

*Note – this is an initial Schedule of Matters and Issues to be examined; it is likely that additional issues and questions will arise in advance of the Hearings whilst others may be resolved or refined. Any updated Schedule will be available on the Council’s web site in due course. More than one Matter will be discussed at some Hearing sessions.*

**Hearing 1**

Vision, Objectives and Places – Whole Doc, Section 3.0; 4.0 CS1 – CS5

**Matter 1: With due regard to its means of production, does the Core Strategy (CS) provide the most appropriate spatial strategy for sustainable development within the context of the Borough? Does it contain clear objectives for the plan period in accord with the aims of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 12?**

**Is the evidence in relation to the settlement hierarchy and the intended levels of development robust? Does the evidence support the effectiveness of the CS in these regards?**

1.	What is the relationship between the CS and the SE Plan <sup>1</sup> ? Is the former consistent with the latter? Does the CS reflect adequately the aims of the SEP, for example in relation to sustainable development (Policy CC1), climate change (CC2), resource use (CC3) and sustainable design/construction (CC4)?
2.	What is the evidence supporting the principle of sustainable growth that underpins the CS? How has the CS approach to sustainable development evolved in relation to alternatives? Is the evidence base in support of the chosen strategic approach robust and credible against alternatives? To what extent was a strategy that did not promote growth considered?
3.	To what extent has the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) informed the content of the CS? Is the Council satisfied that the SA adequately summarises or repeats the reasons that were given for rejecting the alternatives at the time when they were ruled out (and that those reasons are still valid)?
4.	Does the SA (NB Appendix 4/5) accurately assess the impacts of Policy CS9/15 in relation to flooding?
5.	Has the production of the Core Strategy followed the Statement of Community Involvement? Has this led to timely, effective and conclusive discussion with key stakeholders on what option(s) for a core strategy are deliverable?
6.	To what extent has the production of the CS followed the LDS <sup>2</sup> ? How does the CS relate to other intended LDF documents, for example the intended Sites Allocation DPD?
7.	Is the CS aligned and coordinated adequately with the Sustainable Community Strategy? Are there areas of discord/omission? Does the CS reflect local distinctiveness adequately?

<sup>1</sup> Regional Spatial Strategy – South East Plan

<sup>2</sup> Local Development Scheme

8.	Is the Equalities Impact Assessment adequate and robust? What methodology has been used in its completion?
9.	Does the CS contain sufficient justification of its policies? Is more explanation needed of how the policies relate to the key objectives identified within Section 3? Do the objectives link the vision with the policies adequately? Is it sufficiently clear how the policies meet the needs of the Borough identified in the course of the CS preparation?
10.	Does the CS acknowledge adequately cross border issues? (Evidence relating to the duty to cooperate?)
11.	Does the CS provide sufficient detail on how much development is intended to happen, where and when?
12.	Are the population growth forecasts robust?
13.	Should the vision recognise to a greater extent the technological industries and potential of the Borough?
14.	Does the CS take a robust approach to growth and the availability of infrastructure? What is the relationship between the CS and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan? Is there a need to cross reference more clearly the provision of necessary infrastructure? ( <i>Note: detailed discussion may be deferred to Hearing 5</i> )
15.	Does CS 1 indicate sufficient attention to matters of sustainability and does it provide a spatial approach in accord with PPS12 2.2-7?
16.	Is sufficient regard and emphasis given to issues of education, heritage and health? ( <i>Note: detailed discussion on these matters to be undertaken at Hearings 2 and 3</i> )
17.	How does the CS seek to address issues of social deprivation?
	<b><u>CS2 Woking</u></b>
18.	Is the approach to Woking compliant with the content of PPS4? To what extent has the strategy relating to retail and town centre development been developed with neighbouring administrative areas?
19.	Is the proposed increase in retail floorspace justified by the evidence base? Is the evidence sufficiently up to date and robust? How does Policy CS2 reflect the options recommended within the Town, District and Local Centres Study? What evidence supports the likely effectiveness (deliverability) of the CS intentions for Woking?
20.	Is the CS approach to retail frontages warranted by the evidence base and sufficiently flexible to be effective? Are street markets referenced adequately within the CS?
21.	Does the CS address issues relating to the evening/night-time economy adequately?
22.	Does the CS take a justified and evidenced approach to transport and transport infrastructure within the town centre? How does the CS relate to the proposed Area Action Plan and how will necessary development be secured?
23.	Does CS2 provide sufficient flexibility for the refurbishment and/or redevelopment of sites within the town centre?

24.	Should the plan include a specific non implementation allowance for development within Woking?
25.	Has the deliverability of town centre developments been considered fully with particular regard to viability and the provision of infrastructure and affordable housing where necessary?
26.	Are development densities of 200 dwellings per hectare (dph) realistic and supported by the evidence base? <i>(Note: Detailed discussion of the evidence will be deferred until Hearing 4 in relation to Housing Policy CS10)</i>
27.	<i>(note discussion on the Woking town centre boundary will be heard in Hearing 5)</i>
	<b><u>CS3 West Byfleet and CS4 Local Centres</u></b>
28.	Is the evidence base in support of the identified centres/parades robust and up to date? Is it consistent with PPS4? Should the Knaphill boundary be altered? Should Knaphill be a District Centre?
29.	Is the Horsell local centre boundary based on robust evidence?
30.	Does the policy address adequately the small scale local provision of shops and services outside of town centres?
	<b><u>CS5 Priority Places</u></b>
31.	Does the evidence indicate that Westfield and Kingfield should be a Priority Place in terms of CS5?
32.	Is the proposed retail space for Sheerwater clear in its intentions so as to be effective in delivery?

**Hearing 2:**

Environmental Considerations      Section 5

Natural Environment – CS6, CS7, CS8, CS9

**Matter 2: Does the CS take a justified and effective approach to issues relating to the Green Belt (GB) and the natural environment which is consistent with national planning policy?**

	<b><u>CS6 Green Belt</u></b>
1.	Is the Council's approach to GB consistent with the advice of PPG2? What evidence underpins the approach advocated within Policy CS6? Should the GB be an area of potential growth?
2.	Is the planned release of GB land for residential development justified by robust evidence and consistent with PPS12 and PPG2? Why is the GB review planned for 2016/17; should this be earlier? Will the CS be effective over the plan period (how will the housing trajectory be managed in relation to GB land release)?
3.	Does the CS approach follow the provisions of SEP Policy LF3? IS the CS consistent with the SEP? Is Woking departing from the intention of potential sustainable urban extensions? Is CS6 sufficiently precise so as to be effective? Does the available evidence support a reference to land availability to the south of Woking?
4.	How will sites within the GB be identified for release for residential development? Before or after the GB Review and the Sites Allocation SPD?
5.	Should Westfield be considered 'urban' (as per Proposals map) or 'semi rural' as in Dev. Plan? Should the areas identified for growth specifically exclude Conservation Areas, flood plains etc?
6.	Is CS6 consistent in its aims to protect the GB whilst releasing elements for development?
7.	Is the delineation of the GB upon the proposals map accurate?
8.	With due regard to the advice of PPG2, is the McLaren group headquarters a Major Developed Site within the GB? Why is the Carters Lane Sewage Treatment works (and others) a major developed site? Should major development within greenbelt designation of Carters Lane Sewage works be more tightly identified?
9.	Will areas of GB lost to development be compensated under the terms of policy CS17?
	<b><u>CS7 Biodiversity and CS8 Special Protection Areas (SPA)</u></b>
10.	To what extent is the content of PPS9, particularly paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 satisfied by the Core Strategy? How are matters relating to geological conservation evidenced and resolved within the CS? How are issues of biodiversity intended to be addressed in other parts of the Local Development Framework (LDF)?

11.	What evidence justifies the chosen approach to biodiversity and nature conservation? How has this drawn upon the advice of PPS9 and its Practice Guide? How has the evidence base been used in the production of the CS? Is the role of Biodiversity Opportunity Areas referenced adequately within Policy CS7?
12.	What is the process of evaluating and creating/retaining/ de-designating SNCI <sup>3</sup> s? How does this relate to the CS?
13.	Is the supporting Habitats Regulation Assessment adequate?
14.	Does the CS take a robust and justified approach to biodiversity issues, particularly in relation to the Thames Basin Heath SPA? Is CS8 consistent with SEP NRM6? Will CS8 provide adequate policy direction with regard to the Thames Basin Heath SPA? Is there evidence that reasonable mitigation measures can be employed in the event residential development occurs? (Adequacy of SANG over the plan period)
15.	Is Natural England content with the CS and specifically CS8?
16.	Does the proposed change at para 5.25 represent sufficient recognition of the role of trees within the natural environment?
	<b><u>CS9 Flooding</u></b>
17.	Is the CS compliant with the content of PPS25 and associated guidance?
18.	Are matters relating to surface water run off from all forms (not just significant) of development resolved adequately by the CS?
19.	Is there adequate reference to the Water Framework Directive?
	<b><u>Other</u></b>
20.	To what extent has the Council considered the content of PPS23, including Appendix A, in the production of the CS?
21.	Are matters relating to waste management dealt with adequately within the CS and is this in line with the advice of PPS10 and its Companion Guide?

<sup>3</sup> Sites of Nature Conservation Importance

Built Environment – CS17, CS20, CS21, CS22, CS23, CS24

***Matter 3: Is the approach of the CS to design justified by the evidence base, consistent with national planning policy and the most appropriate strategy when considered against alternatives within the context of Woking? Has sufficient regard been had to the historic environment?***

	<b><u>CS 20 Heritage</u></b>
1.	Is the CS consistent with the advice of PPS5 and its Practice Guide? Is sufficient regard and emphasis given to heritage matters?
2.	What evidence base underpins the approach of the CS towards heritage matters? How has any Historic Environment Record been drawn upon? Does the evidence include all designated heritage assets? Is the evidence adequate and robust (up to date)?
3.	How will heritage assets be assessed and protected over the lifespan of the plan? How are archaeological assets to be referenced and protected? Should CS20 refer to designated and non designated heritage assets?
	<b><u>CS 21 Design</u></b>
4.	How will the CS lead to the design of new development that will be of an appropriate standard which satisfies the objectives of, amongst other considerations, PPS 1?
5.	How will tall buildings be managed throughout the borough? Is a specific reference/policy warranted?
6.	Should there be greater reference upon the existing Character Study of the borough?
7.	Is there any evidence to support the need for detailed residential design advice, including house/room sizes?
	<b><u>CS22 Sustainable Construction</u></b>
8.	Are the references to the Code for Sustainable Homes justified? With due regard to issues of viability, is policy CS22 justified by a robust evidence base and will it be effective in relation to both greenfield and brownfield development sites?
9.	Are issues of land contamination, remediation and water quality acknowledged sufficiently by the CS?
10.	Should the CS incorporate specific reference to the approach of the Council to energy conservation, particularly with regard to existing buildings?
11.	What consideration has been given to the inclusion of specific measures/targets to secure a proportion of renewable energy production upon new developments in line with the advice of PPS22?
	<b><u>CS23 Renewable and low carbon energy generation</u></b>
12.	What evidence supports the need for Policy CS23?

13.	What is the purpose of Table 6 in the context of CS 23? Can the DECC Review of Renewable and Decentralised Energy Potential in SE England inform the CS to a more specific extent?
14.	Does policy CS23 have sufficient ambition? Will it be effective?
	<b><u>CS24 Landscape and townscape</u></b>
15.	What evidence underpins the policy? Should the Character Study be explicitly referenced? How will landscape impact be assessed in the absence of a Landscape Character Assessment?
16.	Should there be a reference to the role of trees and soft landscaping within the policy?

DRAFT

**Hearing 3**

Economic Development, Transport and Infrastructure

Section 5 CS15, CS16, CS18, CS19

***Matter 4: Does the CS provide the most appropriate and sufficiently comprehensive strategy towards the economy with due regard to cross border issues? Is the approach evidenced adequately with due regard to PPS4? Will the approach be effective, particularly with regard to flexibility?***

***Matter 5: Does the CS take a robust approach towards infrastructure provision in support of the CS objectives?***

***Matter 6: Is the advocated approach to sustainable transport the most appropriate strategy within the context of the Borough? Does the evidence support sufficiently the premise that the approach will be effective?***

	<b><u>CS 15 Economy</u></b>
1.	To what extent is the content of PPS4 in particular satisfied by the Core Strategy? Has consideration been given within the CS to a specific level of job creation over the plan period?
2.	Has the location and role of employment areas been assessed adequately? Is the evidence in support of the CS approach to employment land retention and release robust (is the CS consistent with the findings of the Employment Land Review)? Does the CS address the issue of warehousing and storage space within the Borough adequately?
3.	What evidence supports the range of uses envisaged in the identified employment areas?
4.	Does the policy/CS cater adequately for micro SMEs?
5.	Is CS 15 sufficiently flexible, particularly in relation to Broadoaks in West Byfleet?
6.	For reasons of effectiveness, should the CS include a specific reference to the role of McLaren within the Borough?
7.	To what extent has the CS considered the role of tourism within the local economy?
8.	How are issues relating to advertisements to be addressed within the CS and the LDF? <i>How will Local Economic Partnerships be developed and reflected within the CS?</i>
	<b><u>CS 16 Infrastructure</u></b>
9.	How will infrastructure requirements be identified and delivered in an effective manner over the plan period?
10.	Is the CS definition of infrastructure in relation to both CS16 and CS19 adequate and robust?
11.	Is the CS sufficiently flexible in terms of securing obligations in advance of CIL?



12.	What evidence indicates the adequacy of the sewerage system to cater for existing and planned development within the borough over the plan period? How will deficiencies be identified and resolved in a timely manner?
13.	How will the CS seek to balance the demand for water supplies across the Borough over the plan period (as identified in the SA)?
	<b><u>CS17 Open space and CS19 Social and Community Infrastructure</u></b>
14.	To what extent does the evidence base accord with the advice of PPG17 and its Companion Guide? Is the evidence base sufficiently up to date and robust (is any new evidence available/in production)?
15.	What are the open space needs of the Borough and how will they be satisfied? How will deficiencies be resolved? Does the CS take an adequate approach to issues of open space (including hierarchy/type)? Is the evidence in support adequate?
16.	What constitutes enhancement of open space? How will delivery be monitored?
17.	How will allotments be protected and increased in number across the borough?
18.	How will the CS address effectively the provision and development of Green Infrastructure at a strategic level?
19.	Is the evidence base that informs Policy CS19 adequate and robust? How will issues relating to the adequacy of service provision be addressed within the Borough, for example libraries?
20.	Are the roles and needs of faith groups recognised adequately within the CS?
21.	Are educational needs evidenced adequately and addressed suitably within the CS? Does adequate school pupil capacity exist for the plan period?
22.	Are the interests of the arts and cultural facilities addressed adequately?
23.	What evidence exists to demonstrate that issues of health are addressed adequately within the CS?
24.	Does the CS seek to address matters of electronic communication and supporting infrastructure adequately?
25.	Are matters relating to Woking Football Club addressed adequately?
	<b><u>CS 18 Transport</u></b>
26.	Is the evidence in support of the CS robust and is it consistent with the advice of PPS4, PPG 13 Transport et al? Does the CS maintain consistency with the Transport chapter of the SEP?
27.	Is there sufficient clarity within the CS as to how its transport objectives will be delivered? (Relationship to Surrey Transport Plan, other LDF documents and the work of other stakeholders, including Transport for Woking? Applicability of the need for Transport Assessments? )

28.	Does the CS give suitable priority to means of transport other than the private car?
29.	Does the CS address matters of countryside recreation and the use of footpaths/cycleways adequately?
30.	Is the CS approach to car parking warranted by the evidence base and consistent with national planning policy?
31.	Does Woking Railway Station have adequate capacity to deal with the development growth envisaged by the CS?
32.	Should there be a reference to Airtrack within the CS?
33.	Does the CS safeguard adequately land for future transport infrastructure (eg Transport Interchange)? Are there any implications for the proposals map?
34.	Are matters relating to necessary transport infrastructure over the plan period addressed adequately within the CS and its supporting evidence?

DRAFT

**Hearing 4**

Housing Section 5 CS10, CS11, CS12, CS13, CS14

**Matter 7: Is the Core Strategy’s approach to housing provision sufficiently justified and consistent with national planning policy such as found within Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS 3)? With particular regard to deliverability, will the Core Strategy be effective in meeting the varied housing needs of the Borough over the plan period?**

1.	Is the evidence base in support of the housing policies robust and credible? How does this relate to the PPS3 and its associated guidance? To what extent is the content of PPS1 and 3 particularly satisfied by the Core Strategy? How has the CS been informed by, and is consistent with, the Council’s Housing Strategy?
2.	Is the latest SHLAA <sup>4</sup> robust? <i>(to include: what extent was a joint SHLAA with neighbouring authorities considered? Why was the site size threshold set at 6 units? Should the net increase in housing from sub-divisions be considered in the overall housing supply figures? Why are net housing increases from small sites only included in the overall housing supply figures for the last 5 years of the plan period? Were assumptions made as regards the potential impact of CIL<sup>5</sup>?)</i>
3.	To what extent, and in what ways, was the chosen spatial distribution of housing considered against alternatives? Is the spatial distribution of intended housing over the plan period clear?
4.	Does the Council have a demonstrable housing land supply consistent with PPS3? Is the intended release of Green Belt deliverable? What reliance is made upon windfalls?
5.	How will matters relating to housing design be addressed to meet the aims of PPS3 et al?
	<b><u>CS10 Housing</u></b>
6.	Is the number of new homes consistently stated in CS? Are the house prices up to date in Para 2.14? Should current ONS stats be used?
7.	What is the primary evidence to support the housing distribution identified in CS10? Is the evidence base robust? (to include 2007 Fordham’s Research Paper) Can the required housing trajectory be delivered? Is the proposed approach to housing supply adequate and reasonable when considered against the evidence of need?
8.	Is the policy sufficiently flexible to enable different density and housing mixes?
9.	Is the policy on Green Belt (GB) release robust and effective?
10.	Are the indicative density ranges deliverable when considered against the required housing mix of the Borough?

<sup>4</sup> Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

<sup>5</sup> Community Infrastructure Levy

11.	Where is the evidence that the town centre can support 200dph to meet the target of 2300 dwellings? Will this be the required type of housing?
12.	Is there sufficient flexibility within Policy CS10? Particularly in relation to potential non-implementation? Should a non-implementation figure of 10% be applied?
13.	Is the annual housing figure an indicative minimum target? Is the figure too low? To what extent have alternatives been considered?
14.	Is housing at Moorlane and Brookwood Farm justified by the evidence base? Is it deliverable?
	<b><u>CS 11 Housing Mix</u></b>
15.	Is the policy sufficiently flexible to cater appropriately for specialist housing schemes such as care homes?
16.	Does the CS plan adequately and upon a robust evidence base for the projected increased proportion of elderly within the population?
17.	How will the aims of para 5.72 be realised? Is this supported by evidence? Consistent with CS 13?
18.	How will the delivery of necessary family housing be secured and managed?
	<b><u>CS12 Affordable Housing</u></b>
19.	To what extent is the CS approach to the total provision of affordable housing justified by the evidence base? How much affordable housing (and of what size/tenure mix) is required and how will it be delivered? Are the thresholds justified? Should the affordable housing target be greater than 35%? <i>Issues to be covered include: Are housing waiting lists increasing or decreasing? Does the policy address social deprivation adequately? Does the policy reflect the Council's Housing and Community Strategies?</i>
20.	Are issues of development viability recognised adequately? Are the assumptions of the Viability Assessment unrealistic (market conditions; CSH level 4 not 5)? Will development be deliverable?
21.	Is the proposed change to para 5.83 clear?
22.	Is 'affordable' adequately defined and consistent with PPS3? Are the tenure splits justified by the evidence base? Is there adequate detail with regard to the need and intended supply of dwelling house sizes – is this consistent with the evidence base?
23.	How will the off-site provision of affordable housing be managed? Is the intended approach justified?
24.	What is the evidence base in support of enabling the payment of commuted sums for alternative provision elsewhere? Will the potential for off site affordable housing provision lead to an unbalanced proportion of affordable housing on the alternative site? Is this element of policy warranted by the evidence base?
25.	Is the 50% requirement for affordable housing on greenfield sites warranted by the evidence base? Why should land in public ownership be treated differently? Is this justified and effective? Will 50% target for affordable housing on greenfield be

	ineffective in terms of stymied delivery?
26.	Is para 5.89 inflexible?
27.	Is the policy clear with regard to affordable housing and non residential development schemes? Is this approach supported by robust evidence?
28.	Should the issue of RSL <sup>6</sup> rents be addressed within the CS?
	<b><u>CS Policy CS13</u></b>
29.	What is the need for accommodation to serve older people and vulnerable groups? What is the evidence to justify 3 <sup>rd</sup> para of CS13?
30.	Does CS13 cater adequately for the leisure and service needs of an ageing population?
	<b><u>CS14 Gypsy and Travellers</u></b>
31.	Is the evidence for gypsy/traveller pitches robust? Is the 'pitch' requirement justified?
32.	Is the Council's approach consistent with the SEP and Circular 1/06?

---

<sup>6</sup> Registered Social Landlords

**Hearing 5**

Delivery and Monitoring

Whole CS, inc. Sections 5 and 6

**Matter 8: Does the CS address adequately the provision of necessary infrastructure to support the delivery of the strategic objectives? Are the Core Strategy's monitoring targets justified adequately and of a level of detail that is appropriate to a Core Strategy? How will the effectiveness of the CS be managed?**

1.	To what extent is the content of PPS1, 4, 12, 25 et al satisfied by the Core Strategy with regard to implementation and monitoring? Are the arrangements for managing and monitoring the delivery of the Core Strategy clear and will they be effective?
2.	Are the targets and monitoring proposed related adequately to the Policy objectives? How will the effectiveness of the CS and its individual policies be measured/assessed? What are the monitoring indicators for each policy; do these relate to the policy content and objectives? How will the effective delivery of the CS be managed?
3.	Is there sufficient clarity regarding how, when and where necessary infrastructure will be provided (and by whom)?
4.	Should the CS include clearer timescales to assist monitoring, thereby providing milestones to assess policy effectiveness?
5.	How will the Community Infrastructure Levy be managed within the Borough and what implications does it have for the delivery of the Core Strategy?
6.	Does the CS provide adequate clarity upon the issue of water and wastewater infrastructure delivery?
7.	How are matters relating to waste intended to be resolved?
8.	Have risks and contingency been robustly addressed in the production of the CS? (evidence?)
9.	Impact of spending review and reduction in public expenditure? How has reduction in govt expenditure been reflected within the CS?
10.	Where is there a list of relevant 'saved' development plan policies?
<b><u>Proposals Map (PM)</u></b>	
11.	Do the changes to the proposals map reflect the CS adequately? Are the changes proposed to the PM sufficiently clear and comprehensive?
12.	Is the PM a Submissions Proposal Map – compliant with Regulation 30?
13.	Is the site to rear of 103/109A High St to be included on PM as a result of CS?
14.	Should the PM reflect issues of flood risk? Is the submitted approach compliant with the advice of PPS12?
15.	How will the PM be altered to reflect Highway Improvement Schemes that will not be pursued?
16.	Is 63-75 Commercial Way a primary or secondary retail frontage?

17.	<i>Is the Woking town centre boundary shown accurately upon the proposals map and justified by the evidence base?</i>
-----	---

DRAFT