunities to enhance the skills offer, particularly linked to regeneration proposals within Redhill and Horley.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 9**

### **Regional, Town and Local Centres**

Include policies that reinforce the multi-purpose role of regional, town and local centres by retaining and increasing the provision of retail, social, community, housing and leisure uses. Accommodate the majority of comparison retail growth in Redhill Town Centre. Accommodate appropriate trade offs encouraging vitality and viability to aid regeneration in Redhill and Horley Town Centres.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 10**

### **Regeneration**

Encourage Regeneration in Redhill and Horley town centres as a focal point for a mix of uses with high quality environments. Regenerate Preston and Merstham to enhance community facilities and improve the quality of life and environment for residents. Proposals should increase accessibility and incorporate sustainable design.

Include a commitment to produce Area Action Plans or Supplementary Planning Documents for large areas that meet some or all of the following criteria:

- The area is subject to development pressure and rapid change;
- The area suffers from poor environmental quality;
- The area contains communities with problems arising from social disparity.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 11**

### **Housing Delivery**

The Borough will provide its allocated number of new homes between 2006 and 2026, in accordance with the Panel Report (August 2007) into the draft South East Plan requirement and the Borough's New Growth Point status. This is subject to the timely provision of the necessary supporting social and physical infrastructure, and the creation of sustainable mixed communities/neighbourhoods throughout the Borough.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 12**

### **Strategic Location of Housing**

Graduated densities for new housing development taking account of character and whether the location is sustainable.

The spatial strategy will;

- Formulate appropriate housing density ranges for the urban areas in the Borough, taking into account a range of factors (the character of areas, public transport, public services, resource efficiency and environmental impacts).
- Direct higher density residential development to Redhill
- Direct development to regeneration areas
- New neighbourhoods in Horley will be developed according to the allocation in the Borough Local Plan 2005.
- Other sustainable locations in the urban area.

The definition and description of the valued character of an area will inform the specific densities for the borough. How these densities can be achieved in these locations taking account of character will be identified in a SPD or through the Borough Wide Landscape & Townscape Character Assessment as set out in PPS3.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 13**

### **Providing the Appropriate Type and Housing Mix**

Secure the appropriate mix of new housing sizes and types in the Borough to:

- Meet identified shortfalls in different areas; and
- To meet future needs.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 14**

### **Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showmen**

Include policies for groups with special housing needs, including setting out how the Council would consider proposals for Gypsy and Traveller sites and Travelling Showmen sites in the Borough, taking into account the East Surrey Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment joint study.

- Provision will be made for identified sites or permission will be granted for the number of caravan site pitches specified in the South East Plan on sites which meet the requirements of this Preferred Option. In identifying sites, first consideration will be given to limited expansion of existing private sites in the Borough.

- Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers (as defined in Circular 1/06), suitable for mixed residential and commercial use, and sites for Travelling Showpeople will be proposed in the LDF or permitted if all of the following requirements are met:

1.

- a. there is an identified need that cannot reasonably be met on an existing or planned site;
- b. residential amenity is not prejudiced as a result of visual intrusion, excessive noise, lighting, traffic generation or activity at unsocial hours;
- c. the site respects the scale of and does not dominate the nearest settled community;
- d. the site can be adequately accessed by vehicles towing caravans and there is safe pedestrian and cycle access to the site;
- e. the site has reasonable accessible to local shops, medical services, schools and other community facilities on foot, bicycle or public transport, and
- f. in the case of Travelling Showpeople, the site is suitable for the storage of large items of mobile equipment.

2.

- a. There is a presumption against the development of Gypsy and Traveller sites (including Travelling Showpeople) in the Green Belt unless there are very special circumstances.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 15**

### **Affordable Housing**

Include an affordable housing policy that requires:

- New housing developments comprising of 15 dwellings or more to provide at least 40 per cent of housing as affordable;
- For housing developments of less than 15 dwellings, a financial contribution towards affordable housing will be required, so that affordable housing can be provided elsewhere in the Borough.
- These financial contributions will be banded and vary for sites comprising of 0 to 9 dwellings and 10 -14 dwellings.

The target mix of affordable housing shall be a minimum of 50 percent social rented housing; the remainder to be intermediate affordable housing, usually in the form of shared-ownership.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 16**

### **Community Facilities and Infrastructure**

Encourage proposals that would increase the range or improve the quality and accessibility of community and leisure facilities in the Borough, and proposals that provide for a mix of compatible community services on a single site. Encourage the mixed

use of community services including consolidation of different community facilities which would result in better economies of scale.

The loss of existing leisure and community facilities would only be considered within this context or where it can be clearly demonstrated that a need no longer exists.

Secure contributions from new development (both big and small) towards the infrastructure required to meet the needs created by new development.

### **Preferred Policy Approach 17**

#### **Parks and Recreation Improvements and Accessibility**

It is proposed that the Core Strategy commits to review and seek to maintain balanced provision across the borough via joint efforts and improve (where necessary) the quality and accessibility of our parks and play facilities, and to take account of areas of deficiency to seek the provision of open space or the improvement of facilities in existing recreation areas.

### **Preferred Policy Approach 18**

#### **Travel Options**

Improve travel options by enhancing provision for bus, rail, walking, cycling and bridleways. Promote walking and cycling as the preferred travel option for shorter journeys. Enhance public transport interchange facilities in Redhill and Horley Town Centres.

More specifically, the Council will work with Surrey County Council, and other relevant agencies, and require development proposals to achieve the above, including through the use of contributions, Travel Plans and high quality design.

### **Preferred Policy Approach 19**

#### **Accessibility**

Direct development to accessible locations to reduce the need to travel. Seek improvements in highway network to meet all street users' needs, to maximise efficiency of the movement network. Seek to promote non-car travel and enhance accessibility along key corridors and at hubs, in particular promote Redhill/Reigate as a Transport Hub.

More specifically, the Council will work with Surrey County Council, Highways Agency, other relevant agencies, the private sector, requiring development proposals to achieve the above, including through the use of contributions, promoting car sharing/car clubs/car pools and assessing the impact of traffic generated by new development in an accompanying transport assessment/statement.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 20**

### **Parking**

Implement graduated parking standards to allow different levels of off-street and on-street parking provision depending on an area's accessibility to services by walking, cycling and public transport.

Take a more strategic approach to the overall level of provision of parking in Redhill, Reigate and Horley town centres to provide for different types of users.

## **Preferred Policy Approach 21**

### **Aviation**

Support the development, within the Gatwick airport boundary, of facilities which contribute to the safe and efficient operation of the airport as a single runway, two terminal airport only.

Seek to minimise the environmental impact of the existing development at the airport and actively seek to ensure that any further expansion of passenger numbers at the airport at least addresses any environmental effects of such growth as well as trying to claw back additional environmental benefits.

Oppose expansion at Gatwick Airport and intensification of Redhill Aerodrome.

## **12 Delivery and Implementation**

12.1 While indicators and targets will provide a basis for monitoring the implementation of policies in their final form, an important element of the new spatial planning system is delivery. The Council believes it is essential that the Core Strategy includes a framework for investment and partnership working, coordinating delivery to achieve the spatial vision and strategy.

12.2 Work is already underway to assist with the delivery of elements of these preferred options. The Council has been working with key stakeholders such as Surrey County Council, the Primary Care Trust and Raven Housing Association who will play a role in implementing the policies in their final form and identifying funding opportunities. This is part of a joined up approach with other agencies and processes. This will ensure priorities are aligned for effective resource management and coordination. It also assists with clearly identifying mechanisms and commitment where the actions required to implement policy are outside the direct control of the Council. In these cases the Council seeks to identify a reasonable prospect of provision.

12.3 The purpose of this section is to illustrate the delivery mechanisms and point to other information sources such as other organisations investment plans, which are outside the remit of the LDF and will contain more up to date, detailed information. This focuses on the delivery of physical and social infrastructure needed to enable the

development proposed for the area. Good infrastructure planning considers the infrastructure required to support development, costs, sources of funding, timescales for delivery and gaps in funding, to enable prioritisation.

- 12.4 These regeneration initiatives need to be undertaken in a phased and planned approach. The phasing of these projects will need to be determined according to their deliverability. Therefore although the regeneration initiatives represents a spatial approach to undertaking development in the Borough there is a time dimension to this as well. The following diagram shows a simplified timing for the regeneration projects proposed in the Borough.