

Duty to Cooperate Update Statement

SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL

FINAL REPORT



Spelthorne Takes Shape

January 2019



Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Statements of Common Ground/Memorandums of Understanding	3
3. Overarching Duty to Cooperate groups/ processes	4
4. Housing	7
5. Gypsies and Travellers	10
6. Employment and Retail	12
7. Green Belt	16
8. Infrastructure	18
9. Flood Risk	22
10. Natural Environment	24
11. Heathrow	26
12. Other Strategic Matters	30
Appendix A – Glossary of Terms	31
Appendix B – Engagement with neighbouring authorities on strategic matters	33
Appendix C – Joint Member Liaison Group	44
Appendix D – Officer level agreement on joint SLAA methodology	68
Appendix E – Spelthorne Local Plan update email	70
Appendix F – Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 email	72
Appendix G – Open space correspondence	75
Appendix H – SNCI Correspondence	76

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Duty to Cooperate statement seeks to update the reader on how the Council has continued to comply with the requirements of the Localism Act (2011) which relates to the Duty to Cooperate (DtC) since the publication of the Council's Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework in June 2015.
- 1.2 This update statement must be read in conjunction with the earlier Scoping Framework as it seeks to provide a continuous dialogue of the steps that the Council has taken to cooperate with relevant partners on strategic cross boundary matters between June 2015 and the public consultation on the Spelthorne Issues and Options in May/June 2018.
- 1.3 For details of the steps that the Council has taken, and the outcomes achieved between the commencement of work on the Spelthorne Local Plan in September 2014 and the publication of the Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework in June 2015¹, this earlier document should be referred to. The Scoping Framework also sets out in detail the Council's intended approach to cooperation for all cross boundary matters over the course of Local Plan preparation.
- 1.4 In the following chapters, each of the strategic matters highlighted in the Council's Scoping Framework will be considered in turn with commentary on:
 - The key issues identified in each topic area
 - The actions and outcomes achieved through cooperation between June 2015 up to the Council's public consultation on its Issues and Options document in May/June 2018.
- 1.5 When read in conjunction with the Council's 2015 DtC Scoping Framework, these documents seek to provide a continuous dialogue of the steps that the Council has taken to cooperate with relevant partners on strategic cross boundary matters.
- 1.6 In addition to those strategic topics set out in the 2015 Scoping Framework, a new chapter has been included on matters relating to Heathrow Airport and the potential expansion. This is due to the significant level of ongoing engagement occurring under the Duty to Cooperate since the production of the 2015 Framework.

¹ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/13031/DtC-Framework-Final-Version-25-May-2015/pdf/Duty_to_Cooperate_Framework2.pdf

2. Statements of Common Ground/Memorandums of Understanding

- 2.1 Since the production of the Duty to Cooperate Framework key progress has been made on the progression of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) /Memorandums of Understanding (MoU) with relevant partners.
- 2.2 Officers from Spelthorne met with officers from Slough on 6 March 2017. It was agreed that a Memorandum of Understanding would be produced setting out topics of common strategic concern. This was signed 17 May 2018².
- 2.3 Following Duty to Cooperate engagement between Spelthorne and Runnymede it was agreed that in line with Government direction set out in the recent 'Planning for the right homes in the right places consultation', a Statement of Common Ground should be prepared between the two authorities. In May 2018 a primary Statement of Common Ground was agreed with Runnymede Borough Council³.
- 2.4 Spelthorne is currently engaging with Local Authority partners to agree the position of each authority with regards to strategic issues and determine if a SoCG is required. This will be included in the next iteration of the Duty to Cooperate Update Statement alongside the Preferred Options consultation.
- 2.5 It should be noted that in addition to the above, Spelthorne is a signatory to a Terms of Reference (ToR) with a range of Local Authority and LEP partners as part of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group⁴. An Accord was signed in October 2017 which provides oversight of the ongoing partnership work by elected Members in regular meetings and provides a structure whereby deliverable outcomes to develop and share evidence base information can be achieved.

² https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/18235/Memorandum-of-Understanding-between-Spelthorne-Borough-Council-and-Slough-Borough-Council/pdf/MoU_Spelthorne_Slough_signed.pdf

³ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/18220/Statement-of-Common-Ground/pdf/Statement_of_Common_Ground.pdf

⁴ HSPG Terms of Reference: <https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/DtC>

3. Overarching Duty to Cooperate groups/ processes which cover multiple matters

- 3.1 Representatives from Spelthorne Borough Council attend a number of groups which engage on a range of cross boundary matters, on a regular basis.

Surrey Planning Officers Association (SPOA)

- 3.2 This is a group for the Heads of Planning in Surrey. This comprises the 11 Boroughs/Districts and the County Council. The Group meets monthly to discuss joint working opportunities, to consider matters of a cross boundary nature, and to discuss all other matters of pan-Surrey interest.
- 3.3 As part of the work of this group, alongside Surrey Chief Executives and Council Leaders, a Local Strategic Statement (LSS) is being prepared, supported by a Memorandum of Understanding, which seeks to provide a framework for joint working across Surrey and help to align strategic spatial, infrastructure and economic priorities.

Planning Working Group (PWG)

- 3.4 This is a group for Planning Policy Managers in Surrey and the County Council that meets bimonthly. Members discuss and resolve cross boundary policy issues, share relevant information and experiences, and prepare joint responses to consultations of pan-Surrey interest. From time to time, the group is required by SPOA to carry out research or projects that are directed at improving the understanding and experience of an aspect of planning policy. The Planning Working Group has been instrumental in progressing the County's LSS work.

The Surrey Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership (SSPIP)

- 3.5 A joint partnership between all Surrey Boroughs and Districts and the County Council was formed in 2014 to allow County wide priorities and opportunities to be identified as a way to assist in meeting the Duty to Cooperate.
- 3.6 The elected Leaders of all of the 11 Boroughs and Districts and the County Council sit on the SSPIP board to progress the LSS. The Partnership envisages the development of a planning and investment framework which will comprise the LSS; a MoU setting out how councils will work together; and an investment framework to support the delivery of strategic priorities set out in the LSS.
- 3.7 Phase I of the LSS has now been completed and agreed by Surrey Leaders. Spelthorne Borough Council has been an active participant in the development of the LSS and has signed the MoU.

Heathrow Strategic Planning Group

- 3.8 The Heathrow Strategic Planning Group (HSPG) was established in September 2015 in recognition of the fact that Heathrow airport is a key economic driver for West London and the M3/M4 Corridor. Although the operational airport is located entirely within the London Borough of Hillingdon, it together with the supporting uses and infrastructure has a significant impact across the sub region spatially, socially, economically and environmentally.
- 3.9 The Government's Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) was designated on 25 June 2018.

- 3.10 HSPG enables collaborative working between local authorities and other bodies surrounding Heathrow Airport to allow better spatial planning and management of the impacts, together with maximising the benefits of the airport to the local economy and community whatever decisions are made regarding growth in the future.
- 3.11 The group was formed in response to the nature of the location of the airport which neighbours a number of different administrative boundaries, which lack any formal mechanism for strategic or 'sub regional' planning and governance other than the Duty to Cooperate.
- 3.12 The HSPG Terms of Reference⁵ outline the purpose and scope of the group, as well as the objectives and outputs. The signed accord provides oversight of the ongoing partnership work by elected Members in regular meetings and provides a structure whereby deliverable outcomes to develop and share evidence base information can be achieved. Spelthorne is a regular attendee of the meetings of this group.
- 3.13 Since it was established, a number of sub groups have also been organised including spatial planning, environment and transport sub groups. A Leaders board has also been formed to ensure political oversight. Spelthorne, along with other HSPG members, have executed an Accord⁶ which provides oversight of the ongoing partnership work by elected Members in regular meetings and provides a structure whereby deliverable outcomes to develop and share evidence base information can be achieved.
- 3.14 More recently the group have worked collaboratively to produce the Joint Evidence Based and Infrastructure Study (JEBIS) which looks to the wider area of influence of the airport to provide a common dataset and analytical framework to help provide a coordinated approach to strategic planning.

River Thames Scheme Partnership

- 3.15 The River Thames Scheme (RTS) is a proposed programme of projects and investment to reduce flood risk in communities near Heathrow, including: Datchet, Wraysbury, Egham, Staines, Chertsey, Shepperton, Weybridge, Sunbury, Molesey, Thames Ditton, Kingston and Teddington.
- 3.16 In total approximately 15,000 homes and businesses and significant local infrastructure (roads, sewerage network, power supplies) will be better protected from flooding when the River Thames Scheme has been fully implemented.
- 3.17 Spelthorne Borough Council is working in partnership with the Environment Agency, Runnymede Borough Council, Elmbridge Borough Council, the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames, the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, Surrey County Council, the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, the Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), Thames Water and the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC) to deliver the River Thames Scheme.

Transport for the South East

- 3.18 Transport for the South East is a partnership to improve the transport network for all and grow the economy of the whole South East area.

⁵ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/18222/Heathrow-Strategic-Planning-Group-Terms-of-Reference/pdf/Heathrow_Strategic_Planning_Group_Terms_of_Reference.pdf

⁶ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/18229/Signed-Accord-for-the-Heathrow-Strategic-Planning-Group/pdf/HSPG_Accord_Final.pdf

- 3.19 It covers an area stretching from the English Channel to the border of London, and from the Kent coast to Berkshire, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.
- 3.20 The aim of Transport for the South East (TfSE) is to help support and grow the economy in the South East by choosing the right strategic transport priorities for investment. This will also mean improvements for everyone who relies on the transport system; including more reliable journeys free of congestion and the possible introduction of integrated smart ticketing across the area.
- 3.21 TfSE represents all the area's transport authorities and its local enterprise partnerships which will enable it to speak with a single voice on the South East's strategic transport needs, directly influence how and where money is invested and drive improvements for the travelling public.
- 3.22 TfSE currently operates as a shadow body. The intention is that, with Government approval, it will begin full operation in 2020.
- 3.23 TfSE has engaged with stakeholders, including Spelthorne Borough Council, to produce an Economic Connectivity Review, the aim of which was to take a strategic view and identify the economic priorities for transport in the South East and make the case for investment in transport to increase productivity in the South East.

4. Housing

- 4.1 Since the production of the June 2015 DtC Framework and Scoping Statement, the Council has continued to engage with partners on matters relating to housing. The key actions and outcomes are set out below.
- 4.2 Appendix B sets out where Duty to Cooperate engagement has taken place with neighbouring local authorities on strategic issues, including housing.

Strategic Planning Issue
Meeting the identified housing needs in full for Spelthorne and the wider Housing Market Area (HMA), shared with Runnymede, given the constraints to development that exist in the Borough and the wider HMA.
Evidence Base
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), November 2015 - Strategic Land Availability Assessment, May 2018 - Strategic Land Availability Assessment Methodology, December 2015 - Spelthorne Green Belt Assessment Stage 1, October 2017
Strategic Partners engaged with
See list of relevant partners in the Council's Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework 2015.
Actions
<p>Action: Completion of a NPPF compliant SHMA with Runnymede Borough Council to identify the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) that exists across the Housing Market Area (HMA). This involved a number of meetings, telephone discussions and email exchanges to ensure that both authorities agreed the content of the report prior to publication. A joint Spelthorne/Runnymede Member Liaison group (JMLG) was set up in December 2014 to allow for discussion of key issues and for decisions to be made jointly between the two authorities. The JMLG terms of reference and the minutes for all meetings held to date can be viewed in Appendix C.</p> <p>Partners: Runnymede Borough Council (other neighbouring authorities were consulted on the SHMA report).</p> <p>Outcome: Spelthorne and Runnymede Borough Councils agreed the content of the SHMA and the document was published on the website of both authorities.</p> <p>Date: November 2015</p>
<p>Action: Continuing to produce collaborative evidence of housing need through the SSPIP as part of the LSS to create a common picture across Surrey in relation to housing needs.</p> <p>Partners: All Surrey Local Authorities and Surrey County Council</p> <p>Outcome: Spelthorne Borough Council has been an active participant in the production of the interim LSS. Through the development of the LSS, a vision, SWOT analysis, overview of Surrey and strategic objectives has been produced in consultation with officers at the Surrey boroughs and districts and Surrey Chief Executives. Different sub areas in the County have</p>

been identified, with differing challenges and priorities (but which link into the higher level LSS objectives). The second phase of the LSS has been agreed to take forward work to develop the current LSS into an agreed spatial strategy for Surrey (and sub-county areas)

Date: February 2018 – agreement of LSS. 21 June 2018 – progress secured on taking forward an agreed growth vision and strategy for Surrey.

Action: Discussions on the Borough's housing land supply and potential spatial options with Runnymede Borough, in particular relating to the production of SLAAs within the HMA.

- Action 1: Production of a joint SLAA methodology with Runnymede Borough Council, which was published in December 2015 (Appendix D provides the officer level agreement between Runnymede and Spelthorne to produce the methodology). The methodology was consulted on in September/October 2015⁷.
- Outcome 1: The methodology was published in December 2015 on the Council's website⁸.
- Action 2: JMLG meeting on 13 April 2016 to discuss Runnymede's approach to assessing sites in the SLAA; the benefits of using compatible Green Belt assessment approaches; and whether the HMA's housing needs could potentially be met.
- Outcome 2: Agreed Spelthorne would keep Runnymede updated on its housing evidence, including housing figures and 5 year land supply.
- Action 3: Strategic Land Availability Assessment produced in line with joint SLAA methodology prepared with Runnymede Borough Council.
- Outcome 3: Draft and then final SLAA published on Council's website and email sent to Duty to Cooperate partners on 5 March 2018 informing them of Local Plan progress, including the draft SLAA findings and inviting any comments. See email sent in Appendix E.

Action: Local Plan Issues and Options consultation circulated to all relevant Duty to Cooperate bodies, inviting comments via the online consultation portal or via email on 14th May 2018. This included consultation on strategic issues, including housing.

Partners: All partners listed in the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework (all topic areas).

Outcome: Officers have consulted partners on the Issues and Options and provided the opportunity to highlight any issues of concern.

Date: May/June 2018

Outcomes from strategic working

The evidence contained within the jointly produced SHMA identified the HMA that Spelthorne sits within and has fed into the strategic options in the Council's Issues and Options document (in terms of housing need and mix). The SHMA established the OAN for the HMA at the time of writing.

The jointly produced SLAA methodology has been used to produce the SLAA, which has been used to inform the spatial strategy options on meeting housing requirements.

⁷ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/14265/SLAA-Table-of-Comments-and-Responses/pdf/SLAA_Table_of_Comments_and_Responses.pdf

⁸ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/14264/SLAA-Methodology/pdf/SLAA_methodology.pdf

Spelthorne Borough Council has agreed a Statement of Common Ground with Runnymede. It has been agreed that the two parties form a HMA and both authorities will endeavour to meet their proportion of the OAN for the HMA.

Ongoing cooperation

It is still unclear whether the objectively assessed housing needs can be met across the HMA. This will not be known until Spelthorne completes its Green Belt Assessment Stage 2, anticipated at the end of 2018 and undertakes further site capacity and selection work, prior to the Preferred Options stage of the Local Plan.

Spelthorne Borough Council is awaiting the Government's revised standardised methodology for calculating housing need. This could potentially impact the minimum housing need figures for Spelthorne. This in turn could influence the extent to which the OAN can be met across the HMA.

Spelthorne Borough Council will continue to engage with neighbouring authorities and other relevant stakeholders to ensure the delivery of homes to meet need.

5. Gypsies and Travellers

- 5.1 Since the production of the June 2015 DtC Framework and Scoping Statement, the Council has continued to engage with partners on matters related to Gypsy and Travellers. The key actions and outcomes are set out below.
- 5.2 Appendix B sets out where Duty to Cooperate engagement has taken place with neighbouring local authorities on strategic issues, including Gypsy & Traveller needs.

Strategic Planning Issue
Ensuring the delivery of sufficient sites to meet the needs of local Gypsies and Travellers given the planning constraints that exist in the Borough, most notably relating to Green Belt and flooding.
Evidence Base
Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, April 2018
Strategic Partners engaged with
See list of relevant partners in the Council's Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework, 2015.
Actions
<p>Action: Local Plan Issues and Options consultation circulated to all relevant Duty to Cooperate bodies, inviting comments via the online consultation portal or via email on 14 May 2018.</p> <p>Partners: All partners listed in the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework (all topic areas).</p> <p>Outcome: Officers have consulted partners on the Issues and Options and provided the opportunity to highlight any issues of concern.</p> <p>Date: May/June 2018</p>
<p>Action: Continuing to produce collaborative evidence on traveller needs through the SSPIP as part of the LSS.</p> <p>Partners: All Surrey boroughs and districts</p> <p>Outcome: Planning Working Group (PWG) set up a sub-group to focus on the matter of Gypsies and Travellers. This group was responsible for compiling the 'Preparing Travellers' Accommodation Assessments (TAAs) - The Surrey Approach' (April 2012). The Sub-Group has recently been reconvened to consider the matter of producing a new methodology in view of the changes to Gypsy and Traveller policy at the national level.</p> <p>Date: Cooperation ongoing</p>
<p>Action: Production of a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Telephone interviews conducted by consultants ORS to gauge the extent of cross boundary issues and current/future provision.</p> <p>Partners: Elmbridge BC, LB of Hillingdon, LB Hounslow, RB Windsor & Maidenhead, LB Richmond, Runnymede BC, Slough BC, Showman's Guild.</p>

Outcome: The responses received helped inform the approach taken to the Spelthorne GTAA and identify where, if any, there was need for further engagement on cross boundary flows. The GTAA provides more detail on how engagement on this issue has taken place.
Date: Spring 2018

Outcomes from strategic working

The work that was carried out jointly by Spelthorne and its partner authorities on compiling a Countywide strategy for TAA preparation in 2014 has assisted in making Spelthorne's completed GTAA broadly compatible with others in the County. Taking a Countywide view has been helpful to all Surrey LPAs in ensuring a consistent approach to assessing the needs of Gypsies and Travellers. Changes at the national level, e.g. concerning the legal definition of 'traveller', have been considered at local level, however consideration has been given to the agreed Surrey approach.

Cooperation with neighbouring authorities on the Spelthorne GTAA has helped to identify any cross boundary issues and has informed the approach taken in the Spelthorne assessment.

Spelthorne has agreed a Statement of Common Ground with Runnymede Borough Council. Both authorities will endeavour to meet their identified needs in full within their Borough boundaries over the period of the Local Plan.

Ongoing cooperation

Officers at Spelthorne Borough Council remain committed to working with partners to effectively resolve outstanding strategic issues. The Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework outlines the methods of engagement that the Council intends to rely upon to cooperate with partners on strategic cross boundary issues relating to gypsies and travellers. It is not yet known if Spelthorne can meet its gypsy and traveller needs, therefore work on this is ongoing.

The Council is advocating the production of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with its partners to agree positions on a range of cross boundary matters including meeting the needs of gypsies and travellers.

6. Employment and Retail

- 6.1 Since the production of the June 2015 DtC Framework and Scoping Statement, the Council has continued to engage with partners on matters related to employment and retail. The key actions and outcomes are set out below.
- 6.2 Appendix B sets out where Duty to Cooperate engagement has taken place with neighbouring local authorities on strategic issues, including Employment & Retail.

Strategic Planning Issue
<p>The Council needs to work with Functional Economic Area partners to ensure sufficient employment land is allocated to meet local and sub regional employment needs. Provision also needs to be made of the right type of workspace, and the creation of jobs and improvement of skills to strengthen local employment opportunities.</p> <p>Ensuring the growth of Spelthorne's economy including its town centres whilst recognizing the wider regional context is a key strategic issue for the Local Plan. The Council will need to consider how much additional retail floorspace is required across the Borough and the role of existing centres in meeting retail needs.</p> <p>Balancing the Council's economic and housing strategies will be a key challenge.</p>
Evidence Base
<p>Functional Economic Area Analysis, March 2017 Spelthorne Retail and Other Town Centre Uses Study, 2015 Spelthorne Retail and Other Town Centres Uses Study Update, 2018 Employment Land Needs Assessment, 2018 Strategic Land Availability Assessment, May 2018</p>
Strategic Partners engaged with
<p>See list of relevant partners in the Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework, 2015</p>
Actions
<p>Action: Completion of Retail and Other Uses Study, 2015 Partners: All those listed in the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Framework in the 'Retail' and 'Leisure and Other Commercial' section. Outcome: Following consultation on the draft report, two comments were received. These comments were considered and the Retail Study amended as appropriate. A table of DtC responses can be found on the website⁹. Date: March/April 2015</p>

⁹ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/13153/DtC-Table-of-Comments-and-Responses-on-the-Draft-Retail-Study/pdf/DtC_Table_of_Comments_Responses_on_the_Draft_Retail_Study.pdf

Discussions on the Borough's land supply and spatial options with relevant Local Authorities and other bodies following the completion of the SLAA. This has included:

Action: Production of a joint SLAA methodology with Runnymede Borough Council, which was published in December 2015 (Appendix D provides the officer level agreement between Runnymede and Spelthorne to produce the methodology). The methodology was consulted on in September/October 2015¹⁰.

Partners: All those listed in Duty to Cooperate Framework

Outcome: Comments made were considered before the final methodology was published in December 2015¹¹ (this is relevant as the SLAA considers employment land uses).

Date: September 2015.

Action: Officer attendance and contribution to discussions at the London and wider South East workshop: offices, industry and logistics (West London Workshop). Spelthorne officers provided information on both the office and industrial markets in Spelthorne, and on the work being carried out by the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group. Spelthorne advised on its strongest economic links, with linkages to London. It was noted that Spelthorne's employment evidence was emerging at this stage and was therefore not currently in a position to meet any unmet needs arising in London.

Partners: Greater London Authority, various local authority partners including London Borough of Hillingdon, London Borough of Hounslow and Spelthorne Borough Council.

Outcome: Unknown at the current time how the GLA will respond to the points raised by individual Local authorities at this workshop in their evidence gathering.

Date: 12 October 2016

Action: Completion of Functional Economic Area Analysis, with DtC partners consulted.

Partners: All those listed in the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Framework in the 'Employment' section.

Outcome: Following consultation on the FEA Analysis (18 February 2016 for DtC partners – 9 comments received and 10 October 2016 for public – 8 comments received from DtC partners), comments were carefully considered and the FEA Analysis amended as necessary. A table of comments and the Council's response can be found on the website¹². Following the consultation, the FEA Analysis was finalised and published on the Council's website.

Date: FEA published March 2017

Action: Local Plan Issues and Options consultation circulated to all relevant Duty to Cooperate bodies, inviting comments via the online consultation portal or via email on 14 May 2018.

Partners: All partners listed in the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework (all topic areas).

Outcome: Officers have consulted partners on the Issues and Options and provided the opportunity to highlight any issues of concern with regards to employment matters. This will feed into the development of the Preferred Options consultation.

Date: May/June 2018

¹⁰ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/14265/SLAA-Table-of-Comments-and-Responses/pdf/SLAA_Table_of_Comments_and_Responses.pdf

¹¹ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/14264/SLAA-Methodology/pdf/SLAA_methodology.pdf

¹² Appendix 1 of FEA Analysis: https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/17496/Functional-Economic-Area-Analysis/pdf/Functional_Economic_Area_Analysis.pdf and [https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/17477/Functional-Economic-Area---Table-of-Comments-and-Responses/pdf/FEA - Table of Comments and Responses.pdf](https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/17477/Functional-Economic-Area---Table-of-Comments-and-Responses/pdf/FEA_-_Table_of_Comments_and_Responses.pdf)

Action: Producing collaborative evidence on economic needs through the SSPIP as part of the LSS to create a common picture across Surrey in relation to the needs of the economy.

Partners: All Surrey boroughs and districts

Outcome: Officer level involvement in drafting a high level LSS since December 2016.

Since this time, a vision, SWOT analysis, overview of Surrey and strategic objectives have been produced in consultation with officers at the Surrey boroughs and districts and Surrey Chief Executives. Different sub areas in the County have been identified, with differing challenges and priorities (but which link into the higher level LSS objectives). Portraits of each sub area are currently being produced. The completion of the sub area portraits will finalise this first stage of the LSS work.

Date: Cooperation ongoing

Action: Continuing to be an active participant of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group and its sub groups. The Terms of Reference for the group can be found online¹³. Spelthorne has been a regular attendee of HSPG meetings, with attendance at the economic and spatial planning sub groups considered to be particularly relevant.

Partners: Details of membership are set out in the Terms of Reference for the main group.

Outcome: The Terms of Reference for HSPG set out the aim of this group and the specific objectives and outputs being worked towards. A Heathrow Employment Land Forecasting Study has been produced on behalf of HAL to show different growth scenarios at the airport. Spelthorne made comments on the stage 1 and stage 2 studies as appropriate. Spelthorne has also been engaged in a Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study (JEBIS) which will provide a common understanding of demand and supply for employment and housing land and the infrastructure requirements for infrastructure necessary for both airport expansion and wider planned growth.

Date: Engagement ongoing

Outcomes from strategic working

Through joint working, Spelthorne has established the extent of the Functional Economic Area that it is located within.

Spelthorne has produced a Retail and Town Centres Study with cooperation from Duty to Cooperate partners. It then produced a 2018 update study utilising the same methodology agreed with Duty to Cooperate Partners.

Strategic cooperation on this topic has assisted in the production of the Council's Issues and Options document, notably the Employment chapter. This has informed the potential options for the emerging Local Plan. The Issues and Options document has been consulted on and Spelthorne will review the comments received to help the preferred option going forward.

Cooperation through HSPG has helped Spelthorne to consider the potential employment and economic impacts of the Heathrow expansion and engage with partners on strategic issues to produce a number of joint consultation responses to seek shared outcomes.

Given that it is not yet known if Spelthorne can meet its employment needs, Spelthorne needs to further engage with FEA partners, members of the HSPG, Surrey County Council

¹³ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/18222/Heathrow-Strategic-Planning-Group-Terms-of-Reference/pdf/Heathrow_Strategic_Planning_Group_Terms_of_Reference.pdf

and the Local Enterprise Partnership to further consider how employment needs may be met through the emerging Local Plan.

The Council has engaged with surrounding local authorities to agree the position of each authority area in relation to employment and retail needs. Runnymede and Spelthorne have produced a SoCG agreeing the current position. These will be regularly reviewed moving forward.

Ongoing cooperation

It is not yet known whether Spelthorne can meet all of its employment and retail needs within the Borough, however it will endeavour to do so. Officers at Spelthorne Borough Council remain committed to an ongoing dialogue with Duty to Cooperate partners on meeting employment and retail needs. The Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework outlines the methods of engagement that the Council intends to rely upon to cooperate with partners on strategic cross boundary issues relating to employment and retail.

The Council is advocating the production of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with its partners to agree positions on a range of cross boundary matters including those related to employment and retail. Spelthorne will seek to produce a SoCG with partners to set out the agreed position between the authorities.

Spelthorne will continue to engage with HSPG on strategic issues, including those related to employment, to achieve agreed outcomes for the wider strategic area. Work on this is ongoing through the main meetings and sub groups.

7. Green Belt

- 7.1 Since the production of the June 2015 DtC Framework and Scoping Statement, the Council has continued to engage with partners on matters related to Green Belt and Landscape. The key actions and outcomes are set out below.
- 7.2 Further detail of how Spelthorne has engaged with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate is available in Appendix B.

Strategic Planning Issue
<p>65% of the Borough is designated as Green Belt, forming the strategic area of metropolitan Green Belt preventing urban sprawl. Given that the Green Belt extends over the borough boundary into all neighbouring local authority areas it is a strategic matter.</p> <p>The NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the Local Plan process. Given the significant extent of Green Belt in Spelthorne, the Council will need to determine the degree to which development needs can be met within the urban area and if there is a need to review the current extent of Green Belt to assist in meeting requirements.</p> <p>Working across authority boundaries is an essential part of Green Belt review due to the strategic nature of Green Belt in Spelthorne and the role that Green Belt parcels may play in preventing sprawl in neighbouring authorities.</p>
Evidence Base
<p>Spelthorne Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 (February, 2018) Spelthorne Green Belt Assessment Stage 2 (emerging)</p>
Strategic Partners engaged with
<p>See list of relevant partners in the Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework, 2015.</p>
Actions
<p>Action: Completion and publication of the Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 to consider the performance of Green Belt against the NPPF in Spelthorne. The Council consulted Duty to Cooperate Partners on the Stage 1 consultants brief and methodology. See Appendix F for emails sent to DtC partners.</p> <p>Partners: All partners listed in the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework.</p> <p>Outcome: Following the consultation on the Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 methodology, responses were received from Highways England, LB Richmond, Runnymede BC, Guildford BC, Elmbridge BC, Tandridge DC, Environment Agency, Mole Valley DC, Reigate and Banstead BC and Historic England. A summary of the comments made and the officer responses can be viewed on the Council's website¹⁴. Following the consultation on the</p>

¹⁴ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/16482/Green-Belt-Assessment-Methodology---Table-of-Comments-and-Responses/pdf/Table_of_GB_Methodology_Comments_and_Council_Response.pdf

methodology and the consideration of comments made, the Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 was completed and published on the Council's website.

Date: October/November 2016

Action: Local Plan Issues and Options consultation circulated to all relevant Duty to Cooperate bodies, inviting comments via the online consultation portal or via email on 14 May 2018. The purpose of the consultation was to establish how Duty to Cooperate partners received the spatial options identified by the Council to meet development needs.

Partners: All partners listed in the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework (all topic areas).

Outcome: Officers have consulted partners on the Issues and Options and provided the opportunity to highlight any issues of concern with regards to the Green Belt. This will feed into the development of the Preferred Options consultation.

Date: May/June 2018

Outcomes from strategic working

Spelthorne has produced a Green Belt Assessment Stage 1, informed by the methodology consulted on with Duty to Cooperate partners. Consideration of the methods used by neighbouring authorities to undertake Green Belt reviews has helped to inform the approach taken in Spelthorne to ensure consistency. This study has fed into the Spelthorne Issues and Options document which was subject to public consultation.

The Council has engaged with surrounding local authorities to identify cross boundary links and agree each authority's position with regards to Green Belt. Runnymede and Spelthorne have agreed a SoCG setting out the current position of each authority with regards to Green Belt.

Ongoing cooperation

It is not yet known whether Spelthorne can meet all of its development needs within the Borough, and it awaits the results of the Green Belt Assessment Stage 2 work to help determine the approach moving forward. Officers at Spelthorne Borough Council remain committed to an ongoing dialogue with Duty to Cooperate partners on strategic Green Belt matters. The Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework outlines the methods of engagement that the Council intends to rely upon to cooperate with partners on strategic cross boundary issues relating to Green Belt. Spelthorne recognises that further work on developing the narrative around exceptional circumstances for any Green Belt release is required, if deemed necessary in the Preferred Options stage of the Local Plan.

The Council is advocating the production of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with its partners to agree positions on a range of cross boundary matters including those related to employment. Spelthorne will seek to produce a SoCG with partners to set out the agreed position between the authorities.

8. Infrastructure

- 8.1 Since the production of the June 2015 DtC Framework and Scoping Statement, the Council has continued to engage with partners on matters related to Infrastructure. The key actions and outcomes are set out below.
- 8.2 Infrastructure in this statement is considered to include the following matters:
- Transport
 - Telecommunications
 - Waste & Minerals
 - Energy
 - Water
 - Health
 - Education
 - Cultural and Community facilities
 - Open space & recreation
- 8.3 Further information on how Spelthorne has engaged with neighbouring authorities on infrastructure matters under the Duty to Cooperate is available in Appendix B.

Strategic Planning Issue

The Strategic Road Network in Spelthorne includes the M3 and M25 motorways with junction 1 of the M3 located at Sunbury Cross and junction 13 of the M25 at Staines upon Thames. Spelthorne also has good connections to the rail network and Heathrow Airport, making it a desirable place to live and work. This does however exacerbate congestion and traffic generation is recognised as a cross boundary issue.

The key issue for all elements of infrastructure is whether or not any further capacity is required to support development proposed in the Local Plan, and if so, whether that infrastructure can be accommodated within the Borough or if it should be located outside.

Evidence Base

Surrey Infrastructure Study, November 2017
Spelthorne Leisure Facilities – Assessment of Need, May 2017
Surrey School Organisation Plan, January 2018

At the time of writing an Open Space Assessment is being prepared by the Council to underpin the Spelthorne Local Plan although this work is not yet complete.

Strategic Partners engaged with

See list of relevant infrastructure partners in the Council's Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework 2015.

Actions

Action: To assist in the completion of collaborative evidence on infrastructure needs through the Surrey Infrastructure Study to set out the Council's infrastructure requirements in the context of planned growth and estimated likely costs and funding gaps.

Partners: Surrey authorities

Outcome: The Surrey Infrastructure Study was completed in November 2017. The Study was a collaboration between all authority areas in Surrey and the County Council and was carried out by consultants Aecom.

Date: March 2017

Action: Officers held a meeting with Surrey County Council to discuss the development of transport modelling for the new Local Plan.

Partners: Surrey County Council

Outcome: Officers from Spelthorne and Surrey County Council discussed the process of producing transport modelling and how lead in times would impact this stage of the Local Plan development. Officers also discussed scenario testing and the information sharing required to get this process underway. It was agreed that Spelthorne would share a list of potential developments with sufficient lead in time to enable analysis once it is ready to undertake the scenario testing.

Date: 27 February 2018

Action: Meeting with representative from NHS Surrey Downs Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and Ashford & St Peter's Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust to discuss the implications of Local Plan growth up to 2035 on health infrastructure needs as well as asset ownership and land use.

Partners: NHS Surrey Downs CCG, Ashford & St Peters Hospital NHS Foundation Trust.

Outcome: Agreed that the involved parties would further discuss the modelling of development in terms of health infrastructure once Spelthorne was at a more advanced stage of its plan preparation. Also agreed that NHS would share data with Spelthorne on any surplus land.

Date: 20 April 2018

Action: Email correspondence between officers and Spelthorne and Runnymede to discuss the approach to producing an in-house Open Space study. As Runnymede previously undertook a similar Open Space study in 2016, officers at Spelthorne made contact in order to produce a consistent study and gain insight into the process of undertaking the study.

Partners: Runnymede Borough Council

Outcome: A response was received from Runnymede on the approach to undertaking the study and has been used to help inform how Spelthorne has managed the production of the Open Space Study. See Appendix G.

Date: 27 October 2017

Action: Officers from Spelthorne Borough Council have continued to engage with Surrey County Council on the emerging Surrey Waste Plan, through PWG meetings and specific DtC meetings.

Partners: Surrey County Council

Outcome: By providing consultation responses on the Surrey Waste Plan and engaging in an ongoing dialogue, Spelthorne has helped to shape the Plan.

Date: Ongoing. PWG meeting 11 May 2017. Consultation response sent February 2018.

Other actions carried out but not in the Duty to Cooperate Framework or set out above

Action: Highways England M25 South West Quadrant Study led by Highways England and DfT

Partners: Highways England

Outcome: Highways England consulted partner authorities on a long list of possible interventions to consider for the M25 South West Quadrant Study which were discussed at a workshop held on 17 May 2016 which Spelthorne attended.

Date: 17 May 2016

Action: Officer attendance at Thames Water Management Plan stakeholder briefing and at the Water Resources Forum.

Partners: Thames Water

Outcome: Officer input into discussions on the Thames Water draft Water Resources Management Plan, including the impacts of population growth and Local Plan development.

Date: 5 February 2018; 17 August 2018

Action: Officer attendance at Transport for South East Economic Connectivity Review seminars.

Partners: Transport for the South East and various transport stakeholders including Surrey County Council and Highways England.

Outcome: Officer engagement in discussions and subsequent representation made to Economic Connectivity Review. This will help to guide the development of Transport for the South East in order to support and grow the economy through the identification and prioritisation of integrated strategic transport projects and programmes.

Date: 12 February 2018 and 19 April 2018

Action: Officer liaison on Cross Rail 2 (CR2) proposals. Responses sent to consultation on initial proposals and Surrey CC Cross Rail 2 Assessment as part of the Surrey Rail Strategy. Officer attendance at Local Authority Liaison meetings and Technical Planning Forum to provide Local Plan updates, to discuss project progress and facilitate local resident engagement.

Partners: Cross Rail 2, Surrey CC, Elmbridge BC, Transport for London, Network Rail, Epsom & Ewell, Department for Transport (and other local authority bodies impacted by CR2 proposals).

Outcome: Officer engagement has aided the development of the proposals, particularly in relation to the regional branch line potentially passing through Spelthorne Borough.

Date: Cooperation ongoing.

Outcomes from strategic working

Strategic cooperation on this topic has assisted in the production of the Council's Issues and Options document, notably the Infrastructure chapter. This has informed the potential options for the emerging Local Plan. The Issues and Options document has been consulted on and Spelthorne will review the comments received in due course to determine how they may impact the preferred option going forward.

The Surrey Infrastructure Study was completed in November 2017 and Spelthorne collaborated positively in the preparation of the study. Evidence has come forward in the Surrey

Infrastructure Study which identifies a number of traffic hotspots as well as future infrastructure needs and has been used to inform the options set out in the Issues and Options document.

The Council has engaged with surrounding local authorities to agree the position of each local authority area in relation to strategic infrastructure requirements. Runnymede and Spelthorne have agreed a SoCG setting out the current position of each authority with regards to infrastructure, including transport requirements. It is however noted that Spelthorne has not yet assessed its infrastructure requirements to support growth over the period of the Local Plan therefore this will be kept under review in order for both authorities to be in a position to then reach an agreement.

Ongoing cooperation

Spelthorne has not yet completed its evidence base on infrastructure requirements therefore it is not yet known if it can meet all of its infrastructure needs. Spelthorne remains committed to working with partners to effectively identify and subsequently resolve any outstanding strategic issues.

The Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework sets out the identified authorities and bodies for engagement on infrastructure as well as the mechanisms for doing so. This will guide future joint working where cross boundary issues arise through the development of the new Local Plan.

Spelthorne will continue to seek the support of Surrey County Council during the preparation of its transport modelling and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This will also involve engaging with other relevant bodies where appropriate, including Highways England.

As the development of the new Local Plan progresses, Spelthorne will continue to engage with Surrey County Council, the lead Minerals and Waste Authority, to help assess the suitability of potential allocations from a minerals and waste perspective.

9. Flood Risk

- 9.1 Since the production of the June 2015 DtC Framework and Scoping Statement, the Council has continued to engage with partners on matters relating to Flood Risk. The key actions and outcomes are set out below.
- 9.2 Further detail of how Spelthorne has engaged with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate to Flood Risk is available in Appendix B.

Strategic Planning Issue
Large areas of Spelthorne lie within the floodplains of the River Thames, Colne and Ash with only limited flood defence. Flooding and flood risk is a serious issue in Spelthorne. Strategic working with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority is required to assure the risks of flooding are appropriately assessed and addressed in the Local Plan through the location of development and the formulation of policies.
Evidence Base
Spelthorne Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Draft Interim Report, February 2018.
Strategic Partners engaged with
See Spelthorne Duty to Cooperate Framework, 2015 – Flooding section.
Actions
<p>Action: Officers continue to engage with the Environment Agency, Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority and other partner local authorities to bring forward the River Thames Scheme (RTS). Officers have engaged through the Lower Thames Planning Officers Group, the Consents and Authorisations Advisory Group and by responding to consultations from the EA and Surrey CC.</p> <p>Partners: Surrey County Council, Environment Agency, partner authorities that would be impacted by the RTS.</p> <p>Outcome: Spelthorne continues to work with its partners under the Duty to Cooperate to bring forward this strategic infrastructure scheme. The submission of the planning applications for the flood alleviation channel is being aimed for in 2018 and as such this is the date partners are working towards.</p> <p>Date: Cooperation ongoing.</p>
<p>Action: Production of Interim Draft Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Partners: Environment Agency, Surrey County Council, Thames water.</p> <p>Outcome: Data sets supplied to enable the development of the SFRA and consultation on draft project deliverables.</p> <p>Date: February 2018.</p>
Outcomes from strategic working

Spelthorne officers have engaged positively with both the Environment Agency and Surrey County Council at key stages in the preparation of the Spelthorne draft interim SFRA. This engagement has assisted in the production of a robust evidence base document, which in turn has helped formulate the Issues and Options document.

Ongoing cooperation

Spelthorne remains committed to working with partners to finalise the SFRA and to effectively resolve outstanding issues. The Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework outlines the methods of engagement that the Council intends to rely upon to cooperate with partners on strategic cross boundary issues relating to flooding. This will be used to highlight issues which still require cooperation at each key stage of Plan preparation.

Spelthorne will also continue to engage on the delivery of the River Thames Scheme with appropriate partners.

As the development of the Local Plan progresses, Spelthorne will discuss future options and sites where cross boundary impacts are identified with relevant partners.

Spelthorne will aim to produce a Water Cycle Study to assist Local Plan development. In collaboration with the Environment Agency, the Council agrees that at a minimum a scoping exercise should be carried out.

10. Natural Environment

- 10.1 Since the production of the June 2015 DtC Framework and Scoping Statement, the Council has continued to engage with partners on matters related to the natural environment, notably climate change and biodiversity. The key actions and outcomes are set out below.
- 10.2 Further detail of how Spelthorne has engaged with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate on strategic matters, including the natural environment, is available in Appendix B.

Strategic Planning Issue
<p>Climatic impacts resulting from the release of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere is an issue which is affecting the whole of the UK and has no borders. Climate change has the potential to impact the Borough's population, infrastructure and environment.</p> <p>For biodiversity, there are a number of sites in Spelthorne which are designated for their importance to wildlife and biodiversity at international, national and local level, some of which partly fall within other local authority areas. There is potential for these valued areas of biodiversity to be impacted by the delivery of new Local Plan and the meeting of local development needs.</p>
Evidence Base
<p>Surrey Landscape Character Assessment, April 2015</p> <p>At the time of writing, Spelthorne is in the process of producing a review of SNCIs and will be undertaking analysis of Public Urban Open Space to Local Greenspace in due course.</p>
Strategic Partners engaged with
<p>See list of relevant partners in Spelthorne Duty to Cooperate Framework, 2015.</p>
Actions
<p>Action: Email sent to Surrey County Council to obtain information on SNCIs in the borough and the previous process for their review.</p> <p>Partners: Surrey County Council (Natural Environment team)</p> <p>Outcome: The information provided by Surrey County Council has been useful in developing the approach to reviewing SNCIs in the Borough. Officers have utilised this information to aid the production of a Sites of Nature Conservation Importance survey review brief for consultants. See Appendix H for email seeking engagement.</p> <p>Date: October 2017</p>
<p>Action: Meeting held to review Spelthorne's SNCIs and the changes to the sites since the adoption of the Local Plan. The meeting also touched on other biodiversity issues for the new Local Plan.</p>

Partners: Surrey County Council (internal Spelthorne colleagues and Surrey Wildlife Trust)
Outcome: The discussion resulted in Surrey County Council sending through additional information on the Surrey Nature Partnership, Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Local Site Guidance published by DEFRA and guidance for SNCI selection in Surrey. This information has aided the development of the Issues and Options document, in terms of identifying potential biodiversity issues and has also helped develop the consultants' brief for undertaking the SNCI review work.
Date: 24 November 2017

Action: Consultation on the Spelthorne Issues and Options document with relevant partners.

Partners: All partners listed in the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Framework.

Outcome: Officers have sought engagement with partners on issues facing the Borough, including those relating to biodiversity and climate change. This has provided the opportunity to discuss any outstanding issues and to then address such issues in the next stage of Local Plan development.

Date: May – June 2018.

Other actions carried out but not in the Duty to Cooperate Framework or set out above

The Council has consulted the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England on two drafts of its Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The responses received have informed the final scoping report and the Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options.

Outcomes from strategic working

Engagement with Surrey County Council and other relevant stakeholders has helped to inform the approach to reviewing SNCIs in the Borough and producing a project brief in order to commission work.

Through the Sustainability Appraisal scoping report consultation, Natural England has made the Council aware of the particular issues and opportunities regarding nature conservation in the Borough, particularly in relation to protecting internationally and nationally important sites.

Ongoing cooperation

Spelthorne will continue to work with Surrey County Council and other neighbouring authorities on implementing sustainable transport infrastructure in order to reduce emissions and lessen the impacts of climate change. It is considered that engagement on climate change will increase as the new Local Plan is further developed.

Spelthorne is in the process of reviewing SNCIs in the Borough and will engage with relevant partners on outstanding strategic matters. Spelthorne remains committed to working with partners to effectively resolve strategic issues where they arise.

The Council will continue to work in partnership with statutory organisations, neighbouring authorities and locally active partnerships as it develops its preferred options and Local Plan policies to identify opportunities to enhance the natural environment in the borough and to lessen the effects of climate change.

11. Heathrow

- 11.1 The Spelthorne Duty to Cooperate Framework was produced in June 2015, providing a framework for progressing cooperation on a variety of cross boundary matters. Since the production of this document however, Spelthorne has been engaging in a number of work streams associated with the expansion of Heathrow Airport.
- 11.2 The Heathrow Strategic Planning Group was formed in late 2015 in response to the nature of the airport's location neighbouring a number of different administrative boundaries which lack a formal mechanism for strategic or 'sub regional' planning and governance.
- 11.3 Current HSPG membership is as follows:
- London Borough Hounslow
 - London Borough Ealing
 - Spelthorne Borough Council
 - Runnymede Borough Council
 - South Bucks District Council
 - Slough Borough Council
 - Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership
 - Buckinghamshire Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership
 - Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership
 - Surrey County Council (in respect of strategic transport and other relevant functions)
 - Buckinghamshire County Council (in respect of strategic transport and other relevant functions)
 - Colne Valley CIC
- In addition, the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames have been invited to join HSPG. The LB of Hillingdon have an open invitation to join the Group but have so far not taken up that offer.
- 11.4 HSPG also has 'observers' present – bodies with a stake or have an interest in Heathrow through their geography and area of responsibility and who want to be kept informed on the work of HSPG but which do not want to contribute as Full Members. 'Observer Members' are as follows:
- Greater London Authority
 - Transport for London
 - Government (coordinating representative from MHCLG/BEIS)
 - Government (DfT Aviation Policy)
 - Highways England
 - Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
 - Elmbridge Borough Council
- 11.5 The intention of the Group is to assist the plan making of local authorities through essential Duty to Cooperate engagement; to provide early and effective engagement on the Development Consent Order prepared by Heathrow Airport Limited; and to provide a collective point of communication with Government on issues of common concern around the expansion of Heathrow.
- 11.6 Given the cross boundary nature of the Heathrow expansion and the variety of strategic issues arising as a result, it is considered that a new section on Heathrow needs to be incorporated into the Council's Duty to Cooperate work moving forward.

This is due to the significant and ongoing engagement taking place under the Duty to Cooperate which was not identified in the original 2015 Scoping Framework.

- 11.7 Heathrow Airport sits to the north of the Borough in Hillingdon. Approximately 6.9% of Spelthorne residents work at Heathrow Airport and the Borough sits within a Heathrow focussed Functional Economic Area, along with Runnymede, Elmbridge, Hillingdon and Hounslow.
- 11.8 Given the progress associated with the expansion, Spelthorne continues to be an active member of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group. In anticipation of the next stage of consultation on the expansion scheme and given that the impacts on the surrounding area have not yet been quantified, the Council continues to engage in early discussions through HSPG on Heathrow Airport Limited's Development Consent Order.
- 11.9 The outcome being sought for Spelthorne is to minimise the negative impacts from airport expansion on those who live and work in the Borough and to maximise the benefits.

Strategic Planning Issue
<p>Spelthorne neighbours Heathrow Airport directly to the north, therefore the potential impacts must be considered and quantified to help to identify mitigation measures in response. The key issues facing the Borough are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of airport expansion on the needs for housing, employment floorspace and other supporting uses in the surrounding area including Spelthorne. • The impact of expansion on air pollution and noise as well as the natural environment. • The impact on surface access in the surrounding area.
Evidence Base
<p>A Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study (JEBIS) is being prepared for the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group.</p>
Strategic Partners engaged with
<p>See list of relevant partners in paragraph 11.3 above.</p>
Actions
<p>Since the establishment of the HSPG, Spelthorne has been an active participant. The Council's regular attendance and contributions at the meetings of the HSPG and its sub groups as well as input through written correspondence between meetings is considered to demonstrate that engagement has been active and is ongoing. Engagement has been undertaken at both officer level and more recently at Member level, with the need for political oversight. The new Member led governance structure was achieved through the production of a new accord in October 2017.</p> <p>Spelthorne has regularly responded to HAL work requests by providing information and data where required, responding to consultations and aiding scheme development. Through the work requests Spelthorne has assisted in the production of evidence base documents.</p>

Attendance and involvement in the arrangement of HSPG summits – 27th October 2016 and 27th July 2017. The two summit events held so far have been for leadership and senior management to review the engagement, findings and outputs of HSPG so far and to consider the next steps.

Officer Engagement Day – 17 January 2017. This was a full day meeting of HSPG and its sub groups. At the event, presentations were given by the Planning Inspectorate to explain the Development Consent Order (DCO process), and Heathrow Airport Limited to explain the timetable they are working to, and their aspirations for working with HSPG and local authorities more generally. Breakout sessions were also held to discuss the work streams moving forwards for each of the sub groups.

Outcomes from strategic working

Production of a shared Vision and Development Principles Document to guide work of Heathrow Airport and HSPG in preparing its DCO.

Preparing the relevant material for the Summit.

The production of a Key Messages plan to identify cooperative work around the National Planning Policy Statement and resultant DCO.

The agreement of Heads of Terms for a Service Level Agreement between the HSPG and Heathrow Airport Limited.

May 2017 – Agreement of a Memorandum of Understanding to provide an interim arrangement for Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) to share information with the HSPG relating to the preparation of their Development Consent Order (DCO). Under the MoU, HAL has started to issue HSPG members with work requests to create a joint evidence base to lead both a Joint Strategic Planning Framework (JSPF) and to inform HAL's own DCO.

October 2017 – basis of the Accord agreed, with final agreement in March 2018¹⁵. The Accord will guide cooperation in terms of the planning approach to the Heathrow expansion, the vision for the expanded airport and will be the basis for build partnerships to lobby and be a collective voice while sharing information and expertise. Specific outcomes and outputs are described in the Accord including the development of a non-statutory joint planning 'strategy' supported by a joint evidence base across the HSPG area to shape and frame the Heathrow Airport Limited Development Consent Order application.

March 2018 – Engaging with HSPG members to produce a joint response to HAL's Consultation One on airport expansion and air space change.

Attendance at meetings on a Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study (JEBIS) to aid its production.

Engagement through HSPG and with Heathrow Airport Limited on the Development Consent Order process. This includes joint review and agreeing joint responses to their master planning principles and their Limited Assembly Options.

Ongoing cooperation

¹⁵ https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/18229/Signed-Accord-for-the-Heathrow-Strategic-Planning-Group/pdf/HSPG_Accord_Final.pdf

A Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study (JEBIS) is being produced by the HSPG spatial planning sub group. The purpose of this work is to provide an evidence base for the Local Authorities around Heathrow on the potential economic development, labour market and housing needs arising from the proposed expansion of the airport and how that relates to the background growth for which the authorities are already planning. In the first instance JEBIS will inform Local Plan development and will provide a common dataset and analytical framework to help provide a coordinated approach to strategic planning. Work commenced in February 2018 and is due to be completed in autumn. Spelthorne will continue to engage on the emerging JEBIS work with partners.

Following the completion of the JEBIS work, it will be discussed whether a second phase of work could be undertaken on the production of a Joint Spatial Planning Framework.

Moving forward Spelthorne Borough Council awaits the Government's response to various market led proposals for a southern rail access scheme to Heathrow Airport to inform future Duty to Cooperate discussions with partners. Spelthorne will work with partners where appropriate on developing a potential southern rail link to Heathrow Airport.

Whilst the plans for expansion at Heathrow Airport have now been confirmed, the impacts on the surrounding area, including Spelthorne have not yet been quantified. It has therefore not been possible for the Local Plan to fully address the potential implications. Spelthorne will continue to engage with HSPG and other relevant stakeholders to address outstanding strategic issues and to review the impact of the expansion on the Borough and Local Plan, at an appropriate time.

Through the HSPG engagement has taken place with the Colne Valley Community Interest Company (CIC) in relation to the Colne Valley Regional Park. The Park performs an important recreation role for Spelthorne therefore joint working through HSPG will continue into the future. Collaboration on the Park will also continue moving forward in relation to the Local Plan. Spelthorne will continue to engage with Colne Valley CIC to facilitate the designation of the Colne Valley Regional Park within the Local Plan and to develop corresponding policy.

12. Other Strategic Matters

Heritage

Since the Spelthorne Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework was published, limited Duty to Cooperate correspondence has taken place with partners. Partners, including Historic England and Surrey County Council, have been consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, which includes Heritage matters.

At this stage it is therefore considered that the situation remains as set out in the original Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework; that a bespoke chapter is not required in this document, but the situation will be kept under review as the plan preparation continues.

Engagement with Surrey County Council and other partners is expected to occur proportionately when strategic matters arise with respect to heritage issues identified as part of the preferred options and the next stages of the Local Plan.

Appendix A – Glossary of Terms

Acronym	Definition
ANPS	Airports National Policy Statement. Policy framework for expansion at Heathrow Airport and primary basis for decision making on any development consent application for a new north-west runway.
DCO	Development Consent Order. The means of obtaining permission for developments categorised as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) as introduced by the Planning Act 2008.
DtC	Duty to Cooperate. A legal requirement on local planning authorities to engage with other relevant authorities and bodies constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis for strategic planning matters
FEA	Functional Economic Area. The spatial level at which local economies and markets operate.
GTAA	Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Assesses current and future need for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation in the Borough
HAL	Heathrow Airport Limited.
HMA	Housing Market Area. A geographical area defined by household demand and preferences for all types of housing, reflecting the key functional linkages between places where people live and work.
HSPG	Heathrow Strategic Planning Group. Set up to facilitate joint working on matters relating to Heathrow Airport and the DCO submission by Heathrow Airport Limited.
JEBIS	Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study. Will provide a common understanding of demand and supply for employment and housing land and the infrastructure requirements necessary for both airport expansion and wider planned growth.
JMLG	Joint Member Liaison Group. To provide a governance mechanism for the Runnymede-Spelthorne Statement of Common Ground. The Group will also provide a joint forum under the duty to cooperate for engaging on matters of strategic cross boundary importance to Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils.
JSPF	Joint Spatial Planning Framework. Overarching regional planning mechanism informed by the JEBIS work undertaken by the HSPG.
LEP	Local Enterprise Partnership. Business led partnerships between local authorities and local private sector businesses.
LSS	Local Strategic Statement. Produced by Surrey authorities to facilitate cooperation on key strategic planning issues. It sets out shared objectives and priorities around spatial, infrastructure and economic issues.
MHCLG/BEIS	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government/ Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding. A formal agreement between two or more parties outlining the terms and details of an understanding, including each parties' requirements and responsibilities.
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework.

OAN	Objectively Assessed Need. The housing that households are willing and able to buy or rent, either from their own resources or with assistance from the State.
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance.
PWG	Planning Working Group.
RTS	River Thames Scheme. Scheme to reduce flood risk from the River Thames and enhance resilience between Datchet and Teddington.
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Assesses flood risk in the area, and the risks to and from surrounding areas.
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Forms part of the Local Plan evidence base, setting out housing needs.
SLAA	Strategic Land Availability Assessment. Technical exercise to determine the quantity and suitability of land potentially available for housing development.
SNCI	Site of Nature Conservation Importance. Non-statutory sites which have been identified because their flora and fauna are of County or Regional wildlife value.
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground. A written record of the progress made by strategic policy-making authorities during the process of planning for strategic cross-boundary matters.
SPOA	Surrey Planning Officers Association.
SSPIP	Surrey Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership. Joint partnership between all Surrey Boroughs and Districts and the County Council to allow County wide priorities and opportunities to be identified as a way to assist in meeting the Duty to Cooperate.
TfSE	Transport for South East.
ToR	Terms of Reference. Define the purpose and structures of a project, committee, meeting, negotiation, or any similar collection of people who have agreed to work together to accomplish a shared goal.

Appendix B – Engagement with neighbouring authorities on strategic matters

Strategic Issue	Prescribed Duty to Cooperate Bodies – Neighbouring Authorities						
	Runnymede BC	Elmbridge BC	LB Hounslow	LB Hillingdon	LB Richmond	Slough BC	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
Method of engagement by the Council	<p>12th April 2016 – officer DtC meeting</p> <p>9th August 2016 – officer DtC meeting</p> <p>16th January 2017 – officer DtC meeting</p> <p>18th December 2017 – officer DtC meeting</p> <p>Preparation of SoCG – Signed 15th May 2018.</p>	<p>Preparation of annex SoCG with Runnymede – July 2018</p>	<p>18th July 2017 – officer DtC meeting</p> <p>13th April 2018 – Officer DtC meeting</p>	<p>1st November 2017 – officer DtC meeting</p>	<p>19th January 2016 – officer DtC meeting</p>	<p>6th March 2017 – officer DtC meeting</p> <p>Preparation of Memorandum of Understanding – Signed 17th May 2018</p>	<p>22nd February 2017 – officer DtC meeting</p>
Housing	<p>September 2015 - Joint SLAA methodology preparation</p> <p>2014/2015 - Joint SHMA preparation</p> <p>12/04/16 – RBC advised SBC that based on its emerging SLAA it was unlikely that it would be in a position to meet even the</p>	<p>November 2015 - Draft SHMA consultation</p> <p>September 2015 - SLAA methodology consultation.</p> <p>Housing identified as a cross boundary issue, although the authorities sit within</p>	<p>November 2015 - Draft SHMA consultation</p> <p>September 2015 - SLAA methodology consultation</p>	<p>November 2015 - Draft SHMA consultation</p> <p>September 2015 - SLAA methodology consultation</p> <p>01/11/17 – It was noted that Spelthorne and Hillingdon sit in neighbouring HMAs, with Hillingdon's housing target taken from the London Plan. It was confirmed that a</p>	<p>November 2015 - Draft SHMA consultation</p> <p>September 2015 - SLAA methodology consultation</p> <p>19/01/16 – Housing recognised as a strategic cross boundary issues, although the authorities sit within neighbouring HMAs. It was agreed that the</p>	<p>November 2015 - Draft SHMA consultation</p> <p>September 2015 - SLAA methodology consultation</p> <p>06/03/17 – It was agreed that Spelthorne and Slough sit in neighbouring HMAs. Slough are unable to meet their need in full so are looking at options to meet need</p>	<p>November 2015 - Draft SHMA consultation</p> <p>September 2015 - SLAA methodology consultation</p> <p>22/02/17 – It was agreed that the two authorities are not within the same HMA, but adjoin. It was noted that RBWM aim to meet</p>

Strategic Issue	Prescribed Duty to Cooperate Bodies – Neighbouring Authorities						
	Runnymede BC	Elmbridge BC	LB Hounslow	LB Hillingdon	LB Richmond	Slough BC	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
	<p>lower end of its proportion of the HMA's objectively assessed needs. SBC would want to closely scrutinise Runnymede's SLAA when it was published and wanted assurance that densities were maximised.</p> <p>09/08/16 – officer meeting. Discussion centred on Runnymede's Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches (IOPA) consultation document and the potential to meet needs within the HMA. Spelthorne officers raised a number of points around the need to maximise housing densities and meeting the OAN. RBC officers agreed to explore housing delivery and assumptions.</p> <p>16/01/17 – officer meeting. Discussion on RBC's IPOA consultation; potentially updating the SHMA¹⁶; RBC land supply progress; the impact of extensions on housing mix. RBC confirmed they would</p>	neighbouring HMAs.		revised OAN would not be required until the Local Plan part 1 was reviewed and they have consistently met their housing target. Spelthorne confirmed that it was producing a SLAA and was not yet in a position to comment on whether it could meet its OAN.	two authorities would continue to liaise as Richmond's SHMA is progressed alongside the Local Plan Review.	<p>outside of the Borough. It was confirmed that Spelthorne are currently unable to meet any of Slough's unmet need.</p> <p>17/05/18 – MoU agreed to maintain ongoing dialogue and at this stage both authorities are unlikely to be able to take any of each other's unmet need.</p>	their housing need in full, whilst Spelthorne are undertaking a number of evidence documents to support the new Local Plan. It was confirmed that neither authority is requesting the other to accommodate any unmet need at present.

¹⁶ Note: following the publication of the standardised methodology for calculating housing need, Spelthorne decided to delay any update to the SHMA.

Strategic Issue	Prescribed Duty to Cooperate Bodies – Neighbouring Authorities						
	Runnymede BC	Elmbridge BC	LB Hounslow	LB Hillingdon	LB Richmond	Slough BC	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
	<p>undertake a similar study to SBC. See appendix I for email.</p> <p>18/12/17 – officer meeting. Discussion including housing matters and Spelthorne initial SLAA findings.</p> <p>15/05/18 – SoCG agreed noting that both authorities sit within the same HMA. Each authority will endeavour to meet its own need. This work is ongoing and needs to be kept under review.</p>						
Gypsies & Travellers	<p>12/04/16 - Runnymede advised that they were unable to identify a five year supply of traveller sites. Spelthorne had not yet commenced evidence on Gypsy and Travellers but would keep RBC updated.</p>	<p>February 2017 – Spelthorne officers engaged on Elmbridge GTAA. No significant cross boundary issues identified.</p> <p>April 2018 - Officers at Elmbridge interviewed by</p>	<p>February 2017 - Spelthorne officers engaged on Hounslow GTAA. No significant cross boundary issues identified.</p>	<p>01/11/17 - It was agreed that LBH are not asking neighbouring authorities to accommodate any need. Spelthorne's gypsy and traveller needs were unknown at this time.</p>	<p>19/01/16 – Not identified as a cross boundary issue, but keep research under review.</p> <p>April 2018 - Officers at Richmond interviewed by consultants ORS to assist in the production of the Spelthorne</p>	<p>06/03/17 – Spelthorne confirmed that there were not any current major concerns regarding the provision of land for gypsies and travellers. Gypsy and Traveller Assessments were being delayed due to changing definitions. It was agreed that</p>	<p>22/02/17 - It was agreed that there were unknown transit issues currently and that no cross boundary issues had been identified at the present time.</p> <p>April 2018 - Officers at RBWM</p>

Strategic Issue	Prescribed Duty to Cooperate Bodies – Neighbouring Authorities						
	Runnymede BC	Elmbridge BC	LB Hounslow	LB Hillingdon	LB Richmond	Slough BC	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
	<p>18/12/17 - Both authorities were in the process of completing gypsy and traveller evidence. It was unclear if Runnymede would be able to meet its need and Spelthorne agreed to share findings of its GTAA once known.</p> <p>15/05/18 – SoCG signed with both authorities agreeing to endeavour to meet their identified needs in full within their Borough boundaries over the Local Plan period. It was however noted that work is ongoing on this matter.</p>	consultants ORS to assist in the production of the Spelthorne GTAA. No significant cross boundary issues identified.		<p>November 2017 - Spelthorne officers engaged on Hillingdon GTAA. No significant cross boundary issues identified.</p> <p>April 2018 - Officers at Hillingdon interviewed by consultants ORS to assist in the production of the Spelthorne GTAA. No significant cross boundary issues identified.</p>	GTAA. No significant cross boundary issues identified.	<p>approaches to GTAAs would need further review.</p> <p>April 2018 - Officers at Slough interviewed by consultants ORS to assist in the production of the Spelthorne GTAA. No significant cross boundary issues identified.</p> <p>17/05/18 – MoU agreed that there were unknown transit issues and no cross boundary issues identified at present.</p>	interviewed by consultants ORS to assist in the production of the Spelthorne GTAA. No significant cross boundary issues identified.
Employment & Retail	<p>Production of a joint SLAA methodology, published in December 2015.</p> <p>18th February 2016 & 10th October 2016 - consultation on Spelthorne FEA. Responses received from RBC.</p>	<p>18th February 2016 & 10th October 2016 - FEA consultation. Response received from EBC. Strategic links with Elmbridge agreed.</p>	<p>18th February 2016 & 10th October 2016 - FEA consultation. No response received from Hounslow.</p> <p>No cross boundary retail issues.</p>	<p>18th February 2016 & 10th October 2016 - FEA consultation. No response received from Hillingdon.</p> <p>01/11/17 - Both authorities provided an update on employment</p>	22/01/17 - Although there were common concerns about losing employment floorspace, employment was not considered to be strategic issue between the two authorities.	<p>18th February 2016 & 10th October 2016 - FEA consultation. Response received from Slough. Agreement that low level linkages exist.</p>	<p>18th February 2016 & 10th October 2016 - FEA consultation. Response received from RBWM. Low level linkages agreed.</p>

Strategic Issue	Prescribed Duty to Cooperate Bodies – Neighbouring Authorities						
	Runnymede BC	Elmbridge BC	LB Hounslow	LB Hillingdon	LB Richmond	Slough BC	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
	<p>12/04/16 - Discussions around the emerging Spelthorne evidence base and Runnymede's need for industrial floorspace that it would struggle to meet. Due to the current emerging state of Spelthorne's employment evidence its position could not yet be confirmed. SBC interested in RBC's retail strategy. Previous concerns that RBC was failing to recognise the position of its centres in the retail hierarchy and relationship between Runnymede's centres and Staines. RBC to consult SBC on retail strategy.</p> <p>09/08/16 - Discussed possibility of SBC possibly assisting RBC meet retail needs. To be better known in late 2016. RBC would keep SBC updated. IPOA could better reference retail hierarchy.</p>			<p>matters and current Local Plan evidence. No cross boundary retail issues identified. Uxbridge is main town centre in Hillingdon and Staines in Spelthorne.</p>	<p>18th February 2016 & 10th October 2016 - FEA consultation. Response received from LBR.</p>	<p>06/03/17 - It was agreed that Spelthorne and Slough have functional economic links. Slough indicated that they are unable to meet employment needs at present, however would take into account the emerging findings of HSPG in relation to help meet employment needs. No cross boundary retail issues identified.</p> <p>17/05/18 - MoU agreed noting that both authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet employment and retail need over the plan period, however at present Spelthorne and Slough are unlikely to be able to take any of each other's unmet need.</p>	<p>22/02/17 - Spelthorne's evidence demonstrates that there are some functional economic links between RBWM and Spelthorne. RBWM were concerned that the warehousing needs for the Berkshire-wide Economic Development Needs Assessment had overestimated warehousing needs. RBWM will aim to satisfy 100% retail floorspace. Agreement to keep each other informed of any unmet need in plan period. RBWM noted that it would be pursuing MoUs with DtC partners and Spelthorne were supportive of this approach.</p>

Strategic Issue	Prescribed Duty to Cooperate Bodies – Neighbouring Authorities						
	Runnymede BC	Elmbridge BC	LB Hounslow	LB Hillingdon	LB Richmond	Slough BC	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
	<p>18/12/17 - Both authorities provided updates on their employment evidence. Runnymede were looking to update employment forecasting as part of the partial update to the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA. RBC unable to meet retail needs for Egham. Officers at Spelthorne confirmed that they would consider the request for assistance.</p> <p>15/05/18 – SoCG agreed confirming the FEA extent, however the approach to meeting unmet needs has not yet been agreed. It was however noted that work is ongoing on this matter. Robustness of retail evidence confirmed by each authority. Spelthorne confirmed it will endeavour to meet its retail needs, as will Runnymede, however it is highly unlikely that it will be able to meet identified</p>						

Strategic Issue	Prescribed Duty to Cooperate Bodies – Neighbouring Authorities						
	Runnymede BC	Elmbridge BC	LB Hounslow	LB Hillingdon	LB Richmond	Slough BC	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
	retail needs for Egham. It is yet to be confirmed how this unmet need will be agreed.						
Infrastructure (Utilities, Transport, Waste, Health, Education, Telecoms, Water, minerals, cultural/comm unit facilities, open space & recreation)	<p>09/08/16 – SBC provided factual update on Staines Bridge Corridor Capacity study. Cross boundary transport links identified.</p> <p>16/01/17 – discussion on RBC Infrastructure Needs Assessment. RBC to consult with DtC partners.</p> <p>15/05/18 – SoCG agreed – Agreement that there are cross boundary links but SBC evidence still outstanding therefore could not yet be agreed.</p> <p>Correspondence on approach to producing Open Space Study.</p>	<p>Cooperation on Crossrail 2 ongoing.</p> <p>Infrastructure identified a cross boundary matter.</p>	13/04/18 - No cross boundary issues identified.	01/11/17 - No cross boundary issues identified.	09/01/16 - Not a strategic or cross boundary issue. Discussed Crossrail 2 proposals – will be going to stations in LBR and into Spelthorne. Further work to continue on Crossrail 2 through engagement with TfL and neighbouring boroughs.	<p>06/03/17 - Slough have recently commissioned a £280,000 transport model whilst Spelthorne are likely to rely on Surrey County Council to produce modelling.</p> <p>It was noted that the potential expansion of Heathrow Airport will have transport implications for surrounding local authorities in the future.</p> <p>17/05/18 – MoU agreed - Slough Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council will cooperate on transport issues</p>	<p>22/02/17 - It was agreed that future cooperation would be required on southern rail access as both might benefit from it and that the future of Heathrow Airport would also have significant wider implications for the surrounding area.</p> <p>Proposing to maintain policy approaches to open spaces.</p>

Strategic Issue	Prescribed Duty to Cooperate Bodies – Neighbouring Authorities						
	Runnymede BC	Elmbridge BC	LB Hounslow	LB Hillingdon	LB Richmond	Slough BC	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
						including Heathrow Airport.	
Flooding & Flood risk	<p>12/04/16 – RBC finalising SFRA and would be carrying out a DtC consultation. SBC advised that they had not yet programmed their SFRA but suggested that Runnymede and Spelthorne consider producing a joint study.</p> <p>16/01/17 – RBC awaiting River Thames Scheme modelling. SBC looking to update its SFRA in due course.</p> <p>Acknowledge cross boundary issues. Continued working to deliver River Thames Scheme.</p>	Flooding identified as a cross boundary issue. Ongoing cooperation on the River Thames Scheme.	No cross boundary issues identified.	No cross boundary issues identified.	19/01/16 – Recognise strategic, cross boundary issue, with existing joint working e.g. Lower Thames Planning Officers Group	17/05/18 – MoU agreed – No cross boundary issues identified.	22/02/17 – Cross boundary issue identified. Continue to work collaboratively to deliver the River Thames Scheme.
Green Belt	10 th October 2016 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 methodology.	10 th October 2016 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 methodology.	10 th October 2016 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 1	10 th October 2016 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 1	19/01/16 - At the time of the meeting Richmond had not proposed a review of Green Belt or	10 th October 2016 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 1	10 th October 2016 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 1

Strategic Issue	Prescribed Duty to Cooperate Bodies – Neighbouring Authorities						
	Runnymede BC	Elmbridge BC	LB Hounslow	LB Hillingdon	LB Richmond	Slough BC	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
	<p>Comments from RBC received.</p> <p>28th June 2018 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 2 methodology. Comments received from RBC.</p> <p>12/04/16- RBC confirmed that it had undertaken a review of the Green Belt boundary and it was confirmed that RBC were looking to remove Thorpe Village from the Green Belt. Agreed that this was unlikely to raise cross boundary issues. SBC confirmed that they were to undertake a Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>16/01/17- Officers at Runnymede confirmed that following its Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches consultation, it</p>	<p>Comments from EBC received.</p> <p>28th June 2018 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 2 methodology. No comments received.</p>	<p>methodology. No comments received.</p> <p>28th June 2018 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 2 methodology. No comments received.</p> <p>13/04/18 - Officers discussed the strategic Green Belt between the two authorities and the approach to Green Belt assessments. It was agreed that both Spelthorne and Hounslow intended to retain the Green Belt spanning their shared boundary. It was agreed that a Statement of Common Ground would be a useful framework for confirming this intention and for</p>	<p>methodology. No comments received.</p> <p>28th June 2018 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 2 methodology. No comments received.</p>	<p>Metropolitan Open Land. Spelthorne confirmed that it was preparing a draft brief for a Green Belt Assessment and this would be issued shortly.</p> <p>10th October 2016 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 methodology. Comments received from LBR.</p> <p>28th June 2018 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 2 methodology. No comments received.</p>	<p>methodology. No comments received.</p> <p>28th June 2018 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 2 methodology. No comments received.</p> <p>6/03/17 - Slough confirmed that they had looked at strategic options which included releasing Green Belt. Spelthorne confirmed that it was undertaking a Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>17/05/18 - A MoU was subsequently agreed by the authorities, noting that Slough and Spelthorne will keep each other informed of the approach to Green Belt.</p>	<p>methodology. No comments received.</p> <p>28th June 2018 – consultation on Draft Green Belt Assessment Stage 2 methodology. No comments received.</p> <p>22/02/17 - RBWM undertaking partial edge of settlement analysis but may require further work. . SBC confirmed that they were to undertake a Green Belt Assessment, however no comments were received from RBWM on the methodology consultation.</p>

Strategic Issue	Prescribed Duty to Cooperate Bodies – Neighbouring Authorities						
	Runnymede BC	Elmbridge BC	LB Hounslow	LB Hillingdon	LB Richmond	Slough BC	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
	<p>was to undertake an additional phase of Green Belt review work to look at smaller land parcels. Whilst buffers used extended into neighbouring authorities, only land within Runnymede would be assessed.</p> <p>18/12/17- Officers at Spelthorne updated Runnymede on the progress of the Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 findings. It was confirmed that the majority of the Green Belt performed well across the Borough, however some areas required further consideration.</p> <p>15/05/18 – SoCG, agreeing that the proposed amendments to the Green Belt boundary in Runnymede do not raise any cross boundary issues. RBC confirmed that they are not intending to</p>		continued cooperation.				

Strategic Issue	Prescribed Duty to Cooperate Bodies – Neighbouring Authorities						
	Runnymede BC	Elmbridge BC	LB Hounslow	LB Hillingdon	LB Richmond	Slough BC	RB Windsor & Maidenhead
	allocate any parcels of land for development in the Borough adjacent or in close proximity to Spelthorne. Spelthorne confirmed that further work was being undertaken through the Green Belt Assessment Stage 2 and would provide feedback on parcels AC-4 and AC-5, which are adjacent to Runnymede.						
Natural Environment	<p>No specific cross boundary issues identified.</p> <p>15/05/18 – RBC can identify a 5 year supply of SANG.</p>	No specific cross boundary issues yet identified.	No specific cross boundary issues yet identified.	No specific cross boundary issues identified.	19/01/16 – proposing to maintain policy approaches. No strategic or cross boundary issues identified.	No specific cross boundary issues yet identified.	No specific cross boundary issues yet identified.

Appendix C – Joint Member Liaison Group

Appendix C1 – Joint Member Liaison Group Terms of Reference

Runnymede & Spelthorne Joint Member Liaison (Steering) Group

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Background

1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) confirms that public bodies, including local planning authorities, have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to the strategic priorities. The Government expects joint working on areas of common interest to be diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities.
2. The NPPF is clear that joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas – for instance, because of a lack of physical capacity or because to do so would cause significant harm to the principles and policies of this Framework.
3. Local planning authorities are expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when their Local Plans are submitted for examination. The emerging NPPF encourages the production of Statements of Common Ground as the preferred mechanism to document the cross boundary matters being addressed between relevant parties and progress in cooperating to address these.
4. National guidance is clear that cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation, resulting in a final position where plans are in place to provide the land and infrastructure necessary to support current and projected future levels of development.

Purpose of the Joint Member Liaison Group

5. To provide a governance mechanism for the Runnymede-Spelthorne Statement of Common Ground (once agreed and signed). The Group will also provide a joint forum under the duty to cooperate for engaging on matters of strategic cross boundary importance to Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils where it has been identified at officer level that escalation to Member level is necessary to resolve identified issues in the pursuit of achieving positive outcomes.

The nature of the group

6. The liaison group is not a decision-making body. The Group is intended to provide Member oversight of the joint duty to cooperate activities carried out by Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils. Any agreement by the Group will be subject to the democratic and local plan processes within each local authority.

Specific objectives

7. The objectives being sought are:
 - i. To agree the content of the Runnymede-Spelthorne Statement of Common Ground;

- ii. To provide steer in terms of identifying solutions to address unresolved issues between Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils as set out in the Runnymede-Spelthorne Statement of Common Ground; and,
- iii. To provide steer in terms of identifying solutions to address any subsequent cross boundary issues which are identified by Runnymede and Spelthorne officers through the 2 monthly officer level duty to cooperate meetings but which require escalation to Member level to achieve resolution.

Outcome

8. The outcomes being sought are:

- i. The signing of the Runnymede-Spelthorne Statements of Common Ground; and,
- ii. The identification of potential solutions to resolve strategic cross boundary issues as part of the plan making processes of both local authorities.

Membership

9. The SHMA Joint Member Liaison Group will:

- i. Comprise up to two Elected Members from each authority; specifically the portfolio holder/chairperson for Planning and/or the Leader. Substitutes may attend if appropriate.
- ii. Comprise two senior officers/heads of department from each authority. Substitutes may attend if appropriate.
- iii. A minute taker from each local authority.
- iv. Meet as required dependent on the outcomes of the 2 monthly officer level Duty to cooperate meetings and any requirement for escalation.
- v. Hold an annual meeting in April each year to review progress with duty to Cooperate matters over the preceding year and discuss any required amendments to the Runnymede-Spelthorne Statement of Common Ground.

Appendix C2 – Joint Member Liaison Group Meeting Minutes

Spelthorne & Runnymede SHMA: Member Liaison Group

Goddard Room, Spelthorne Borough Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames

Tuesday 16 December 2014 at 9.30am

Minutes

In attendance:

Ian Maguire – Corporate Head of Planning and Environmental Services - RBC
Jane Margetts - Corporate Head of Housing & Community Development – RBC
Babatunde Adebutu – Planning Policy Officer - RBC
John Brooks – Head of Planning and Housing Strategy - SBC
Cllr Geoffrey Woodger – Portfolio holder Planning - RBC
Cllr Peter Taylor – Portfolio holder Housing - RBC
Cllr Vivienne Leighton – Portfolio holder for planning - SBC
Cllr Richard Smith - Ainsley – Chair of LPWP
John Devonshire – Senior Planning Officer – SBC

Apologies:

None

Minutes taken by: BA

1. Introductions

JB welcomed all in attendance and starts round table introductions. Highlights the necessity for SHMAs and the importance of the duty to cooperate.

JB stated that the focus of this meeting was to agree the terms of reference as presented.

2. Scope and progress of the joint SHMA

Scope of the SHMA

IM gave a background to the SHMA. The work has been carried out by consultants GL Hearn who were jointly appointed by SBC and RBC. BA and JD have been the lead offices along with Georgina Pacey from RBC.

IM reiterated the necessity for SHMAs and for these as evidence to be compliant with the Duty

Stage 1 findings: Extent of the HMA

IW highlighted that the first part of the SHMA was for the consultants to determine the extent of the HMA. GL Hearn concluded that though

arguments could be made for part or whole other boroughs could be considered to be within the HMA, evidence shows that Runnymede & Spelthorne boroughs could justifiably be considered to be a functional HMA and are a “good –fit”.

IM confirmed that RBC members had been briefed on the findings of the “Part 1” report.

JB confirmed that SBC are yet to go through the process.

Stage 2: Objectively assessed need, mix and type

IW stated that the Part 2 of the report would focus on Objectively assessed need, mix and type. A draft report which covered the OAN work was originally expected on 15/12/14 but was yet to materialise from the consultants. Work on mix and type will be forthcoming in the new year with the study expected to be completed by the end of February.

3. Purpose of the Member Liaison Group

Duty to co-operate, Meeting objectively assessed needs & what if needs cannot be met within either authority or the HMA?

IM reiterated that the primary purpose of the group was to agree the ToR. The ToR sets out the steps both authorities will take to deliver the objectively assessed need for the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA

JB reiterated that it the point of importance was to follow the required steps as prescribed by the NPPG. IM explained that in the event that we had exhausted all options and we and demonstrated that we had robustly demonstrated that the need could not be met within the HMA then the wider HMA we would need show that both authorities had exhausted all options including the review of the Green Belt to ensure that the 5 test were being fulfilled.

IM fielded some questions on the Green belt review and RBCs experiences on their current review. JB confirmed that SBC have had many such reviews and that the integrity of the Green Belt in Spelthorne is robust.

4. Agreeing the terms of reference

Objectives & outcomes

IM sets out that this group has no decision making powers and any agreement or decisions by the Group will be subject to the democratic and local plan processes within each authority.

IM went through each of the 5 objectives (i-v) as listed on the ToR. All agreed. Some minor wording changes to iii were suggested and will be actioned by IM.

All were in agreement with the outcomes

All were in agreement as to the composition of membership.

Agreement from the Council

IM confirmed that that the SHMA item was due to go before RBC members at Planning Committee in on 28th January 2015.

JB confirmed the item was due to go before SBC cabinet in February 2015.

Meeting intervals

Intervals of the meeting will be as necessary due to limited availability of members.

5. Date of Next Meeting

IW invited suggestions for when the next meeting could take place. It was agreed that the next meeting should take place sometime in February subject to availability and progress of the SHMA to be coordinated by BA and JD. Venues will be alternated between RBC and SBC.

6. AOB

BA reminded that there would be a member training session for both authorities on the 18th at the Runnymede Civic Centre at 1pm where the consultants GL Hearn would be giving a presentation on the SHMA Part 1 and Part 2 findings.

Runnymede and Spelthorne SHMA Joint Member Liaison Group

Minutes from meeting on Tuesday 17th February 2015, 10am – 12:30 pm at the RBC Offices

Attendees:

Ian Maguire – Corporate Head of Planning and Environmental Services - RBC

Jane Margetts - Corporate Head of Housing & Community Development – RBC

Georgina Pacey- Principal Planning Officer, Policy and Strategy Team - RBC

Cllr Geoffrey Woodger – Portfolio holder Planning - RBC

Cllr Peter Taylor – Portfolio holder Housing - RBC

John Brooks – Head of Planning and Housing Strategy - SBC

John Devonshire – Senior Planning Officer – SBC

Cllr Vivienne Leighton – Portfolio holder for planning - SBC

Cllr Richard Smith - Ainsley – Chair of LPWP

Apologies:

None

Minutes from meeting:

IM opened the meeting and thanked everyone for coming. Suggested that the first matter for consideration should be the contents of the draft part 2 report, picking out the high level issues that needed raising with GL Hearn.

JB added that we then needed to decide what the next steps were in the SHMA process.

The comments made on each section of the report were as follows:

Section 1: Introduction

No comments

Section 2: Defining the HMA

IM advised the group the Runnymede had been visited by Peter Burley, the former chief Inspector at PINS. He had advised that the implications of settling on our local HMA and not a larger, different HMA needed to be properly addressed. IM thought that GL Hearn needed to produce a couple more paragraphs on this. Specifically these paragraphs should also address:

-What the identified flaws/imperfections are with our HMA approach,

-What the implications are of such imperfections (i.e. no clear edge to HMA, overlaps with other local HMAs)

-How the use of the DtC can help to mitigate identified imperfections,

Section 3: Characteristics of the housing market

The general comment was made here that Spelthorne has no council owned properties.

The group agreed that otherwise this section contained typos but there were no substantive issues that needed to be addressed further by GL Hearn.

Section 4: Assessing overall housing need

The group agreed that this was a confused chapter where the presentation of facts could be improved.

JD thought that it would be helpful if at the start of the chapter GL Hearn included a table which outlined all of the different projections that would be relied upon in the remainder of the chapter, and confirm how they had been used, what they mean. JD and GP thought that the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead SHMA had done something similar so were going to look at this and ask GL Hearn and follow the same approach.

JD advised that he thought that officers needed to go through some of the arithmetic in this chapter with GL Hearn.

P54 and 55: start to look at short term and long term trends. Para 4.13 confirms reliance on short term trends. Query as to why this approach has been taken with long term trends not being looked at? GL Hearn may advise that this is what CLG require them to do but the justification is not made clear in the report and needs to be as reliance on short term trends inflates the population growth figures for both Councils.

IM: Advised that members should not be unduly concerned with the large numbers being arrived at in the report for overall level of housing need. It is important that our authorities cannot be accused of suppressing the number, and this will lead to a large upper range of housing need. The emerging constraints work, such as seen in the RBC Green Belt review suggest that it may not be possible to meet the fully objective assessed need in the HMA, and consequently whether we do not meet our need figures by 20 or 200 is not the key matter, but rather that we meet as much of the need as possible and understand the extent of need that may have to be met elsewhere.

VL: In having a high figure it is unlikely that we will be able to meet a very high proportion of the overall figure. Queried whether there would be pressure to release our Green Belt land?

IM: Yes there is, but the key focus of Green Belt reviews is whether all of a borough's Green Belt land is meeting the 5 purposes of the Green Belt. If land is found to be performing weakly against the purposes of the Green Belt, it should no longer be included in the Green Belt. In any instance and can then be looked at for suitability for meeting any identified needs.

JD: Spelthorne will probably have to do a Green Belt assessment to check if all Green Belt land in Spelthorne continues to meet the 5 purposes outlined in the NPPF.

GW: In Runnymede the motorways which run through the borough provide hard boundaries which has seen some small sites recommended for release in our Green Belt Review.

IM: Not suppressing our need figure will help de risk our EiP. The number must be robust though. An inflated number could also be problematic (*Note: The recent Inspector's decision at Durham supports this point of view. In this case, the Inspector raised concerns about Durham's excessively high and unrealistic OAN which he felt represented an unacceptable risk which he could not support*).

JB: SHMA/housing numbers work is not a particularly refined science yet. Once we accept the SHMA we will have to defend it. Accepting low numbers can lead to criticism. In the GL Hearn SHMA, we can see wild variations in figures at 2033.

JB: We need to drill into the figures that GL Hearn are proposing to make sure that we understand them. We need to fully understand the numbers that we are defending. So whilst I take IM's point on board about not being concerned about a big number we still need to make sure that we are satisfied that the number is as objective as it can be.

PT: How much of the projections are made up from migration into our boroughs? Query as to what assumptions are built in around migration. Real problem as to whether the number arrived at will be as objective as possible based on a number of the assumptions made.

JD: 2011 household projections only look at a ten year period. 2012 household projections should assist in testing assumptions used in the report to date.

GW: The theoretical figure arrived at in the SHMA will not necessarily be deliverable.

JB: Assume our migration from London as a starting point in the modelling (see para 10.18). Inflates need in our areas. We need to look at the neutral position. Otherwise could be easy to double count or undercount migration.

IM: But migration based on past trends.

JB: We need to stick with certain methodologies unless there is a good reason to depart. Need to explore if there are any good reasons to depart. We need to question as much as we can to make sure the numbers stand up.

RSA: Is it possible to look at short and long term trends?

JD: This may already have been covered (page 54, figure 36) but as agreed, this point will be raised with GL Hearn. Would also be helpful to know what happened in 2004 to cause the spike in the figures.

IM: p.66 para 4.42: this is a new para that is needed when the 2012 household projections have also been considered.

IM: general comment that the summary and implications sections like these are helpful.

JD: General point that if we do not understand the SHMA, how will we explain it to the public?

GW: The report does not consider things like the Aldershot expansion or the potential expansion at Heathrow etc. Such proposals could have huge impacts on the local area.

IM: market changes are considered in chapters 5 and 6 but impossible to consider everything, especially schemes which are not yet confirmed. SHMA will be updated approximately every 5 years which will help pick up on changes in the market.

Section 5: Affordable housing need

JM: It is not entirely clear whether affordable need is included in the final range or not.

IM: 5.52-5.54 explains the approach that GL Hearn has taken to a degree but agree that the report is not entirely clear on this point.

JD: future population based on growth. How many new affordable households will be required and how many existing households will fall into need? Affordable needs assessment is different from OAN.

PT: Complete muddle about what our affordable housing need is generally (not referring to GL Hearn report here specifically) in terms of:

- 1) What have we got to build, and
- 2) How are we going to deal with people going through life changes? This will be looked at in more detail in our housing strategy work.

JB: Method has a bit of history in Spelthorne. Goes back to 2001. The planners looked at about 6 different ways to assess our affordable housing needs and found that the waiting list was the most robust. We need to check the conclusions of the report against operational findings i.e. who is coming through the door, what are we actually seeing on the ground. Further work will be needed on this post the completion of the SHMA. At EiP we can bring in this operational knowledge as well as refer the Inspector to our existing housing or planning policies which are having an impact. I.e. at Runnymede, do we get a need for 700 affordable homes a year?

JM: Need to look at the big picture-it is not all new build social housing need.

IM: section needs to be re-presented as a complementary assessment to OAN assessment.

JD: a couple more paras would be helpful outlining that the SHMA is just one part of the evidence and confirming that there are other tools at a Council's disposal to meet affordable housing needs.

JB: Building more social housing is a last resort. Agree that there are other mechanisms.

IM and PT: More work is needed locally so that we really understand our needs.

GW: a % of new affordable units come forward through conversions (i.e. through conversions of office building to residential under permitted development).

Section 6: Market signals

IM: page 98-key messages box. These boxes could be used more often throughout the report-helpful.

JB: Overcrowding. Interesting what we consider to be overcrowding. What may represent overcrowding on paper may not actually be overcrowding for the families involved. For example, some cultures like to live together in one unit. However the inference in the report is that the BME population is poorer than the rest of the population which is not the case for a lot of the BME population in Runnymede and Spelthorne. Some of the assumptions in the report seem to be based on national trends and not what we see locally.

GW: The student population has a large population of the BME community but students tend to only stay in the borough for a short period of time. This may confuse the population figures for this part of the community in Runnymede.

General point: HMOS and overcrowding need separate headings.

Section 7: Economic led housing requirements

GP: concern that datasets are being combined-Experian and census 2011 data but some of the figures in these datasets differ (for example total job numbers). Not explained how the differences between the Experian and census figures have been satisfactorily resolved.

JB: p104, figure 83. Example of the wild changes you can get with Experian data.

IM: Economic scenario assumes unconstrained economic growth.

JD: when household number converted into employment floorspace-providing floorspace may not be possible.

JB: 10.33. Growth of people deferring retirement age, more women in the workforce. Clarify whether they have a need for housing?

General point: more info needed on Heathrow at the end of the chapter? Timescale cannot be forecasted.

JB: Caveat needed on flows with economic projections and use of projections generally. More work needed on economic work to underpin our Plans. This is just one piece of the jigsaw.

Section 8: Requirements for different sizes of homes:

A number of typos noted, but no substantive comments made on the contents of this chapter.

JB: even if you do not build anything, the composition of your stock is changing through conversions, extensions etc. Spelthorne have looked at this previously and do the same exercise again so that they know the net need for each size of home based on the changes that have occurred in their stock when contrasted with the SHMA figures.

Figure 93: Size of housing needed from 2013 to 2033-need to refine the figures in this graph so we get a net figure and not a gross figure.

Section 9: Specific groups of the population

General point made that there is more work to do in this chapter.

BME-as discussed previously about our local population being different potentially from the national picture.

Older people-sometimes 55+ are referred to, sometimes 65+ and sometimes 75+. Reason for the changing base for the analysis needs to be explained.

PT: from a housing perspective, more needs to be done to help meet the needs of the mid 70s +.

JB: to what extent should we be including care homes, sheltered housing etc in deciding what types of home need to be provided?

JD: Figure 105 on page 126 and figure 106 on page 127: Lots of numbers, not clear what they are trying to tell us. Do the figures add up to make one number for each authority? What type of accommodation is required?

General comment: Poor job on specialist and older persons housing needs.

PT: Once this report is made available to all Members and the public, people are going to get caught up in the big numbers at the end of the report but discussion needs to focus on what we are going to do.

Para 9.57 on p.138: The needs of younger people. No reference to students or institutional population (as has been looked at for older people). This needs to be re looked at.

Section 10: Draft conclusions and recommendations

General comment: This section is better presented than other sections but may need tweaking after other changes requested are made in the earlier chapters. Figure 126 helpful.

Query as to whether section 10 would be more beneficial as an executive summary? GP advised that contractually GL Hearn did have to provide an executive summary with the final report.

RSA: Green Belt needs capital letters throughout the report.

JD: We need to show through the Plan process that both Authorities are doing everything they can to meet their identified needs.

Discussion on next steps

PT: Supply side factors need exploring further.

JB: Report should be held now until 2012 household projections are available so that GL Hearn only has to amend the report once.

General discussion took place in respect of the best time to engage with stakeholders and partners in light of additional work needed by GL Hearn to increase clarity.

GP: Officers will now go back to GL Hearn and discuss the changes required. We will ask GL Hearn to track the changes in their updated draft so that it is clear to Members and

Officers where changes have been made. If not, comparison with current draft will be difficult and time consuming.

Outcome: Agreed that GP and JD would go back to GL Hearn with the comments of the group and ask them to produce an amended version.

GP and JD would also consider the likely timetable for the next steps in the process and feed back to the Group before any other decisions were made.

Runnymede and Spelthorne SHMA Joint Member Liaison Group

Minutes from meeting on Monday 27th April 2015, 10am – 12 noon at the SBC Offices

Attendees:

Ian Maguire – Corporate Head of Planning and Environmental Services - RBC

Jane Margetts - Corporate Head of Housing & Community Development – RBC

Georgina Pacey- Principal Planning Officer, Policy and Strategy Team - RBC

Cllr Geoffrey Woodger – Chairman of Planning Committee – RBC

Cllr Gail Kingerley-likely successor as Chairman of Planning Committee following elections- RBC

John Brooks – Head of Planning and Housing Strategy - SBC

John Devonshire – Senior Planning Officer – SBC

Cllr Vivienne Leighton – Portfolio holder for planning - SBC

Cllr Richard Smith - Ainsley – Chair of LPWP

Apologies:

Cllr Peter Taylor – current Chairman of the Housing Committee – RBC

Cllr Hugh Meares – likely successor as Chairman of Housing Committee following elections- RBC

Minutes from meeting

JB and IM agreed that IM would chair the meeting. IM suggested that the best way to proceed was to initially focus on the key changes that have been made to the SHMA since the Group last met in February and then discuss next steps in the project and timetable. The Group agreed to this approach.

JB commented that circumstances will change as time goes on and as Plan preparation continues. Caveats are required in the SHMA to confirm where further work will need to be done. IM agreed. The economic chapter was cited as a good example as the detailed economic work which will be carried out by both Authorities may see this section of the SHMA needing to be refreshed at a later stage.

Review of draft SHMA

IM took the Group through the changes that had been made to the SHMA. The Group agreed that they were satisfied that the changes that had been made addressed the comments of the SHMA JMLG that had been put to GL Hearn following the last meeting of the Group.

Officers would now go back to GL Hearn with the minor comments noted on the A4 sheet produced by JD (and with the additional comments made in the meeting) and once these

changes had been made would be satisfied that the document was fit for purpose for consultation.

GP would ask the RBC Housing team to confirm if they had any comments that also needed to be fed back to the consultants.

Some of the more pertinent points made during the discussion were:

-JD and GP advised that they had recently attended a meeting at Hounslow Borough Council Offices and had received a positive response from officers about collaborative working on key strategic issues as we all progress our Plans (as the draft Runnymede and Spelthorne SHMA and Runnymede's Functional Economic Area analysis indicate clear links with Hounslow). JD advised that following the adoption of the Hounslow Local Plan (anticipated in September this year), Hounslow would be embarking almost immediately on 2 partial reviews of the Plan including a West of Borough Plan. This Plan would be particularly relevant for Runnymede and Spelthorne.

-JB commented that the decisions on Airport expansion had the potential to generate enormous economic changes. We need to engage with Heathrow Airport Ltd like they are a DtC body. Heathrow Airport Ltd and the Airports Commission have different views on where housing would be required if Heathrow expansion gets agreed. If expansion at Heathrow is agreed we need to take a proactive and not a reactive approach to engaging with Heathrow Airport Ltd. Heathrow Airport Ltd would need to commission some modelling to determine the impacts for different authorities (relating to the economy and housing).

-In regard to Chapter 7 of the SHMA titled 'economic led housing requirements' JD and GP advised the Group of the difficulties they had had in trying to bottom out the dramatic increases and decreases in Spelthorne's job numbers since the late 90s. Officers advised that they had not been able to do this in the limited amount they had had and felt that it was only through producing the more detailed work which will be undertaken in both Authorities' Employment Land Reviews that we may be able to get some answers. JD had spoken to GL Hearn and a number of caveats had been added into the report to confirm that the Experian projections relied upon in the SHMA have some shortcomings and that the economic led housing requirements chapter in the SHMA may need updating once both Authorities have completed their detailed economic evidence. The Group agreed that the caveats added were sufficient and agreed with the approach suggested by Officers.

-An overarching comment was made that there was a concern about the public, developers and Members flicking through the SHMA and jumping to the 'big numbers' without reading the surrounding text which clarifies that the OAN is not a housing target and that both Authorities are still doing further detailed evidence based work which may see the numbers in the SHMA changing. IM suggested a reordering of some of the paragraphs so that the reader had to read the context behind the numbers before reading the actual numbers. The Group agreed that this would be a good idea. IM also suggested that Officers review the wording in the caveat related to the economic projections to check whether it could benefit from strengthening in places. JD and GP to review.

Next steps in SHMA process

GP outlined that officers thought that the next key steps in the process should be to:

-Publish the document

-Carry out a consultation event with the Duty to Cooperate bodies on the draft SHMA

-Arrange a presentation and consultation event with the bodies that the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises should be consulted with as a Local Authority prepares its evidence in relation to development needs. These groups/bodies are: *local communities, partner organisations, Local Enterprise Partnerships, businesses and business representative organisations, universities and higher education establishments, house builders (including those specialising in older people's housing), parish and town councils, designated neighbourhood forums preparing neighbourhood plans and housing associations.*

The Group agreed with these proposed steps.

Timetable

The following timetable was agreed for the next steps in the SHMA process:

12th May -GL Hearn finalise SHMA content (incorporating the final round of minor comments made by the SHMA JMLG).

15th May to 13th June-Duty to Cooperate Stakeholder event: it was agreed that the draft SHMA would be emailed to the DtC bodies and they would be provided with a 3-4 week opportunity to comment. The wording of the covering email will be agreed by both Authorities before sending.

1st June -Spelthorne Local Plan Working Party meeting (to discuss the draft SHMA and next steps in the process as required by Spelthorne's constitution)

2nd June -Officers to email all of the PPG bodies listed above in italics and who are on each Council's planning policy consultation databases and ask if they would be interested in attending a consultation event on the SHMA which was being arranged for early July (It was agreed that officers would contact the members of the Group by email when they knew the level of interest in the SHMA event from the PPG bodies and would seek agreement on the format of the consultation event).

13th – 20th June-Officers to address comments made by DtC bodies and liaise with GL Hearn as appropriate.

24th June -Spelthorne Cabinet meeting.

25th June -SHMA publication date.

Within the first 2 weeks of July (date to be agreed)-Consultation event for PPG bodies on the SHMA.

Mid July -Officers to produce a table summarising all of the comments received through both consultation events and draft officer responses. Officers will work with GL Hearn to decide whether any further amendments to the SHMA are required following the consideration of the comments received during the consultation events. Any such recommendations for changes will be discussed at the next meeting of the JMLG before the document is published in final form.

Date of next meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting of the SHMA JMLG should be arranged for mid July after all of the comments on the draft SHMA had been received and reviewed by Officers.

Notes from SHMA JMLG 27th August 2015

Present:

Cllr Mrs Kinglerley (GK), RBC

Jane Margetts (JM), RBC

Cllr Meares (HM), RBC

Ian Maguire (IM), RBC

Cllr Mrs Leighton (VL), SBC

Georgina Pacey (GP), RBC

Cllr Smith-Ainsley (RSA), SBC

John Brooks (JB), SBC

Maggie Ward (MW), RBC

John Devonshire (JD), SBC

Cheryl Brunton (CB), RBC

1) Update on SHMA

- GP & JD summarised the key written representations received to the recent draft SHMA consultation, which ended on 3/8.
- 31 reps were received and the main reps for consideration were those received from Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP) and Barton Willmore, both of which provided their own technical review of the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA.
- GP & JD have liaised with SHMA consultants, GL Hearn, regarding the reps to ascertain if any substantial changes would consequently be required.
- GL Hearn advised that amendments to the affordable housing chapter in the SHMA would be necessary in light of a recent High Court decision known as 'Satnam'. The gist of the decision is that a full OAN figure should include an upward adjustment in market housing to meet affordable needs. This would significantly increase the OAN for Runnymede and Spelthorne. However as what Satnam is suggesting is almost directly contrary to what is set out in the July 2015 Planning Advisory Service (PAS) advice report, and as further case law is anticipated in the next 12 months GL Hearn recommend that a flexible approach is taken in the SHMA, not pinning our mast to one position or another until the way forward is clearer (this approach follows legal advice given to Guildford BC on the same issue).
- GL Hearn has applied a 6% market uplift to the figures in the SHMA but the other technical reviews have claimed 10% is more suitable. GL Hearn are confident the 6% uplift is robust and defensible
- The reps also criticised the SHMA because the implications of a Heathrow expansion were not considered. However, officers and consultants defended this position because no decision has actually been made yet on whether Heathrow or Gatwick airport will be expanded. It was concluded that GL Hearn would add some text regarding airport expansion, and if necessary, the SHMA may be refreshed in the future, as and when a decision has been made, and any implications for the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA are understood, but it was agreed that at the current time no refresh would be undertaken.
- There was also criticism from some reps that the population forecast figures were out of date as the 2014 mid year estimates had not been taken account of. However, officers advised that as updated figures are published regularly, the draft SHMA would continually be being revised if it was updated every time a new set of projections was published and the document would consequently never be finalised.

It was agreed that before the Local Plan hearing, the document would need a data refresh, perhaps more than once, however such a refresh was considered to not be necessary at the current time.

- There was criticism that the employment forecasting relied upon in the SHMA was out of date. Officers advised that the forecasting used was up to date when the SHMA was being produced, but in any instance, due to recognised flaws with the Experian data, the SHMA already contained a commitment that each LPA would be conducting an Employment Land Review in due course and more detailed analysis in the area of employment forecasting would be undertaken. Once complete, this more detailed analysis would form an addendum to the SHMA. In reality, officers explained that even if this work does change the upper end of the OAN range given in the SHMA, in reality, this would not change the numbers of houses delivered through the LPAs' local plans as only so much land would be suitable to help meet development needs in an area with such constraints.
- Some representors felt that the SHMA should have carried out sensitivity testing around the inward and outward migration from/to London in line with the assumptions used in the London SHMA (based on a 5% increase in outward migration and 3% decrease in inward migration). GL Hearn has agreed that this sensitivity testing should be carried out for completeness.

Overall, officers concluded that they were confident that the draft SHMA was a sound evidence base, subject to the amendments discussed, although for the reasons outlined, the SHMA would likely need to be refreshed/amended prior to Local Plan examination to respond to new case law, to take account of changing circumstances (such as expansion at Heathrow) and/or to incorporate new modelling, although updates to the document would be kept to the minimum. Members agreed with officers' comments.

2) Next steps for SHMA

- GL Hearn will confirm cost of making minor changes to the draft SHMA by 4th September. It is hoped the cost will be low given that the changes that are required to be made to the SHMA are relatively modest in nature. It is hoped that the necessary amendments will be made to the draft document by the end of September.
- A tracked changed final version of the SHMA will be circulated to the group via email for consideration in due course once GL Hearn has made the revisions discussed.
- The document can then be published by both LPAs, subject to the appropriate corporate processes.
- Officer responses to reps made during the recent consultation will be completed based on technical guidance from GL Hearn. The reps and responses will be published on both Councils websites when the 'final' SHMA is published (anticipated before the end of October).

3) SLAA methodology

- CB gave a brief introduction to the SLAA, which considers land availability for a number of uses, not just housing, (which previous iterations of the evidence base

considered in isolation when it was known as the SHLAA). This change has been necessitated to be compliant with Planning Practice Guidance.

- The draft methodology would be produced jointly with Spelthorne, however the SLAA itself (where the five year supply for housing is determined) would not be produced jointly because the two authorities are at different stages of Plan preparation
- IM set out the premise of the Development Market Panel, which would be made up of developers, professional agents and land owners who would be able to advise officers of site viability, which would assist officers in determining a site's achievability and whether it could form part of the five year supply of deliverable sites. It was discussed whether there would be a separate DMP for each authority, which may become one panel over time *[post meeting note: since the meeting of the JMLG, officers from Spelthorne and Runnymede have continued discussions about the DMP and are now considering producing one panel for both Authority areas from the outset]*.
- IM also advised that a Community Panel would be set up in Runnymede which would be made up of representatives from the Residents Associations and which would advise of potential sites they knew of in their local areas which may have development potential.
- Members agreed that the two Authorities should proceed in producing the joint methodology (which may change over time as new Government changes in policy are made), and that Runnymede will consult on its draft methodology when it conducts its SLAA call for sites exercise in mid September, subject to minor changes. Spelthorne would conduct a call for sites exercise at a later date.
- It was agreed CB would email Members for comments and any comments to the draft SLAA methodology should be received by Thursday 3rd September.

4) AOB

- No AOB

5) DONM

- Date not set, however another meeting would be scheduled once RBC had completed analysis following its call for sites exercise and a supply of housing sites was complete (not anticipated until towards the end of 2015).

**Minutes from the Runnymede BC and Spelthorne BC Joint Member Liaison Group,
13th April 2016**

2-4pm, Runnymede Civic Centre

Present:

Cllr Barry Pitt (BP), RBC
Cllr John Edwards (JE), RBC
Cllr Peter Waddell (PW), RBC
Cllr Smith-Ainsley (RSA), SBC
Angela Horsey (AH), RBC
Apologies:
Jane Margetts (RBC)

John Brooks (JB), SBC
Ian Maguire (IM), RBC
Hannah Cook (HC), SBC
Cheryl Brunton (CB), RBC

1) Summary of SLAA site assessment

- CB summarised the SLAA site assessment, which is considered to be an interim SLAA. CB noted that RBC may publish a later SLAA version when publishing the Local Plan if anything has been left out.
- 148 sites have been considered in the SLAA, coming forward through sites that have previously been identified, new sites and resultant land parcels. The 5-year supply in Runnymede is considered to be between 1400 and 1700.
- JB questioned the use of an under-delivery discount at 20%. IM stated that Runnymede's previous SLAA applied a 20% discount and this is also based on the use of the figure by other local authorities. IM stated that the most appropriate figure could be different in the final Local Plan and this will be an iterative process.
- CB set out that Runnymede would be able to deliver 350 dwellings per annum. Much of this is land is expected to arise through the resultant land parcels identified in the Runnymede Green Belt review undertaken by Arup.
- CB and IM have visited the resultant land parcel sites to assess whether they can accommodate housing. CB stated that Runnymede's Development Market Panel have also been through the sites to provide further market analysis.
- JB stated that none of the resultant land parcels in Runnymede bordered Spelthorne, therefore it is not for Spelthorne to come to a view on Runnymede's green belt sites. IM noted the border links that Runnymede has to Woking and Surrey Heath in terms of green belt and noted that no sites border Spelthorne. It was noted there is a different context arising between Runnymede and Spelthorne in terms of green belt with Spelthorne being at the very inner edge of the green belt, less green belt overall and substantial areas being reservoir and no large 'sweeps' of green belt.
- SBC and RBC discussed the use of Green Belt review methodologies and noted the worth of using compatible approaches. IM discussed the need to balance the assessment of sites with the potential for housing.
- CB summarised the findings of each of the resultant land parcels identified in the Runnymede Green Belt Review. IM stated that housing densities on each site are currently driven by what land owners are willing to accommodate, however national policy may increase housing densities in the future.
- RBC advised that it is looking to test the higher range of units on each site and it was noted that if sites do come forward, a sustainability appraisal will need to be undertaken.

- JB questioned how the process of assessing sites would evolve from a technical assessment to an allocation in the plan. IM stated that the facts would be taken first and planning allocation would evolve in the Autumn/Winter period.
- JB referred to Figure 111 of the Runnymede and Spelthorne joint SHMA, questioning whether the potential number of units listed in the Resultant Land Parcels have taken account of the different levels of need for different size bedrooms. IM stated that Runnymede are roughly satisfied with the housing mix and density and further detail will be provided in the later stages of the plan.

2) Meeting the OAN

- JB advised that the current house building levels in Spelthorne are much lower than the SHMA future need levels (average 2006-2015= 187 average p.a.).
- JB advised that there is a requirement to balance the requirements of housing and employment. Both authorities agreed that effectively balancing employment and housing was essential.
- JB advised that the potential employment impact that the forthcoming decision on Heathrow Airport could have on Runnymede would need to be taken account of. IM noted that even if a decision by the government was made on Heathrow in summer 2016, a significant period of time is expected to pass before more information and figures would come to light that RBC could use in its plan. IM also discussed the potential that future changes in infrastructure could have on commuting patterns to Heathrow and the potential for in-commuting from a wider area.
- The impacts of flexible working and floorspace efficiencies were discussed and the question was raised over how this could potentially alter the level of employment floorspace required for business.
- JB questioned if teasing out the London migration element of the proportion of the OAN attributed to Runnymede was an option for housing, to see if it could meet its own needs. IM stated that the options listed needed to be reasonable and advised that it is unlikely that London could meet its own needs.
- Housing densities were also discussed. Concerns were raised over the low density figures and IM stated that policies were needed to direct densities. JB noted that density is a product of the size of the buildings on site and it was agreed that the use of density as measure has some weaknesses as it can be misleading. BP questioned the impact of infrastructure on density, including site access.
- JB raised the need for affordable housing and whether they had a target figure derived from operational experience as a housing authority along with the model used in the SHMA. IM stated that the figures set out the SHMA are beyond achievable for Runnymede. It is likely that viability work will be undertaken to help inform the Runnymede policy for affordable housing.
- RBC and SBC discussed the need of specialist groups, most notably the impact that the growing elderly population is likely to have on housing need. JB noted the role of care homes on housing contribution. JE noted that RBC are trying to keep people in homes for a longer period of time through policy rather than utilising care homes.
- It was agreed that JB would provide an update to the housing figures and 5 year supply in Spelthorne. Spelthorne will be able to provide these within the next month once the yearly figures have been collated. JB stated that completions are expected to increase over the coming years due to a number of large schemes materialising.
- JB stated that SBC's next step to undertake with its SLAA is a call for sites, however this is delayed somewhat due to resource issues. SBC has undertaken a number of

component parts of the SLAA and are aiming to complete the SLAA by the end of 2015.

- RBC discussed its requirement of data from Spelthorne regarding its housing figures, in order to progress with its current timetable.

3) AOB

- No AOB.

Meeting of the Runnymede-Spelthorne Joint Member Liaison Group

Wednesday 18th April at 3pm

Spelthorne Borough Council offices

Attendees:

Ann Biggs, Spelthorne Borough Council

Councillor Ian Harvey, Spelthorne Borough Council

Councillor Colin Barnard, Spelthorne Borough Council

Ian Maguire, Runnymede Borough Council

Councillor Gail Kingerley, Runnymede Borough Council

Councillor Marissa Heath, Runnymede Borough Council

Minutes of meeting

1-Introductions: All attendees introduced themselves.

2-Purpose of meeting and relevant background information: IM and AB provided some background information on the contents of the draft National Planning Policy Framework which was subject to consultation, in particular in relation to the Duty to Cooperate. The draft NPPF placed more emphasis on the need for Statements of Common Ground to be produced between partners to demonstrate effective and on-going joint working. Given the strength of the functional relationship between Runnymede and Spelthorne, officers at both authorities were of the opinion that a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) should be produced.

A SoCG had been drafted collaboratively by officers at both authorities and sent to all attendees in advance of the meeting. The SoCG aimed to set out where there were strategic cross boundary matters of interest to both authorities, where cooperation had occurred to date, outcomes achieved through cooperation and where matters for resolution remained. The purpose of the meeting was to agree the content of the SoCG so that it could be finalised, signed and published. The SoCG would then form the basis for future discussions under the Duty to Cooperate.

Another aim of the meeting was to agree the amended Terms of Reference for the Runnymede-Spelthorne Joint Member Liaison Group. The Group had originally been formed for the purpose cooperating during the production of the joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Now that the SHMA had been completed, officers were of the opinion that it was appropriate to amend the Terms of Reference for the Group to widen its scope so that it was a suitable Member level mechanism to discuss a range of matters associated with the Duty to Cooperate.

Officers had drafted an amended Terms of Reference which had been circulated to all attendees in advance of the meeting.

3-Terms of Reference for the Joint Member Liaison Group: Following a review of the drafted Terms of Reference, all Members agreed the wording of the amended Terms of Reference for the Joint Member Liaison Group with no amendments.

4-Content of the Runnymede and Spelthorne Statement of Common Ground: Members went through the SoCG to agree its contents. Councillor Harvey asked for officers to produce revised wording on the River Thames Scheme. No other substantive changes were requested by Members. Officers confirmed that there were a number of areas where officers still needed to input information i.e. to reflect the most up to date position with the timescales for the production of Spelthorne Borough Council's evidence base documents. These factual additions would be completed in the final draft of the SoCG which would be circulated to Members prior to signing. Members noted and agreed the intention of RBC to formally request that SBC plans for an additional 1,499sqm of retail provision in Staines upon Thames. Members also noted and agreed that, at this time no other specific requests between the authorities were being made.

5-Discussion of annex Statement of Common Grounds: Officers advised that they felt it would be useful for Runnymede and Spelthorne to pursue an annex Statement of Common Ground with Elmbridge Borough Council and discussions at an officer level were underway. Beyond this, Runnymede had already signed a Statement of Common Ground with Surrey Heath Borough Council and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, and was pursuing Statements of Common Ground with Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council.

6- Timescale for signing of agreements: It was agreed that officers would produce amended wording on the River Thames Scheme and then share with Members for agreement. Other factual information currently missing from the Statement of Common Ground would be inputted. Officers would then recirculate the amended draft to Members. IM advised that he thought it would be useful for the agreement to be signed and published in advance of Runnymede's upcoming consultation on its draft Local Plan which was due to commence on 18th May and in advance of Spelthorne's upcoming Issues and Options consultation which was also due to commence in May. There was agreement that all parties would endeavour to sign the Statement of Common Ground and publish in support of these dates.

7- AOB: None

Appendix D – Officer level agreement on joint SLAA methodology

From: Devonshire, John
Sent: 20 January 2015 15:30
To: Cheryl Brunton
Cc: Babatunde Adebute
Subject: RE: Joint Strategic Land Availability Assessment methodology

Hi Cheryl,

I think a joint SLAA methodology or at least a consistent methodology between Runnymede and Spelthorne would be a good idea given that we are in the same HMA. I would assume that this will be based on the PPG advice, but there may be some aspects of the methodology which will need to be considered further such as approach to site densities, sites in the Green Belt and phasing of sites with constraints i.e. flood risk areas etc...I would certainly expect a 'draft methodology' to be subject to some kind of stakeholder involvement to inform the approach and maybe even discussion under the DtC. This is something I have done before through a Housing Market Partnership with Surrey Heath/Rushmoor/Hart to give legitimacy to the methodology and reduce issues at examination.

This kind of stakeholder involvement is something that I have discussed with Tunde for the SHMA study and I don't see why the SHMA stakeholder group couldn't be used for the SLAA as well. To avoid delay in your timetable a stakeholder event could sit alongside your call for sites with invitation to comment on the methodology during this period.

If you have any thoughts let me know.

Regards

John Devonshire MSc, BSc, BA, MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer
Spelthorne Borough Council
Council Offices
Knowle Green
Staines-upon-Thames
TW18 1XB

From: Cheryl Brunton
Sent: 20 January 2015 11:19
To: Devonshire, John
Cc: Georgina Pacey; Babatunde Adebute
Subject: Joint Strategic Land Availability Assessment methodology

Dear John,

We have recently been discussing how to move forward drafting the methodology for the SLAA (or whatever it will end up being known as) and you might be aware of our current timetabling to get this work completed to enable a call for sites exercise in late February/early March.

Being that the SHMA is being produced jointly between Runnymede and Spelthorne, does Spelthorne also wish to produce a joint methodology for the SLAA? At this stage, I am uncertain as to whether it would be necessary to deviate from the PPG guidance, but would be interested to hear your views.

Ideally, we need to know whether or not Spelthorne is interested in producing a joint methodology within the next week or so in order for us to begin work on this in a timely manner.

If I don't hear from you, I'll be in touch next week.

Thanks,
Cheryl

Kind Regards,
Cheryl Brunton | Planning Policy Officer | Runnymede Borough Council

[Please Think Before You Print This](#)

This message, and the associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.

[My Spelthorne](#) - providing Spelthorne Council and public service information relevant to you

Please visit our brand new website at www.spelthorne.gov.uk to see the new things you can find and do.

We scan every e-mail for viruses but it is your responsibility to carry out any checks on receipt. This e-mail is for the addressee only.

Think before you print.

Appendix E – Spelthorne Local Plan update email

From: Cook, Hannah on behalf of Planning Policy
Sent: 05 March 2018 14:57
Subject: Duty to Cooperate - Spelthorne Borough Council Local Plan Update

Dear Sir/ Madam

Spelthorne Local Plan update 2020 - 2035

Spelthorne Borough Council is currently preparing a new Local Plan to cover the period 2020 – 2035.

I am writing to provide an update on Local Plan progress under the Duty to Cooperate.

In November 2017 Spelthorne Borough Council published an updated Local Development Scheme for 2017 – 2020, setting out the timetable for the preparation and adoption of the Local Plan. The document can be found at: <https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/localplan>

The Council is currently preparing its evidence to support the new Local Plan which will inform the issues and options for consultation in spring/summer 2018. The following evidence base studies are underway:

Green Belt Assessment

Arup were appointed to undertake an independent Green Belt Assessment stage 1 in 2017. This looked at the performance of the Green Belt at two different scales:

1. Strategic areas - focusing on the primary purposes of wider functional areas of Green Belt in the Borough and their role within the wider sub-regional context of the Metropolitan Green Belt
2. Local areas - which considered whether smaller areas fulfil the Green Belt purposes, as set out in the NPPF.

The final assessment is available to view on the Council's website at: <https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/article/13703/Green-Belt-Assessment>

Spelthorne Borough Council have recently commissioned ARUP to undertake a Green Belt Assessment stage 2, considering how smaller parcels of land within wider Local Areas perform individually. This study will largely focus upon sites identified through the Council's 'call for sites' exercise.

Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)

Spelthorne Borough Council has recently published its draft SLAA. This sets out that the Council is able to deliver approximately 388 dwellings per annum, which falls below the 590 target set by the Government in the standardised methodology for calculating housing need. Much of the supply identified is likely to come forward in years 1-5. Work is ongoing to increase housing supply in the Borough to identify potential new development sites.

Economic Land Needs Assessment (ELNA)

Spelthorne Borough Council is producing a new ELNA in-house that will sit alongside the Spelthorne Economic Strategy 2017-2022 and the Local Economic Assessment (2016). This report considers all commercial and industrial uses falling into use classes B1 (a, b and c), B2 and B8 of the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended). Initial findings indicate that there will be a fall in B2 required floorspace and a rise in both B1 and B8 required floorspace, with an overall requirement of approximately 8,000 sqm B Class floorspace over the plan period.

Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA)

ORS were commissioned to undertake a new GTAA in November 2017. Site visits are underway and it is anticipated that the report will be published in due course.

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)

AECOM were commissioned to undertake a new SFRA in November 2017. The majority of data has been collected to inform the study however a few datasets are still outstanding, including modelling for the Lower Thames which is

being updated. The Level 1 SFRA is currently being drafted and initial findings indicate that 23% of the Borough is in Flood Zone 2; 9% is in Flood Zone 3 and 12% is in Flood Zone 3b. The draft report is due to be finalised and will be published in due course.

Retail & Town Centre Study

The Retail & Town Centre Study was produced in 2015, however it is being updated to take account of more recent information. Consultants GVA who undertook the 2015 study are being utilised to provide an update to the study.

Open Space & Leisure Study

Spelthorne Borough Council is currently producing an Open Space & Leisure Study. This study will look at the current stock of open space in the Borough and will help to inform the strategy pursued with regards to open space in the new Local Plan.

Biodiversity Study

A Biodiversity Study is being undertaken and will inform the Council's new Local Plan. This study will look at the biodiversity value of all identified sites and will also look at the significance of the habitats and species within these sites. The Biodiversity Study will review all Sites of Nature Conservation Importance in Spelthorne and any that cross boundaries.

Issues & Options Consultation

Following the evidence gathering stage, Spelthorne Borough Council will be undertaking an Issues and Options consultation in late spring 2018. This will outline the key Issues facing the Borough and the potential options to address them.

In light of the above information, I would like to provide an opportunity for you to raise any specific queries relating to the Duty to Cooperate. Should you wish to discuss any of the above or to arrange a meeting to discuss cross boundary matters under the Duty to Cooperate, please do not hesitate to contact me using the details provided.

Appendix F – Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 email

Bridges, Hannah

From: Devonshire, John
Sent: 13 November 2015 15:27
Subject: Spelthorne Green Belt Assessment - Consultants Brief
Attachments: Specification - v1.docx

Categories: Egress Switch: Unprotected

Dear Sir/Madam,

Spelthorne Borough Council are seeking to appoint consultant's to undertake a Green Belt assessment on their behalf. As you are an authority which Spelthorne has identified in its Duty to Cooperate Framework with an interest in cross boundary Green Belt issues, we are seeking your views on the attached consultants brief before tendering for the assessment work.

If you have any comments on the attached brief I would be obliged if you could return them by email to planning.policy@spelthorne.gov.uk by Friday 27 November 2016.

Regards

John Devonshire BSc (Hons), BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI
Planning Policy Team Leader (Temp)
Policy & Implementation
Spelthorne Borough Council

Bridges, Hannah

From: Gardner, Lynne **On Behalf Of** Planning Policy

Sent: 10 October 2016 15:49

Subject: Spelthorne Borough Council Local Plan Review Evidence Base Documents for consultation

Dear Consultee

Spelthorne Borough Council Local Plan Evidence Base Consultation

Spelthorne Borough Council began a review of its Local Plan in September 2014 and is working to prepare an evidence base to support the new Local Plan. A number of documents have already been consulted on and the council has prepared three further documents which are now available for public consultation:

- **Green Belt Assessment Draft Methodology**
- **Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment Draft Scoping Report**
- **Spelthorne Functional Economic Area Analysis Draft Report**

Consultation

The Council is now inviting comments on the documents. The consultation will run for a period of 4 weeks from **Monday 10 October 2016 until Monday 7 November 2016**. If you have any comments on the documents or feel that any relevant information has been omitted from them you can respond in a number of ways using the form provided:

Online: <https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/article/3014/Consultations-and-representations>

Please use a separate form for each consultation document.

Email: planning.policy@spelthorne.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy Team, Spelthorne Borough Council, Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 1XB.

The documents are:

- 1) **Green Belt Assessment Draft Methodology:** This sets out the methodology through which an up-to-date objective assessment of the Borough's Green Belt will take place against the criteria within the National Planning Policy Framework. This study does not seek to identify any sites to be released for development, only whether the Green Belt fulfils the purposes as defined in the NPPF.
- 2) **Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment Draft Scoping Report:** Sustainability Appraisal (SA), including Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), is a statutory requirement for all Local Plans and considers the sustainability credentials of a Local Plan and its policies through social, environmental and economic considerations. The SA Scoping Report is the first stage of the SA and its purpose is to set out relevant plans or programmes which may influence the Local Plan; collect baseline information and identify sustainability issues and problems; and provide the Sustainability Framework against which options, policies and strategies of the Local Plan will be assessed.
- 3) **Spelthorne Functional Economic Area Analysis Draft Report:** This report seeks to define the Functional Economic Area (FEA) for Spelthorne. The draft report concludes that Spelthorne sits within a Heathrow-focussed FEA, and holds its strongest links with Runnymede, Hounslow, Hillingdon and Elmbridge. The report has been produced in line with national policy and planning guidance, which requires local authorities to have

a good understanding of the wider economic area of which they are a part, so that they can clearly identify which neighbouring authorities they need to work with under the Duty to Cooperate.

Copies of the draft documents are available at: <https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/article/3014/Consultations-and-representations>

Please contact Planning Policy on planning.policy@spelthorne.gov.uk or call 01784 446405 if you have any queries about the Local Plan review.

Kind regards

**Planning Policy Team
Spelthorne Borough Council**

You are being contacted because your details appear on our Local Plan consultation database. However, if you no longer wish to receive notifications regarding planning policy documents being prepared by the council, please let us know by emailing planning.policy@spelthorne.gov.uk and we will remove you from our database.

Appendix G – Open space correspondence

Bridges, Hannah

From: Dickson, Luke
Sent: 16 October 2017 09:10
To: Georgina Pacey
Subject: Queries about Runnymede Open Space Study 2016

Dear Georgina,

I have just started at Spelthorne Borough Council and my colleague Geoff Dawes recommended that I contact you. He said you were very helpful.

Spelthorne is currently looking at its Open Space Evidence base and I notice that you undertook your Open Space Study 2016 in-house.

I don't know if you were involved directly with this piece of work, but I was wondering if you or another member of your team might be able to provide a little background on the work the study entailed.

I would be interested to know:

- How much time the study took from inception to completion?
- Do have a project plan that you followed to guide you through the process? And were you able to keep to the timescales?
- How many site visits were undertaken? I would imagine this was fairly time-consuming.
- You have a set of open space/parks quality criteria could you tell where this came from/from what it was derived?
- To what extent did you take account of open spaces outside the borough in terms accessibility catchments?
- What are your thoughts on the in-house production of the work vs the use of consultants? Do you feel it was the right decision to do it in-house?

Any light you could shed on the process would be very gratefully received.

Kind regards,

Luke Dickson
Planning Policy Officer
Spelthorne Borough Council
Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 1XB

Appendix H – SNCI Correspondence

Bridges, Hannah

From: Dickson, Luke
Sent: 20 October 2017 13:48
To: John Edwards EI
Subject: Spelthorne - Review of SNCIs

Dear John,

I am have just started working in the Planning Policy Team at Spelthorne and Geoff Dawes advised me that you would be an important person to contact with regards to nature conservation matters.

Spelthorne is in the process of producing a replacement Local Plan and we are looking at the evidence base for the nature conservation sites and in particular the Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs).

I have been trying to get a grasp of the chronology of the SNCIs within the Borough and the picture I have is the following:

1. I understand the SNCIs were originally selected and endorsed at SNCLG meetings in 1996.
2. They were then adopted through Spelthorne's 2001 Local Plan
3. The designations and the policies pertaining to them (*RU11 & RU14*) were saved in 2009. The Proposals Map Development Plan Document was produced in the same year.
4. I understand that there was a review in 2012 which looked at the status of existing sites, potential new sites and boundaries and included some recommendations regarding this (see attached). In particular it looked at the following locations:

- Land Adjacent to Bronzefield Prison
- Shortwood Common South
- River Thames and Towpath – Staines Lammas to Staines Bridge
- River Colne (from County Boundary to Staines Moor), Stanwell Moor
- Kempton Lake & Half Moon Covert
- Littleton Lake – Shepperton Green Reservoir
- West of Poyle Meadows

Would you have information regarding the following or, if this is held by the Surrey Wildlife Trust, would you be able refer me to an appropriate contact there?

1. Information on the last review of the 26 sites designated in the Local Plan and where the sites are now within the review process – whether they are scheduled for another review and, if so, when?
2. Any changes from the original 26 sites – changes to boundaries, recommendations for de-designation & for new sites to be designated that have been identified over the years by SWT. If these changes were available in spreadsheet and GIS form, it would be very useful.

I understand a former Bio-diversity Officer at Spelthorne, Cynthia Bendickson, looked at certain water bodies within the Borough of Spelthorne which potentially merited designation as SNCIs. I am not sure how far this work progressed.

3. The up-to-date evaluation criteria for the selection of sites and process of endorsement prior to adoption through the planning process.

I am speaking to the current person responsible for biodiversity at Spelthorne on Monday, but I thought it would important to get a handle on things from you as well.

Any information, help and advice you could provide, would be very useful.

Kind regards,

Luke Dickson
Planning Policy Officer
Spelthorne Borough Council