

## PAS LOCAL PLAN ROUTE MAPPER TOOLKIT PART 1: LOCAL PLAN REVIEW ASSESSMENT

### Why you should use this part of the toolkit

The following matrix **will assist you in undertaking a review of policies within your plan to assess whether they need updating.**

The matrix is intended to supplement the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (NPPF) 2021 (paragraph 33 in particular) and the associated [National Planning Practice Guidance](#) on the review of policies within the plan. Completing the matrix will help you understand which policies may be out of date for the purposes of decision making or where circumstances may have changed and whether or not the policy / policies in the plan continue to be effective in addressing the specific local issues that are identified the plan. This in turn will then help you to focus on whether and to what extent, an update of your policies is required. We would recommend that you undertake this assessment even if your adopted local plan already contains a trigger for review which has already resulted in you knowing that it needs to be updated. This is because there may be other policies within the plan which should be, or would benefit from, being updated.

**This, Part 1 of the toolkit deals with local plan review.**

Part 2 of the toolkit sets out the content requirements for a local plan as set out in the NPPF.

Part 3 of the toolkit outlines the process requirements for plan preparation set out in legislation and the NPPF.

Part 4 of the toolkit deals with Soundness and Plan Quality issues.

### How to use this part of the toolkit

Before using this assessment tool it is important that you first consider your existing plan against the key requirements for the content of local plans which are included in the [Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 \(as amended\)](#); [The Town and Country Planning \(Local Planning\) \(England\) Regulations 2012 \(as amended\)](#) and the most up to date [NPPF](#), [PPG](#), **Written Ministerial Statements** and the [National Model Design Code](#).

To help you with this **Part 2 of the toolkit** provides a checklist which sets out the principal requirements for the content and form of local plans against the relevant paragraphs of the [NPPF](#).

Completing **Part 2 of the toolkit** will help you determine the extent to which your current plan does or does not accord with relevant key requirements in national policy. **This will assist you in completing question 1 in the assessment matrix provided below**, and in deciding whether or not you need to update policies in your plan, and to what extent.

To use the matrix, consider each of the statements listed in the “requirements to consider” column against the content of your current plan. You will need to take into consideration policies in all development plan documents that make up your development plan, including any ‘made’ neighbourhood plans and/ or any adopted or emerging Strategic Development Strategy. For each statement decide whether you:  
Disagree (on the basis that your plan does not meet the requirement at all);  
Agree (on the basis that you are confident that your current plan will meet the requirement)

Some prompts are included to help you think through the issues and support your assessment. You may wish to add to these reflecting on your own context.

Complete all sections of the matrix as objectively and fully as possible. Provide justification for your conclusions with reference to relevant sources of evidence where appropriate. You will need an up to date Authority Monitoring Report, your latest Housing Delivery Test results, 5 year housing land supply position, any local design guides or codes and the latest standard methodology housing needs information. You may also need to rely on or update other sources of evidence but take a proportionate approach to this. It should be noted that any decision not to update any policies in your local plan will need to be clearly evidenced and justified.

## How to use the results of this part of the toolkit

The completed assessment can also be used as the basis for, or as evidence to support, any formal decision of the council in accordance with its constitution or in the case of, for example, Joint Planning Committees, the relevant Terms of Reference in relation to the approach to formal decision-making, as to why an update to the local plan is or is not being pursued. This accords with national guidance and supports the principle of openness and transparency of decision making by public bodies.

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement
<b>A</b>	<b>PLAN REVIEW FACTORS</b>		
<b>A1.</b>	<p><b>The plan policies still reflect current national planning policy requirements.</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b> As set out above in the introductory text, in providing your answer to this statement consider if the policies in your plan still meet the ‘content’ requirements of the current NPPF, PPG, Written Ministerial Statements and the National Model Design Code (completing Part 2 of the toolkit will help you determine the extent to which the policies in your plan accord with relevant key requirements in national policy).</p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence):</b></p> <p>The consistency of each local plan core strategy policy with current national policy (NPPF and any relevant Written Ministerial Statements) has been assessed and set out by Core Strategy policy in the Local Plan Core Strategy Review provided at Annex 1 of the March 2024 report to Council.</p> <p>As the Borough’s local plan is not a single Local Plan, but rather its Core Strategy provides the strategic planning policies for the Borough (the detailed development management policies and site allocation policies being subsequently provided in the Development Management Plan 2019), and with the toolkit not having been updated to reflect the 2023 NPPF updates, the Council has found that it is not useful in this situation to complete Part 2 of the PAS Toolkit.</p> <p>The elements of the PAS Toolkit Part 2 that relate to the content of strategic local plans, along with their Dec 2023 NPPF paragraph references, are included in the local plan Review itself, provided at Annex 1.</p> <p>The Council has also adopted has a variety of guidance documents in the past few years which provide detail on application of local plan policies.</p> <p>A draft Design Code SPD for a large area of the centre Borough (the draft of which has been subject to consultation) is based on</p>

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
			<p>the National Design Code.</p> <p>With regards consideration of Section A1 of this Toolkit, we note that the PPG is not policy but guidance and the “soundness” requirement for local plans, as set out in NPPF paragraph 35, is to be consistent with national policy ..”<i>the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant</i>”.</p> <p>Whilst the guidance provided in the PPG has been considered, where relevant in the local plan review, this does not necessarily determine whether a policy remains consistent with national policy, but can assist in considering whether it is.</p>
<b>A2.</b>	<p><b>There has not been a <u>significant</u> change in local housing need numbers from that specified in your plan (accepting there will be some degree of flux).</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b> Look at whether your local housing need figure, using the standard methodology as a starting point, has gone up significantly (with the measure of significance based on a comparison with <b>the housing requirement</b> set out in your adopted local plan).</p> <p>Consider whether your local housing need figure has gone down significantly (with the measure of significance based on a comparison with the housing requirement set out in your adopted local plan).</p> <p>You will need to consider if there is robust evidence to demonstrate that your current housing requirement is deliverable in terms of market capacity or if it supports, for example, growth strategies such as Housing Deals, new</p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</b></p> <p>Question A2 relates to whether <b>local housing need</b> has changed significantly, and NOT as suggested by the prompt whether local housing need has changed compared to “<b>the housing requirement set out in your adopted local plan</b>”).</p> <p>In the case of RBBC’s Core Strategy, the local housing <b>requirement</b> specified in the plan is a constrained needs figure as referred to in NPPF paragraph 11, footnote 7.</p> <p>NPPF Dec 2023 paragraph 33, and PPG (Plan Making: Plan reviews; Paragraph Reference 61-062-20190315; Revision date: 15 03 2019) both refer to where “housing <b>need</b>” has changed significantly, and NOT the local plan housing requirement.</p> <p>NPPF Paragraph 33 specifies that “Relevant strategic policies will need updating at least once every five years if their applicable</p>

Annex 3: PAS Toolkit Part 1: LP Review - To support Reigate & Banstead local plan Core Strategy Review, March 2024

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
	<p>strategic infrastructure investment or formal agreements to meet unmet need from neighbouring authority areas.</p>		<p><b>local housing need figure</b> has changed significantly; and they are likely to require earlier review if local housing need is expected to change significantly in the near future.”</p> <p>As “significant” in this context has not been defined, it is for each local authority to decide whether its local housing need has changed significantly.</p> <p>Through the local plan Core Strategy Review 2024, the Council has robustly demonstrated that the Borough’s local housing need has not changed significantly (644 compared to between “600 and 640” referenced in the Core Strategy Inspector’s Report ).</p> <p>Even if the uncapped figure of 1,123 were to be used, it is still not significantly different from the 933 anticipated in the later years of the plan period.</p> <p>The Council’s annually published Housing Monitors demonstrates that the current local plan housing requirement is consistently deliverable through the whole of the plan period.</p> <p>As identified in the PAS Local Plan Route Mapper, “failure to deliver new homes is <i>the single matter most likely to trigger the need for a review of policies and update of a local plan. Failure to keep your housing need requirement under regular review, or to achieve delivery of the housing need requirement in an existing local plan can significantly hamper efforts to maintain a plan-led system.</i>”</p> <p>As demonstrated through regular local plan monitoring, summarised in the LP Review, the Council has a good record of housing delivery, cumulatively achieving delivery over the</p>

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
			<p>annualised average minimum Local Plan housing requirement.</p> <p>The evidence is that the local plan housing requirement is deliverable.</p>
<b>A3.</b>	<p><b>You have a 5-year supply of housing land</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b> Review your 5-year housing land supply in accordance with national guidance including planning practice guidance and the Housing Delivery Test measurement rule book</p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">2023 Housing Monitor</a> concludes that as at 1 April 2023, the current supply of deliverable sites (which includes a windfall allowance) against its adopted minimum local plan housing requirement is equivalent to 7.80 years, thus significantly exceeding the 5-year requirement.</p> <p>Since the Council adopted its Core Strategy in July 2014, it has consistently maintained a five-year land supply and there have been no appeals allowed based on successful challenges to this position since adoption of the Core Strategy.</p>
<b>A4.</b>	<p><b>You are meeting housing delivery targets</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b> Use the results of your most recent Housing Delivery Test, and if possible, try and forecast the outcome of future Housing Delivery Test findings.</p> <p>Consider whether these have/are likely to trigger the requirement for the development of an action plan or trigger the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Consider the reasons for this and whether you need to review the site allocations that your plan is reliant upon. In doing so you need to make a judgement as to whether updating your local plan will support delivery or whether there are other actions needed which are not dependent on</p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p>Reigate &amp; Banstead Borough’s most recent Housing Delivery Test (HDT) performance (19 December 2023) is 168%, which reflects significant delivery above the local plan minimum housing requirement over the past rolling three-year period. As a result, there is no specific action or penalty, such as “action plan or trigger the presumption in favour” required to be taken by the Council.</p> <p>The Council’s Housing Monitor, published on line in June each year, sets out a 5-year supply of deliverable sites for the year and also a predicted supply of deliverable sites for the following year, sufficient to meet the Council’s housing requirement, as required by DMP Policy MLS1 ‘Managing Land Supply’ applying Core</p>

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
	changes to the local plan.		Strategy Policy CS13.
<b>A5.</b>	<p><b>Your plan policies are on track to deliver other plan objectives including any</b></p> <p><b>(i) affordable housing targets including requirements for First Homes; and</b></p> <p><b>(ii) commercial floorspace / jobs targets over the remaining plan period.</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b> Use (or update) your Authority Monitoring Report to assess delivery.</p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p>The Council's Housing Monitor, published online annually in June confirms that the cumulative target over the plan period to date (1,100 affordable homes at an annualised average of 100 per year) has been exceeded, as to date 1,129 additional affordable homes have been completed within the Borough.</p> <p>The total plan period target for additional affordable homes is 1,500 units between 2012-2027. The Council is on-track to have these provided in the Borough by 2027.</p> <p><a href="https://reigate-banstead.gov.uk/housing-delivery-monitor-and-trajectory-plan-monitoring">Housing Delivery Monitor and Trajectory   Plan Monitoring   Reigate and Banstead (reigate-banstead.gov.uk)</a></p> <p>Following the 24 May 2021 Affordable Homes Update WMS , the Council produced a '<a href="#">First Homes Interim Policy Statement</a>' the policy requirements and local eligibility criteria of which were noted by the Council's Planning Committee (Item 10 of Planning Committee 8<sup>th</sup> June 2022). (Since referenced in the NPPF December 2023 at paragraph 6 and footnote 36).</p> <p>As a tenure of intermediate affordable housing, the Council has secured First Homes as flats in Redhill town centre, but its application in the Borough is limited by the discounted price cap of £250,000, and other eligibility criteria (first time buyer, cap on income). Given inflation, cost of living increases, and changes in mortgage availability since the national First Homes policy was introduced, as well as reduction in the mortgage products offered, this type of affordable housing has not been delivered to the degree envisaged by central government, but has otherwise by agreement with developers, been provided as other intermediate</p>

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
			<p>affordable housing products such as shared ownership.</p> <p>Local plan Core Strategy Policy CS8 sets out the commercial floorspace requirements and outlines how these are being met over the plan period.</p>
<b>A6.</b>	<p><b>There have been no significant changes in economic conditions which could challenge the delivery of the Plan, including the policy requirements within it.</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b> A key employer has shut down or relocated out of the area.</p> <p>Unforeseen events (for example the Covid-19 Pandemic) are impacting upon the delivery of the plan.</p> <p>Up-to-date evidence suggests that jobs growth is likely to be significantly more or less than is currently being planned for.</p> <p>Consider if there is any evidence suggesting that large employment allocations will no longer be required or are no longer likely to be delivered.</p> <p>You will need to consider whether such events impact on assumptions in your adopted local plan which have led to a higher housing requirement than your local housing need assessment indicates.</p> <p>Consider what the consequences could be for your local plan objectives such as the balance of in and out commuting and the resultant impact on proposed transport infrastructure provision (both capacity and viability), air quality or climate change considerations.</p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</b></p> <p>As summarised in the local plan Core Strategy review, the employment needs identified within the Core Strategy are to be met predominantly through intensification of existing employment land.</p> <p>The only large employment allocation in the current local plan is in the DMP, as the Core Strategy does not allocate sites</p> <p>Site allocation Policy ‘HOR9: Horley Strategic Business Park’ was allocated to reduce out commuting from Horley to London, provide for a proportion of the Borough’s strategic office need, as well as approximately 75% of Crawley Borough’s unmet business floorspace needs for that plan period.</p> <p>Site allocation HOR9 does not result in an increased need for housing, as it is allocated to reducing commuting from Horley and surrounding areas into London, and to meet much of Crawley Borough’s strategic employment needs.</p> <p>The Council commissioned a study of employment land needs in 2020 to inform the drafting of a Supplementary Planning Document. The ‘<i>Horley Strategic Business Park Economic and Market Assessment</i>’, Feb 2021, by Chilmark Consulting was</p>



	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
			published on the Council’s website and is available using this <a href="#">weblink</a> . It considered the impact of Brexit and the 2020/22 pandemic. The delivery of the strategic employment site allocated by the local plan (part 2) Development Management Plan is currently paused due to the Gatwick Airport DCO application.
<b>A7.</b>	<p><b>There have been no significant changes affecting viability of planned development.</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b> You may wish to look at the Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) All-in Tender Price Index, used for the indexation of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), or other relevant indices to get a sense of market changes.</p> <p>Consider evidence from recent planning decisions and appeal decisions to determine whether planning policy requirements, including affordable housing, are generally deliverable.</p> <p>Ongoing consultation and engagement with the development industry may highlight any significant challenges to delivery arising from changes in the economic climate.</p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</b></p> <p>We note that in 2020 the CIL indexing changed from the ‘All-in Tender Price Index’ published from time to time by the Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) to RICS’s ‘CIL Index’.</p> <p>We have considered the development viability in some detail both in preparation of the Council’s CIL Charging Schedule and in considering the viability of DMP policies and site allocations.</p> <p>Given the record of development in the Borough, particularly of housing development including affordable housing, we are satisfied that, notwithstanding the current higher interest rates and lending, overall changes in development viability since the Core Strategy was examined are within the normal range to be expected across an economic cycle, and are not stifling development.</p>

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
<b>A8.</b>	<p><b>Key site allocations are delivering, or on course to deliver, in accordance the local plan policies meaning that the delivery of the spatial strategy is not at risk.</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b></p> <p>Identify which sites are central to the delivery of your spatial strategy. Consider if there is evidence to suggest that lack of progress on these sites (individually or collectively) may prejudice the delivery of housing numbers, key infrastructure or other spatial priorities.</p> <p>Sites may be deemed to be key by virtue of their scale, location or type in addition to the role that may have in delivering any associated infrastructure.</p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</b></p> <p>The key Core Strategy policy relating to allocating land for development is Policy CS6. The Core Strategy does not itself allocate sites, but rather sets out (in Policies CS6 and CS8) broad sustainable areas for development, subject to allocations of sites in the subsequent Development Management Plan (DMP).</p> <p>As outlined in the LP CS Review 2024, housing delivery is exceeding the minimum annualised average. There are no key urban sites allocated in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Monitoring shows that the spatial strategy established in Policy CS6 remains robust, and that the sustainable urban extensions are still not needed to ensure a 5-year housing land supply.</p> <p>As summarised in the annually published Housing Monitor, the sustainable urban extension sites referred to in Policy CS6(3), and allocated by the DMP, do not yet need to be released to deliver the spatial strategy as set out under Policy CS13, to maintain a 5-year housing land supply of deliverable sites and a predicted 5-year supply for the following (and the subsequent Development Management Policy MLS1).</p> <p>The delivery of Horley Strategic Business Park allocated by the local plan (part 2) Development Management Plan Policy HOR9 is currently paused due to the Gatwick Airport DCO application.</p>
<b>A9.</b>	<p><b>There have been no significant changes to the local environmental or heritage context which have implications for the local plan approach or policies.</b></p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</b></p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the DMP sites</p>

Annex 3: PAS Toolkit Part 1: LP Review - To support Reigate & Banstead local plan Core Strategy Review, March 2024

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
	<p><b>PROMPT:</b> You may wish to review the indicators or monitoring associated with your Sustainability Appraisal (SA) / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) / Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).</p> <p>Identify if there have been any changes in Flood Risk Zones, including as a result of assessing the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Consider whether there have been any changes in air quality which has resulted in the designation of an Air Quality Management Area(s) or which would result in a likely significant effect on a European designated site which could impact on the ability to deliver housing or employment allocations.</p> <p>Consider whether there have been any changes to Zones of Influence / Impact Risk Zones for European sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest or new issues in relation to, for example, water quality.</p> <p>Consider whether there have been any new environmental or heritage designations which could impact on the delivery of housing or employment / jobs requirements / targets.</p> <p>Consider any relevant concerns being raised by statutory consultees in your area in relation to the determination of individual planning applications or planning appeals which may impact upon your plan - either now or in the future.</p>		<p>and its allocations ensure that the local plan strategy and its site allocations (in the DMP) are deliverable, and included consideration of climate change effects.</p> <p>Since the start of this plan period in 2012, the Council has designated one new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), in Hooley – Area 1, in 2013 (Ref: No13 2013). The location of this new AQMA relative to European designated environmental sites and to the amount of development planned, indicate that there is no impact on the delivery of the local plan’s housing or employment allocations. Air quality in the Borough is closely monitored, including in relation to Gatwick Airport’s proposal to use its emergency runway.</p> <p>The Surrey Hills AONB boundary review being undertaken by Natural England has now reached an advanced stage, although as yet there is no date for expected publication and re-drawing of AONB boundary. Statutory and public consultation on the proposed extension areas to the nationally important landscape was completed in June 2023.</p> <p>Natural England is currently considering the responses and determining whether a further statutory and public consultation will be needed if, as a result of comments received, the proposed area is changed. The potential designation of any additional new land as AONB is therefore some time off.</p> <p>The local plan review highlights the Council’s appeal record, and planning decisions where statutory consultees such as the Environment Agency have objected.</p>

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
<b>A10.</b>	<p><b>No new sites have become available since the finalisation of the adopted local plan which require the spatial strategy to be re-evaluated.</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b></p> <p>Consider if there have been any new sites that have become available, particularly those within public ownership which, if they were to come forward for development, could have an impact on the spatial strategy or could result in loss of employment and would have a significant effect on the quality of place if no new use were found for them.</p> <p>Consider whether any sites which have now become available within your area or neighbouring areas could contribute towards meeting any previously identified unmet needs.</p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</b></p> <p>The site allocations which were made in the 2019 Development Management Plan (DMP) are in accordance with the spatial strategy set out in the 2014 Core Strategy, in particular at Policy CS6 and CS13.</p>

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
<b>A11.</b>	<p><b>Key planned infrastructure projects critical to plan delivery are on track and have not stalled / failed and there are no new major infrastructure programmes with implications for the growth / spatial strategy set out in the plan.</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b> You may wish to review your Infrastructure Delivery Plan / Infrastructure Funding Statement, along with any periodic updates, the Capital and Investment programmes of your authority or infrastructure delivery partners and any other tool used to monitor and prioritise the need and delivery of infrastructure to support development.</p> <p>Check if there have been any delays in the delivery of critical infrastructure as a result of other processes such as for the Compulsory Purchase of necessary land.</p> <p>Identify whether any funding announcements or decisions have been made which materially impact upon the delivery of key planned infrastructure, and if so, will this impact upon the delivery of the Local Plan.</p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</b></p> <p>One of the Council’s key infrastructure priorities, jointly with Surrey County Council, is the improvement of Three Arch Road junction with the A23 Horley Road, which is close to East Surrey Hospital. The Council is working closely with Surrey County Council to ensure that the project can commence on site according to the agreed timescale. Both Councils are contributing considerably to fund the improvements to this road junction for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. This project is included in the DMP Infrastructure Schedule (Annex 6).</p> <p>The local plan review document sets out progress on delivery of the key infrastructure against Policy CS8.</p> <p>M23 spur junction improvements are not currently needed as HOR9 site allocation will not be progressed to delivery before the outcome of the Gatwick Northern Runway Development Consent Order (DCO) application is known.</p>

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
<b>A12.</b>	<p><b>All policies in the plan are achievable and effective including for the purpose of decision-making.</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b> Consider if these are strategic policies or those, such as Development Management policies, which do not necessarily go to the heart of delivering the Plan's strategy.</p> <p>Identify if there has been a significant increase in appeals that have been allowed and /or appeals related to a specific policy area that suggest a policy or policies should be reviewed.</p> <p>Consider whether there has been feedback from Development Management colleagues, members of the planning committee, or applicants that policies cannot be effectively applied and / or understood.</p>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</b></p> <p>This local plan review is of the Core Strategy and its strategic policies only, not of the part 2 local plan, the Development Management Plan and site allocation policies that help to deliver the CS.</p> <p>As outlined in the LP CS Review 2024, the Council's appeal record over the plan period to date reflects that the LP CS remains up to date and effective for decision making.</p>

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
<b>A13.</b>	<p><b>There are no recent or forthcoming changes to another authority’s development plan or planning context which would have a material impact on your plan / planning context for the area covered by your local plan.</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b> In making this assessment you may wish to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Review emerging and adopted neighbouring authority development plans and their planning context.</li> <li>● Review any emerging and adopted higher level strategic plans including, where relevant, mayoral/ combined authority Spatial Development Strategies e.g. The London Plan.</li> <li>● Review any relevant neighbourhood plans</li> <li>● Consider whether any of the matters highlighted in statements A1- A12 for their plan may impact on your plan - discuss this with the relevant authorities.</li> <li>● Consider any key topic areas or requests that have arisen through Duty to Cooperate or strategic planning discussions with your neighbours or stakeholders - particularly relating to meeting future development and /or infrastructure needs.</li> </ul>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</b></p> <p>Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) is currently at the later stages of its local plan examination. MVDC responded to our Duty to Co-operate consultation regarding our local plan Core Strategy and advised that it has difficulties in meeting local housing and gypsy and traveller needs in full, and will not be able to accommodate any unmet housing need from R&amp;B Borough, which we accept and understand.</p> <p>Tandridge District Council has recently had its local plan found ‘unsound’ following a protracted local plan examination over some six years. We appreciate that TDC cannot meet our unmet needs for housing or other uses.</p> <p>Crawley Borough Council is also currently at examination with its updated local plan. We continue to work closely with Crawley over Gatwick Airport’s DCO proposal, and appreciate that they cannot meet any of our Borough’s unmet development needs. Gatwick Airport Ltd.’s DCO application is currently at examination.</p>

	<b>Matters to consider</b>	<b>Agree / Disagree</b>	<b>Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement</b>
<b>A14.</b>	<p><b>There are no local political changes or a revised / new corporate strategy which would require a change to the approach set out in the current plan.</b></p> <p><b>PROMPT:</b> In making this assessment you may wish to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Review any manifesto commitments and review the corporate and business plan.</li> <li>● Engage with your senior management team and undertake appropriate engagement with senior politicians in your authority.</li> <li>● Consider other plans or strategies being produced across the Council or by partners which may impact on the appropriateness of your current plan and the strategy that underpins it, for instance, Growth Deals, economic growth plans, local industrial strategies produced by the Local Economic Partnership, housing/ regeneration strategies and so on.</li> </ul>	<b>Agree</b>	<p><b>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</b></p> <p>The Council has remained relatively stable politically over the plan period to date. The current Corporate Plan '<i>Reigate &amp; Banstead 2025</i>' dates from 2020, and covers the period to 2025.</p> <p>The Council's Environmental Sustainability Strategy and Action Plan was adopted in 2021, and as set out in the LP CS Review, ever increasing environmental standards and requirements are planned to be considered and addressed in a new Local Plan, for which work was started in early 2023.</p> <p>The Borough was designated as a Growth Point in the SE Plan 2009, on which basis the Core Strategy's housing requirement was partially based.</p> <p>Since then, it has not been designed as a Growth Point, so the trend based approach to identifying local housing needs is not suitable.</p>



	<b>ASSESSING WHETHER OR NOT TO UPDATE YOUR PLAN POLICIES</b>	<b>YES/NO (please indicate below)</b>	
<b>A15.</b>	<p>You <b>AGREE</b> with <u>all</u> of the statements above</p> <p><b><u>If no</u> go to question A16.</b></p> <p><b><u>If yes</u>, you have come to the end of the assessment. However, you must be confident that you are able to demonstrate and fully justify that your existing plan policies / planning position clearly meets the requirements in the statements above and that you have evidence to support your position.</b></p> <p><b>Based on the answers you have given above please provide clear explanation and justification in section A17 below of why you have concluded that an update is not necessary including references to evidence or data sources that you have referenced above. Remember you are required to publish the decision not to update your local plan policies. In reaching the conclusion that an update is not necessary the explanation and justification for your decision must be clear, intelligible and able to withstand scrutiny.</b></p>	<b>YES</b>	<p>See section A17 below and the local plan Core Strategy Review, which, if agreed by the Council, will be made available and published on its website.</p>
<b>A16.</b>	<p>You <b>DISAGREE</b> with one or more of the statements above and the issue can be addressed by an update of local plan policies</p>	<b>NO</b>	<p><b><u>If yes</u>, based on the above provide a summary of the key reasons <u>why</u> an update to plan policies is necessary in section A17 below and <u>complete Section B below.</u></b></p> <p>N/A</p>

<p><b>A17.</b></p>	<p><b>Decision: Update plan policies / No need to update plan policies</b> (delete as necessary)</p> <p><b>Reasons for decision on whether or not to update plan policies (clear evidence and justification will be required where a decision not to update has been reached):</b></p> <p>The reasons for the Council’s conclusion that each of the local plan Core Strategy policies is considered to remain up to date and effective is set out in the Local Plan Core Strategy Review.</p> <p>The conclusion is that as they all remain effective and generally consistent with national policy, none of the Core Strategy policies needs to be updated at this time. The CS policies therefore remain up to date for decision making.</p> <p>This Local Plan Core Strategy Review is to be presented to the Council for approval and adoption before being published on the Council’s website.</p> <p><b>Other actions that may be required in addition to or in place of an update of plan policies</b></p> <p>Council Officers are working to support the Council’s position on the Gatwick Airport Development Consent Order (DCO) application and related highways infrastructure works, particularly Riverside Close, and will continue to monitor implications for the Borough.</p> <p>We will also continue to monitor the Surrey Hills AONB boundary review, as our local plan treats AGLV with the same level of protection as AONB until the AONB boundary review is completed and any remaining local landscape areas are re-assessed.</p>		
	<p><b>B. POLICY UPDATE FACTORS</b></p>	<p><b>YES/NO</b> (please indicate below)</p>	<p><b>Provide details explaining your answer in the context of your plan / local authority area</b></p>
<p><b>B1</b></p>	<p><del>Your policies update is likely to lead to a material change in the housing requirement which in turn has implications for other plan requirements / the overall evidence base.</del></p>		
<p><b>B2</b></p>	<p><del>The growth strategy and / or spatial distribution of growth set out in the current plan is not fit for purpose and your policies update is likely to involve a</del></p>		

Annex 3: PAS Toolkit Part 1: LP Review - To support Reigate & Banstead local plan Core Strategy Review, March 2024

	<del>change to this.</del>		
<b>B3</b>	<del>Your policies update is likely to affect more than a single strategic site or one or more strategic policies that will have consequential impacts on other policies of the plan.</del>		
	<del>You have answered yes to one or more questions above.</del>		<del>You are likely to need to undertake a full update of your spatial strategy and strategic policies (and potentially non-strategic policies). Use your responses above to complete Section B4.</del>
	<del>You have said no to <u>all</u> questions (B1 to B3) above</del>		<del>If you are confident that the update can be undertaken without impacting on your spatial strategy and other elements of the Plan, you are likely to only need to undertake a partial update of policies. Complete Section B4 to indicate the specific parts / policies of the plan that are likely to require updating based on the answers you have given above.</del>
<del>—B4</del>	<del><b>Decision: Full Update of Plan Policies/ Partial Update of Plan Policies (delete as necessary)</b></del>		
	<del><b>Reasons for scope of review:</b></del>		
<b>Date of assessment:</b>	March 2024		
<b>Assessed by:</b>	Tanya Mankoo-Flatt, Principal Policy Development Officer		
<b>Checked by:</b>	Andrew Benson, Head of Planning		
<b>Comments</b>	This toolkit should be read alongside the Council's local plan Core Strategy Review, March 2024, which includes full consideration of consistency of the strategic policies of the Core Strategy with current national policy.		

