

Agenda

1. 10.00am Welcome and Introductions
2. Factual updates and clarifications (as necessary)
3. Focus for Discussion: Vision, Objectives and Places

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?

i.	What is the relationship between the CS and the SE Plan ¹ ? 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)?
ii.	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?
iii.	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)?
iv.	Does the SA (NB Appendix 4/5) accurately assess the impacts of Policy CS9/15 in relation to flooding?
v.	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?
vi.	To what extent has the production of the CS followed the LDS ² ? How does the CS relate to other intended LDF documents, for example the intended Sites Allocation DPD?
vii.	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?
viii.	Is the Equalities Impact Assessment adequate and robust? What methodology has been used in its completion?
ix.	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?
x.	Does the CS acknowledge adequately cross border issues? (Evidence relating to the duty to cooperate?)
xi.	Does the CS provide sufficient detail on how much development is intended to happen, where and when?
xii.	Are the population growth forecasts robust?
xiii.	Should the vision recognise to a greater extent the technological industries and

¹ Regional Spatial Strategy – South East Plan

² Local Development Scheme

Woking Borough Council Core Strategy Examination **ID/7**
Hearing Session 1 20th March 2012

	potential of the Borough?
xiv.	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>
xv.	Does CS 1 indicate sufficient attention to matters of sustainability and does it provide a spatial approach in accord with PPS12 2.2-7?
xvi.	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>
xvii.	How does the CS seek to address issues of social deprivation?
	<u>CS2 Woking</u>
xviii.	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?
xix.	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?
xx.	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?
xxi.	Does the CS address issues relating to the evening/night-time economy adequately?
xxii.	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?
xxiii.	Does CS2 provide sufficient flexibility for the refurbishment and/or redevelopment of sites within the town centre?
xxiv.	Should the plan include a specific non implementation allowance for development within Woking?
xxv.	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?
xxvi.	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>
xxvii.	<i>(note discussion on the Woking town centre boundary will be heard in Hearing 5)</i>
	<u>CS3 West Byfleet and CS4 Local Centres</u>
xxviii.	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?
xxix.	Is the Horsell local centre boundary based on robust evidence?
xxx.	Does the policy address adequately the small scale local provision of shops and services outside of town centres?
	<u>CS5 Priority Places</u>
xxxi.	Does the evidence indicate that Westfield and Kingfield should be a Priority Place in terms of CS5?
xxxii.	Is the proposed retail space for Sheerwater clear in its intentions so as to be effective in delivery?

4. Other Matters

5. Close