Dear Inspector

We write further to your letter of 28 April 2020 (Ref. ID12) and our initial response of 6 May 2020. As promised, the Council has considered further the likely timescale going forward and the work needed to respond to your questions. We have been actively engaging with Highways England and Surrey County Council, which has been useful, and this has required us to write to you regarding the matters set out below.

From our engagement with Highways England and Surrey County Council, all parties agree the exact timing of when junction 6 would be at capacity is not detailed in the Tandridge strategic highways model. All parties suggest an interim Statement of Common Ground could be prepared within the next few months; focusing on junction 6. The methodology to be agreed will likely include modelling the interim years between 2013-2033, more specific zoning of sites and further detailed mitigation designs.

This Statement of Common Ground with Highways England and Surrey County Council would not cover the local road network, this would be a matter between Tandridge District Council and Surrey County Council only. The local road network could also be required to have further mitigation tested within the strategic model and this would be discussed further with Surrey County Council and agreed in a separate interim Statement of Common Ground also to be prepared within the next few months.

Based on indicative assumptions, the Council considers completing the additional transport modelling and viability testing would likely cause a delay of around a year and a half. We have attached to this letter a broad chronology for the steps required. Taking this step will therefore cause significant delay to the adoption of any plan and comes with implications of additional cost (approximately £250k) and officer resource. In the meantime, the Council will continue with other work to progress the Garden Community, for example, implementing a governance structure, preparing a stakeholder engagement plan and masterplanning.

We are all still understanding the impacts of the coronavirus pandemic, and as such would propose that using data collated over a short timeframe may well not be appropriate in terms of plan making. The Council has always been very keen to work with you and the Planning Inspectorate to progress the plan and provide information as required. As such, we wish to seek further clarity and guidance from you on how we can satisfy your requirements in a reasonable and proportionate way, giving the Authority comfort that the work we would be undertaking is both necessary and beneficial to you to reach a favourable outcome, therefore justifying the time and cost.

In terms of responding to your questions, the Council has provided an overview of potential work required. We want to understand whether this is necessary to make the Local Plan sound and if so, how we carry out this work alongside your
thoughts on the allocations proposed to ensure the strategic transport model is built with all the appropriate data and avoid the need to re-model this at a later stage. Inevitably, running this work in parallel with any further necessary work arising from your current views would avoid further delay to the Local Plan and remove the potential risk of having to re-run the transport and viability modelling again.

For those reasons, the Council invites you to consider whether these two letters provide sufficient clarity on our current stance and proposed way forward for you to now set out your thoughts and outline the way forward for the examination (recognising at this stage some of those thoughts may be provisional and dependent on what the further modelling demonstrates).

Yours

WAYNE BEGLAN/others
CORNERSTONE BARRISTERS
27 MAY 2020