

Runnymede 2035

Annual Monitoring Report



2016 - 17



Table of figures and list of tables	2
Portrait of Runnymede	3
Introduction	8
Core Output indicators (COIs)	9
New Local Plan Progress	10
Section 1	12
Infrastructure Delivery plan (IDP) & Community Infrastructure Levy	13
Business Development and Town Centres	15
BD1 Total amount of additional floorspace	16
Housing Development	17
H1 (a) Net dwellings in previous years	17
H2(b1) Net dwellings for the reporting year	18
H2 (b2) Bedroom information on additional dwellings	18
H2(c) Net additional dwellings in future years	18
H2(d) Managed delivery target	18
H3: Net additional pitches (Gypsy and Traveller)	18
H4: Net affordable housing completions	19
Environmental Quality	21
E1: Change in areas of biodiversity importance	21
E2: Renewable energy generation	22
The Duty to Cooperate	23
The Duty to Cooperate in the context of Runnymede 2016/17	25
Section 2	26
Other sources of Information	27
External Sources of Information	27
Internal Sources of Information	30
Appendices	32
Appendix 1 – Regulation 34 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)	32
Appendix 2 – Inspectors Letter (April 2014)	34
Appendix 3- Local Development Scheme (LDS)	44
Appendix 4 – Areas of Biodiversity Importance	68

Table of Figures


Figure Number	Title	Page Number
Figure 1	Runnymede and Neighbouring Boroughs	3
Figure 2	Runnymede Key Diagram	4
Figure 3	Runnymede population by age (ONS Census 2011)	5
Figure 4	Housing completions in Runnymede over the past 5 years	18

List of Tables

Table Number	Title	Page Number
Table 1	Housing requirement over the past 5 years in the absence of an up to date Local Plan	6
Table 2	Employment land completions – gains and losses 2016/17	16
Table 3	Size of dwelling units completed 2016/17	18
Table 4a	Affordable housing completions 2016/17	20
Table 4b	Total net affordable housing provision 2016/17	20
Table 5	Changes to the list of areas of biodiversity importance	21

1. Runnymede is in North West Surrey only twenty miles from Central London, and is strategically located at the junction of the M25 and M3 motorways. It has excellent road and rail connections to the capital, Heathrow Airport, and the wider South East Region, having good access to the motorway network and the Reading – Waterloo and Woking – Waterloo railway lines.
2. Runnymede is a relatively small Borough measuring only 8 miles from north to south and approximately 79% of its area lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt.

Figure 1 Runnymede and neighbouring Boroughs



3. This is the first open land on the south west edge of the London Metropolitan area and much of Runnymede's Green Belt is used for open land uses such as mineral working and landfill, public utilities, motorways and their intersections, educational and other institutions, research and development establishments, hotel and conference centres and large scale recreational uses, all of which were largely established before the Green Belt was designated.
4. Accessibility to London and Heathrow by rail and motorway makes Runnymede a highly desirable business location. The Borough has a strong local economic base with many commercial enterprises in the town centres, industrial estates and business parks. The local economy, in common with the rest of Surrey, is



dominated by the service sector, which employs the majority of the workforce, while manufacturing accounts for just 2%¹. Businesses and institutions in the Borough include: Ashford and St Peters Hospital Trust (ASHP), Royal Holloway (University of London), Gartner and Toshiba. ²

Figure 2 Runnymede Key Diagram




¹ Nomis Employee Jobs 2015

² Further information about the economy in Runnymede can be found in the Economic Development Strategy 2016-2019 at:

<https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16252&p=0>

- The population of Runnymede is growing; at the time of the 2011 Census there were 32,714 households in the Borough³ (translating to an average household size of 2.36 people), accommodating a population of 80,510⁴. The age profile of the population in Runnymede is shown in figure 3 below.

Figure 3 - Runnymede Population by age (ONS- Census 2011)



- Runnymede has seen an annual average housing delivery of 189 additional dwellings being completed over the past 5 years. In the absence of an up to date Local Plan (and adopted housing target) for the Borough, the Council is benchmarking housing delivery against the Council’s identified proportion of the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) for the wider Housing Market Area (HMA) as set out in its most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment. With this in mind, over the last 5 years, the relevant housing requirements for the Council are set out in table 1 below:

³ Source: ONS Census 2011 – Table HH01 Number of households with at least one usual resident, unrounded

⁴ Source: ONS Census 2011 – Table PP04 Usual Resident population

Table 1: Housing requirement over the past 5 years in the absence of an up to date Local Plan

Year	Housing delivered	Housing requirement	Source
2012/13	168	161	South East Plan (2009)
2013/14	70 (Includes student accommodation)	535	Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA (2015)
2014/15	124	535	Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA (2015)
2015/16	424 (Includes student accommodation)	535	Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA (2015)
2016/17	160	498	SHMA update (2018)

7. House prices are on average higher than in the rest of the south east and similar to London. The availability of affordable housing to meet local needs remains a key issue in the Borough.

8. Runnymede has a rich architectural and environmental heritage, having four Grade 1 listed buildings: Royal Holloway, University of London Founders Building, the former Holloway Sanatorium, Runnymede Park and Great Fosters, along with important listed parks and gardens such as Great Fosters (Grade 2*) and Savill Garden (Grade 1). The Borough also has a number of nationally and internationally important nature conservation sites including a boundary with the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area to the west and Windsor Great Park to the north-west.

9. Watercourses and lakes are a key characteristic of the Borough, with the River Thames forming the northern and eastern boundary, and the Basingstoke Canal forming the south eastern boundary. The rivers Wey, the Addlestone Bourne and the Chertsey Bourne run through the Addlestone and Chertsey areas of the Borough, and consequently much of the eastern side of the Borough is subject to flood risk. Recreationally, there are a number of water-based activities available in Runnymede including sailing, water-skiing, wind-surfing, canal and river boating and fishing. The Thorpe No. 1 Gravel Pit is a flooded former gravel pit, which is a

Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). It forms part of the London Water Bodies Special Protection Area (SPA), as it supports many wintering birds including the endangered Gadwall migratory bird population.



10. Tourism is an important part of the local economy. The main attractions include Thorpe Park, the River Thames, the Runnymede meadows and Coopers Hill slopes (site of the Magna Carta memorial, the John F. Kennedy memorial and the Royal Air Forces Memorial), Wentworth Golf Club, Virginia Water Lake, Savill Gardens and Windsor Great Park, Chertsey Meads and the site of Chertsey Abbey.
 11. The Borough has three main towns; Addlestone, Chertsey, and Egham. A brief overview of each of these centres is provided below:
 - a. Addlestone is the Borough's youngest centre, which grew with the coming of the railway in the late 19th century. Today the centre contains a mix of commercial and residential uses, with a large superstore at its centre and the Runnymede Civic Centre. Station Road, the core of Addlestone, is currently undergoing revitalisation following permission being granted for the redevelopment of the former Civic Offices site for a mix of town centre uses in 2014 (RU.14/0435). Outside the town are the long established Weybridge and Bourne Business Park and trading estate.
 - b. Chertsey is an historic town which had a famous abbey dating from Saxon times. Part of the town was 'revitalised' with modern offices and apartments in the 1990s but the high street conservation area retains much of its historic character. To the west of Chertsey is St Peters Hospital and Hillswood Business Park, which are major employment locations.
 - c. Egham lies close to the historic Runnymede Meadow, site of the sealing of the Magna Carta in 1215. Egham has seen significant commercial redevelopment, both in the town centre and along the Causeway business area, which extends towards Staines upon Thames to the north east of the town.
 12. The Borough also has a number of other centres and villages, including Englefield Green New Haw, Virginia Water, Woodham, Ottershaw and Thorpe.
-

Introduction



13. Monitoring is an essential part of the continuous planning process and Plans should be monitored to give feedback as to the effectiveness of policies.
14. Following enactment of the Localism Act, Councils are no longer required to submit an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) to the Secretary of State. However, Councils are still required to prepare and publish an amended report known as a Monitoring Report at least annually.
15. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Local Planning Regulations, regulation 34(6)) (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) requires Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to produce Authority Monitoring Reports (AMR) containing specific information such as status and progress of the Authority's Local Plan, the performance of policies and details as to the Authority's endeavours with regard to Duty to Cooperate. The relevant regulations with regard to the production of the AMR is included in Appendix 1 and can also be viewed on the Government website here:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/767/regulation/34/made>
16. From 1 April 2011, all previous Government set National (Core Output) Indicators were abolished, leaving LPAs to monitor what they consider relevant. New local indicators will be developed as part of the work on the development of the new Borough Local Plan.
17. The national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out the role of the AMR. The guidance states that:

'Local planning authorities must publish information at least annually that shows progress with Local Plan preparation, reports any activity relating to the duty to cooperate and shows how the implementation of policies in the Local Plan is progressing and are encouraged to report as frequently as possible on planning matters to communities. This is important to enable communities and interested parties to be aware of progress. Local planning authorities can also use the Authority Monitoring Report to provide up-to-date information on the implementation of any neighbourhood plans that have been made, and to determine whether there is a need to undertake a partial review or full review of the Local Plan'⁵

⁵ PPG Paragraph: 027 Reference ID: 12-027-20140306

18. This AMR reports on indicators for the period 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2017.



Core Output Indicators (COIs) (Section 1)

19. As noted above, previously, the Government set out specific COIs for the Council to report on; these are now obsolete and Local Authorities are free to report annually what is deemed to be of local importance.
20. Runnymede still adopts the use of these legacy indicators where relevant and will maintain these until new indicators are adopted.
21. It is anticipated that new indicators which require monitoring will emerge as work on the new Local Plan progresses. This will ensure Local Plan policies and targets can be monitored in terms of their effectiveness over the plan period. Details as to Runnymede's progress in adopting a new Local Plan are available from paragraph 23.
22. In the interim, the key statistics being reported on relate to progress with the Local Plan, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), economic floorspace, housing, the Duty to Cooperate and environmental quality.

Local Plan Update

23. During the 2016/17 period the Council continued to progress with the preparation of a new Local Plan for the Borough. This included undertaking the first round of public consultation on the Local Plan in July 2016. This was known as the Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches (IOPA) consultation. Following this period of consultation, the Council considered all of the representations received. This led the Council to produce additional evidence to underpin the Local Plan. This included the commissioning of a second phase of Green Belt Review work (known as the Green Belt Review Part 2) which was published in March 2017.
24. Runnymede also completed the following evidence base studies during 2016/17 reporting year
- Employment Land Review (ELR) in September 2016.
 - A Green Belt Villages Review (stages 1 and 2) (May 2016)
 - The draft Site Selection Methodology and Assessment (SSMA) was published in June 2016
 - Draft level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The draft SFRA was subject to consultation with partners in April 2016 (although it should be noted that the final report was not finalised until after the reporting year).
 - The Council's first round of strategic highway modelling to support the Local Plan was published in June 2016.
 - The interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) in June 2016.
 - The Council published a Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options in July 2016 and a Habitats Regulations Assessment screening and appropriate assessment report in June 2016 to support the IOPA consultation.
 - In March 2017, a Centre Hierarchy report and Town and Local Centre Boundaries Study were published
25. The Runnymede Planning Policy webpages at www.runnymede.gov.uk/planningpolicy are updated frequently to reflect the most up-to-date position on the preparation of the Plan, including details of the extensive evidence base. The schedule of dates for the preparation of the Local Plan and other DPDs is to be found in the latest Local Development Scheme (LDS) (December 2017) which is provided in Appendix 3.
26. Copies of published documents can also be found on the planning policy webpages. In the alternative, documents can be obtained by emailing the Policy and Strategy team at planning@runnymede.gov.uk. You can also follow us on Twitter using the handle **@rbcplanning**.



Neighbourhood Plans

27. Neighbourhood Planning is a right for communities introduced through the Localism Act 2011. It gives the opportunity for communities to shape development in their areas through the production of Neighbourhood Development Plans, Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders.

 28. The Thorpe Neighbourhood Forum and Thorpe Neighbourhood Area were designated by the Council on 24 August 2016. Following these designations, the Neighbourhood Forum commenced the key tasks to underpin their Neighbourhood Plan including engagement with the local community.

 29. A community in Englefield Green has also indicated their intention of pursuing a neighbourhood Plan for their area although no application has been made to the Council at the time of writing..
-

Section 1

30. An important part of the monitoring process going forward will be the account of CIL monies collected on certain new developments if the Council adopts a CIL charging schedule.
31. The Council's 2013 IDP and the accompanying Infrastructure Schedule (IS) identified the future infrastructure and service needs for the Borough for the now withdrawn Core Strategy. The Council has begun to consider the infrastructure needs arising from proposed levels of growth in the new Local Plan. Consultancy firm Aecom was commissioned in the 2016/17 reporting year to produce an Infrastructure Needs Assessment (INA) for the Borough followed by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). It should be noted however that neither of these reports were published in the 2016/17 reporting year.
32. The Council's 2013 IDP showed a significant infrastructure funding gap and this position is unlikely to change in the updated infrastructure assessment work. As such, the Council will be looking to prepare a charging schedule under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) (as amended) for new development (the Council will specify what types of developments will require payment under the levy).
33. CIL is not intended to replace main stream funding for infrastructure but instead is used to reduce the gap between the cost of providing the required infrastructure to support a growing population, and the amount of money available from other mainstream sources, such as from Central Government, The Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and the Local Authority's own capital receipts.
34. The PPG encourages authorities to keep their charging schedules, once adopted, under review to ensure that CIL charges remain appropriate over time and relevant to the gap in the funding for the infrastructure needed, for instance, as market conditions change and infrastructure projects are delivered.
35. To ensure that the CIL charges remain appropriate over time, the evidence base which informs CIL (the INA and IDP), and which determines the size of the aggregate funding gap must be kept up to date. The IDP in particular will be a 'live' document, which, with the input of infrastructure providers will be regularly reviewed and updated over the Plan period.

36. The following will be monitored in relation to CIL as required by section 62 of the CIL regulations at the appropriate time:

- a. the total CIL receipts for the reported year;
- b. the total CIL expenditure for the reported year;
- c. summary details of CIL expenditure during the reported year including:
- d. the items of infrastructure to which CIL (including land payments) has been applied,
- e. the amount of CIL expenditure on each item,
- f. the amount of CIL applied to repay money borrowed, including any interest, with details of the infrastructure items which that money was used to provide (wholly or in part),
the amount of CIL applied to administrative expenses pursuant to regulation 61, and that amount expressed as a percentage of CIL collected in that year in accordance with that regulation; and
 - a) the total amount of CIL receipts retained at the end of the reported year.
 - b) In relation to any infrastructure payments accepted by the charging authority –
 - i. the terms of infrastructure to which the infrastructure payments relate,
 - ii. the amount of CIL to which each item of infrastructure relates

37. As the charging Authority, Runnymede would need to publish the report on its website by the end of December following the end of the reported year. This would require robust monitoring systems to be put in place before a CIL charging regime is adopted so that section 62 of the CIL regulations can be complied with.

38. Alongside its CIL charges, the Council is likely to adopt a Regulation 123 list which will detail the types of infrastructure or specific projects that CIL money will go towards funding. This list would also need to be reviewed over the Plan period as priorities change and projects are delivered. Again therefore, monitoring will be required to ensure that the Regulation 123 list remains relevant and up-to-date.

Business Development and Town Centres

Key pieces of evidence produced in the reporting year:

Functional Economic Area Analysis 2015, Runnymede Town and Local Centres Study 2015, Employment Land Review 2016, Centre Hierarchy report (2016) and Town and Local Centre Boundaries Study (2016)

39. Runnymede has a strong economic base due to its strategic location in the South East, its good access to the primary road network, its proximity to Heathrow, a highly skilled workforce and a diversified business base that serves both local and sub-regional needs.
40. The Council prepared an Employment Land Review (ELR) during the course of the 2016/17 reporting year, to help inform the Council's economic policies in the forthcoming Local Plan. The updated ELR was published in March 2016 in draft form and then published in its final form following consultation with partners in September 2016.
41. The 2016 ELR revealed that Runnymede has a small but strong local economy that outperforms Surrey and South East averages on a number of indicators, including its high wage levels (especially workplace wages) and its historic and predicted growth rates in GVA (borough level). The Borough's other main economic strengths include its excellent transport accessibility by motorway (M25 and M3), rail and air services; its location within the economically buoyant M25 area close to Heathrow airport; its strong record in attracting inward investment, with a significant number of national and EMEA headquarters and its skilled labour force, with approximately half of all working age residents employed in higher skilled professions.
42. In respect of the future requirements for employment floorspace, the 2016 study identifies that in quantitative terms, overall there is likely to be sufficient sites with planning permission for offices (use class B1) to meet and exceed the highest forecast requirements up to 2035. However in regard to industrial requirements, 2 of the 3 growth scenarios contained in the ELR require a growth in the industrial floorspace in the Borough which the Council currently has insufficient extant planning permissions to meet by a significant margin.
43. The Council's Centre Hierarchy report which was published in March 2017 has defined the centre hierarchy in the Borough, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The report concludes that the Borough's town centres

of Addlestone, Chertsey and Egham are positioned at the top of the centre hierarchy, followed by the key service centres of New Haw and Woodham (who share a single centre) and Virginia Water. Below this are the Borough's Local Service Centres of Englefield Green and Ottershaw. The Town and Local Centre Boundaries report (March 2017) provided the evidence and justification to support proposed changes to the existing town centre boundaries and their shopping core areas where necessary and to support the proposed definition of local centre boundaries as well as the definition of primary shopping areas, primary shopping frontages and secondary shopping frontages in these smaller centres.

BD 1: Total amount of additional commercial floorspace – by type

44. 2016/17 saw modest losses in terms of retail floorspace. These largely occurred through changes of use and conversions to housing. A large increase was recorded for B1A due to the completion of a large office development (RU.13/1311- Land at Dashwood Lang Drive)

45. The relevant figures for the reporting period are in table 2 below.

Table 2 – Employment Land completions, gains and losses 2016/17

Commercial Use Type	Net Addition/Loss (sqm)
A1	143
A2	-189
A3	-382
A4	-298
A5	206
B1a	12236
B1b	25
B1c	-88
B2	-249
B8	-256
D2	155
Sui Generis	-340

Housing Development

Key pieces of evidence produced in the reporting year:

Draft Site Selection Methodology and Assessment (SSMA) (2016),
Interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) (2016).


Background

46. Housing delivery has been and remains one of the key national challenges, with Runnymede being no exception. The NPPF seeks to promote continuing economic and housing growth and sustainable development.
47. The NPPF also requires local planning authorities to identify sufficient land to meet their housing requirements unless:
- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or
 - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.
48. The Runnymede interim SLAA 2016 showed that there would be insufficient sites within the urban areas, on previously developed sites in the Green Belt and existing Local Plan housing reserve sites and windfalls to meet the needs set out in the 2015 SHMA.
49. Prior to the Council's IOPA consultation it published its Site Selection Methodology Assessment. Through this methodology, sites have been assessed in terms of their Green Belt performance, the existence of constraints which could affect their development potential and a range of sustainability criteria. This methodology has assisted the Council in identifying the most suitable sites for allocation in the Local Plan.

H1 (a): Net additional dwellings in previous years

50. This year records 160 net dwellings for the period 2016/17. Whilst this is a lower number in comparison to the previous year it is anticipated this number will be exceeded for the period 2017/18 due to several large partially completed developments.

Figure 4 - Housing completions in Runnymede over the past 8 years



H2 (b1): Net additional dwellings for the reporting year

51. Runnymede recorded a total of 160 net additional dwellings in the 2016/17 reporting year.

H2 (b2): Bedroom information on additional dwellings

52. Information relating to bedroom numbers in new dwellings is monitored. History indicates that 2 bedroom dwellings are usually most common. However, for 2016/17 4 bedroom dwellings were the most common due to a new development under planning permission RU.13/0777, Land at Aviator Park, Addlestone.

Table 3 – Size of Dwelling Units Completed 2016/17

Dwelling Type	Previous	Proposed	Net
1 Bed	2	41	39
2 Bed	3	56	53
3 Bed	7	21	14
4 Bed and above	5	59	54
Student Units	0	0	0
C2 Unit	74 rooms	60 rooms	-14 rooms

H2 (c): Net additional dwellings in future years

53. An interim SLAA was published in 2016 to support the Council's Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches consultation. Additional work was undertaken outside of the reporting year to support the Additional Sites and Options consultation. The Local Plan SLAA will then be revised as necessary to underpin the consultation on the pre submission version of the Plan which is anticipated to commence in January 2018.

H2 (d): Managed delivery target

54. Please see paragraph 49 above.

H3: Net additional pitches (Gypsy and Traveller)

55. As set out in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS), which was issued by DCLG in March 2012 and updated in August 2015, it is now the responsibility of local authorities to identify the number of travellers' pitches/plots that will be required based on local needs assessments.

56. Runnymede published a **Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA)** in September 2014 which provides the basis for current need amongst the Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population over the next 15 years.

57. No further permanent pitches have been created since 2014, when the shortfall identified from 2013/14 for a 5 year period was 71 for Gypsies and 1 for Travelling Showpeople. There are currently 10 temporary gypsy and traveller pitches in Runnymede. The Council is proposing that a number of pitches will be allocated in its emerging Local Plan to help meet identified needs.

H4: Gross and Net affordable housing completions

58. Runnymede currently exercises a policy that requires affordable housing to be provided on developments of 0.5 hectares or 15 units or above at the rate of 40% as set out in the Runnymede Borough Council Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Affordable Housing 2007. The target is set at 40% of total provision.

59. The 2015 Runnymede-Spelthorne Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) sets out the current affordable housing need and provides the evidence to support an approach towards the provision of affordable housing in the Borough over the period of the new Local Plan which is being prepared for the Borough.
60. The SHMA estimates that, on the basis of viability and past delivery, both Runnymede and Spelthorne might expect to provide up to 35% of future housing as affordable homes. This will be considered in more detail during 2017 following the completion of the viability evidence which will underpin the Local Plan.

Table 4a - Affordable Housing Completions

Scheme	Gross Affordable units
Aviator Park (RU.13/0770)	10

Table 4b - Total net affordable housing provision 2016/17

H5	Social rent homes provided	Affordable Rent homes provided	Shared Ownership homes provided	Affordable homes total
	2	1	7	10

Environmental Quality

61. Runnymede's proximity to the River Thames and other rivers and watercourses makes the Borough particularly susceptible to flooding. According to information from the EA, approximately 30% of Runnymede is located in flood zones 2 and 3. The Council is currently updating its evidence base related to flood risk to underpin the emerging Local Plan.
62. These flooding issues are particularly important in planning for future housing. National and Local policy highlights the need to locate new housing outside the flood plain unless absolutely necessary with suitable mitigation measures in place.
63. As a statutory consultee, the Environment Agency is consulted on certain applications that fall within the flood plain.
64. In Runnymede in September 2017 there were 11,575 residential properties in flood zone 2 and 7,856 residential properties in flood zone 3 at risk of flooding. With regard to commercial properties, 1,316 commercial properties in flood zone 2 and 613 commercial properties in flood zone 3 are at risk of flooding.

E1: Change in areas of biodiversity importance

65. Appendix 4 contains a list of sites considered to be 'areas of biodiversity importance' in Runnymede. Each of these holds at least one recognised designation. Definitions for each designation are included in the Appendix.
66. There were no known changes to any of the 'Areas of biodiversity importance' in 2016/17.

Table 5- Changes to the list of areas of biodiversity importance

	Loss	Addition	Total
E2	0	0	0

E2: Renewable energy generation

67. The Council has no policies or supplementary planning guidance in place at the current time which requires a defined percentage of the energy requirement of a new development to be met through the use of a renewable source.
68. Furthermore, as accurate information on the capacities of renewable technologies based on applications is not available, this indicator is not currently being monitored.
69. The Council's Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document (July 2016) confirms that the new Borough Local Plan will include a policy which requires a percentage of a development's energy to be obtained from renewable/low carbon sources, connect to decentralised sources where reasonable, and support community led schemes.
-

Duty to Co-operate

70. The 'Duty to Co-operate' became a legal requirement under the provisions of the Localism Act, which came into force in November 2011. In essence, it requires Local Planning Authorities such as Runnymede and other prescribed bodies to co-operate on strategic matters, so as to maximise the effectiveness of preparing Development Plan Documents and other Local Development Documents.
71. The NPPF directs that public bodies have a duty to co-operate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those that relate to the strategic priorities set out in paragraph 156. In such instances, there is an expectation of joint working on areas of common interest to be diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities.
72. The duty:
- a) relates to sustainable development or use of land that would have a significant impact on at least two local planning areas or on a planning matter that falls within the remit of a county council
 - b) requires that councils set out planning policies to address such issues
 - c) requires that councils and public bodies 'engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis' to develop strategic policies
 - d) requires councils to consider joint approaches to plan making.
73. The NPPF also requires that Local Planning Authorities work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that cross boundary strategic priorities are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans. Joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas.
74. Local Planning Authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively co-operated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when their Local Plans are submitted for examination, and recognise that co-operation should be a continuous process of engagement.

The Duty in the context of Runnymede 2016/17

75. The Council has, throughout the preparation of the evidence base for new Local Plan that is being prepared for the Borough and through other related planning work, sought to liaise with, and work jointly with, neighbouring local authorities and other relevant organisations to deal with strategic issues that extend across local authority boundaries or that involve a number of different agencies. This collaborative work has taken many forms and includes:
- Organisations specifically set up to deal with regional and sub-regional issues. A good example is the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) Joint Strategic Partnership Board (JSPB), which was formed to ensure consistent and collaborative working to address issues arising from the potential impact of new housing close to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. This is an issue which affects 11 boroughs and districts in the region.
 - The Surrey Planning Officers' Society (SPOA) comprises all the Surrey Heads of Planning. The Group meets monthly to agree joint working opportunities and arrangements, consider matters of cross boundary significance and to discuss all other issues of pan Surrey interest. It often delegates matters of detailed resolution to the Planning Working Group and the Development Management Group.
 - The Planning Working Group (PWG) is a group of Planning Policy Managers in Surrey and the County Council that meets on average five times a year to discuss and resolve cross boundary policy issues, and share relevant information and experience.
76. The Council published its Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework in October 2015. A Duty to Cooperate update statement was also published in July 2016. These two documents provide a more detailed overview of the collaborative work that the Council has undertaken since work commenced on the preparation of the new Local Plan in relation to a range of strategic matters. The Council will continue to produce Duty to Cooperate update statements at key milestones during the remainder of the Plan preparation

Section 2

Other Sources of Information

External Sources of Information

Data is collected about Runnymede and surrounding areas by external sources. Some of the key information available is shown below divided into the areas of economic, social and environmental data.

1. Economic Data Sources

- 1.1 The Office of National Statistics provides data that shows the cost of housing to income ratio. The most current information for Runnymede is for the year 2016.

The data may be viewed at the following link:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/bulletins/housingaffordabilityinenglandandwales/1997to2016>

with historical information also available.

- 1.2 Nomis provides data that shows the percentage of the population claiming key benefits in Runnymede. The most current information available for Runnymede is for the year 2016. The data may be viewed at the following link:

<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157333/report.aspx> with

historical information also available.

- 1.3 Nomis provides data that shows academic qualifications within Runnymede. The most current information available for Runnymede is for the year 2016. This information may be viewed at the following link:

<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157333/report.aspx> with

historical information also available.

- 1.4 Nomis provides data that shows the overall employment rate and economic activity within Runnymede. The most current information for Runnymede is for the year 2016. This information may be viewed at the following link:

<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157333/report.aspx>

with historical information also available.

- 1.5 Surrey provides data that shows the number of businesses within Runnymede. The most current information for Runnymede is for the year 2016. This information may be viewed at the following link:

<https://www.surreyi.gov.uk/Search.aspx?sc=1&txtQuery=businesses>

with historical information also available.

- 1.6 Surrey provides data on gross value added income (gva) per person for Surrey. The most current information for Surrey is for the year 2016. This information may be viewed at the following link:
<http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/search.aspx?txtQuery=gross%20value%20added%20income> with historical information also available.
- 2. Social Data Sources**
- 2.1 Public Health England provides data on health in Runnymede. The most current information for Runnymede is for the year 2017 and may be viewed at the following link:
<http://fingertipsreports.phe.org.uk/health-profiles/2017/e07000212.pdf> with historical information also available.
- 2.2 Surrey provides data on crime statistics in Runnymede. The most current information for Runnymede is for the year 2016 and may be viewed at the following link:
<https://www.surreyi.gov.uk/Viewpage.aspx?C=basket&BasketID=231>. with historical information also available.
- 2.3 Surrey provides data on resident's satisfaction with their local neighbourhood as a place to live and perceptions of anti-social behaviour. The most current information for Runnymede is for the year 2017 and may be viewed at the following link:
<http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/search.aspx?txtQuery=Surrey%20Residents%20Survey&sc=1&pt=2> with historical information also available.
- 2.4 The Department of Education provides data on 16-18 years olds related to education, training and employment. The most current information for Runnymede is for the year 2015 and may be viewed at the following link:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/neet-data-by-local-authority-2012-16-to-18-year-olds-not-in-education-employment-or-training> with historical information also available.

3. Environmental Data Sources

- 3.1 Historic England provides data on buildings and gardens that are at risk. This information is updated as new data becomes available for Runnymede and may be viewed at the following link: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/search-register/results?q=runnymede&searchtype=harsearch>.
- 3.2 Natural England provides data for Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) within and adjacent to Runnymede. The most current information available for Runnymede is for the year 2016 and may be viewed at the following link: <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/>
- 3.3 Surrey provides data for annual road traffic estimates (vehicles miles) for the county of Surrey. The most current information for Surrey is for the year 2017 and may be viewed at the following link: <http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/search.aspx?txtQuery=transport&pt=2&sc=1&cookieCheck=true> with historical information also available.
- 3.4 Surrey provides data on waste and recycling for Runnymede. Current information can be viewed for Runnymede at the following link: <http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/ViewPage.aspx?c=datasetinformation&did=1292&v=4354> with historical information also available.
- 3.5 The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy provides data on regional renewable statistics. The most current data for Surrey is for the year 2015 and may be viewed at the following link: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/regional-renewable-statistics> with historical information also available.
- 3.6 Surrey provides data on CO2 emissions estimates. The most current data for Surrey is for the year 2014 and viewed at the following link: <http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/ViewPage.aspx?c=datasetinformation&did=1358&v=4536> with historical information also available.
- 3.7 Surrey provides data on waste and recycling in Runnymede. The most current data for Runnymede is for the year 2016 <http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/search.aspx?txtQuery=waste&pt=2> with historical information also available.

4. Internal Information Sources

In addition to information produced externally relevant to Runnymede Borough Council, various data sources are produced in house within different departments. Some of the most relevant may be viewed below.

- 4.1 Large amounts of research and data have been produced in support of the New Local Plan Runnymede 2035. Information on the evidence base produced may be viewed at the following link:

<https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/5275/Evidence-Base-Documents>

- 4.2 Runnymede Borough Council produces a number of strategies and plans which are relevant borough wide or which cover the operational aspects of the Council. These may be viewed at the following link:

<https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/4688/Strategies-and-plans>

- 4.3 In addition Runnymede Borough Council uses a performance management framework to monitor the following areas:

- Financial Position
- Key Corporate Performance/Activity Indicators
- Corporate Projects

Reports produced on the above areas may be viewed at the following

link : <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/4860/Performance-management>

Appendix 1 – Regulation 34 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

Authorities' monitoring reports

34. (1) A local planning authority's monitoring report must contain the following information—

(a) the title of the local plans or supplementary planning documents specified in the local planning authority's local development scheme;

(b) in relation to each of those documents—

(i) the timetable specified in the local planning authority's local development scheme for the document's preparation;

(ii) the stage the document has reached in its preparation; and

(iii) if the document's preparation is behind the timetable mentioned in paragraph (i) the reasons for this; and

(c) where any local plan or supplementary planning document specified in the local planning authority's local development scheme has been adopted or approved within the period in respect of which the report is made, a statement of that fact and of the date of adoption or approval.

(2) Where a local planning authority are not implementing a policy specified in a local plan, the local planning authority's monitoring report must—

(a) identify that policy; and

(b) include a statement of—

(i) the reasons why the local planning authority are not implementing the policy; and

(ii) the steps (if any) that the local planning authority intend to take to secure that the policy is implemented.

(3) Where a policy specified in a local plan specifies an annual number, or a number relating to any other period of net additional dwellings or net additional affordable dwellings in any part of the local planning authority's area, the local planning authority's monitoring report must specify the relevant number for the part of the local planning authority's area concerned—

(a) in the period in respect of which the report is made, and

(b) since the policy was first published, adopted or approved.

(4) Where a local planning authority have made a neighbourhood development order or a neighbourhood development plan (1), the local planning authority's monitoring report must contain details of these documents.

(5) Where a local planning authority have prepared a report pursuant to regulation 62 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (2), the local planning authority's monitoring report must contain the information specified in regulation 62(4) of those Regulations.

(6) Where a local planning authority have co-operated with another local planning authority, county council, or a body or person prescribed under section 33A of the Act, the local planning authority's monitoring report must give details of what action they have taken during the period covered by the report.

(7) A local planning authority must make any up-to-date information, which they have collected for monitoring purposes, available in accordance with regulation 35 as soon as possible after the information becomes available.

(8) In this regulation “neighbourhood development order” has the meaning given in section 61E of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (3).

To: Ian Maguire
Head of Planning
Runnymede Borough Council

Dear Mr Maguire

Runnymede Local Plan Core Strategy

1. Following the publication in February of my initial concerns regarding the Runnymede Local Plan Core Strategy (LPCS), a Hearing Session was held on 9th April to discuss the duty to co-operate (the duty) and the Council's broad approach to housing provision. My conclusions on those two matters are contained in the following paragraphs.
2. For the avoidance of doubt I have taken into account the planning guidance that was launched on 6 March 2014. This guidance does not change policy but sets out in the one document how existing policies should be applied.

DUTY TO CO-OPERATE

Preamble

3. In terms of the duty, the Council's evidence is largely contained within Core Document RUN 007 (and Addendum) but I have also taken into account the content of the submitted representations; the Statements on the matter in response to my Issues and Questions on Matter 1; and the discussion at the hearing session. I have also considered the Minutes of the Planning Working Group in Surrey - PWG (2012-2014) and the Surrey Planning Officers' Association¹ - SPOA (2012-2014) which were submitted by the Council after the hearing session.

Background

4. The Localism Act 2011 establishes the duty to co-operate (the duty). It stipulates that, in this case, the Borough Council is required to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of Development Plan Documents, so far as they relate to strategic matters. The engagement should include consideration of whether to consult on and prepare, and enter into and publish, agreements on joint approaches towards the preparation of planning documents. The Act also confirms that regard must be given to any guidance from the Secretary of State on the matter. That further guidance is primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), supplemented by the planning guidance that was published in March.

¹ RBC/23 and RBC/24

5. The NPPF confirms that public bodies have a duty to co-operate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those that relate to strategic priorities, such as the delivery of homes and jobs needed in an area. Strategic priorities across local boundaries should be properly co-ordinated and clearly reflected in individual local plans. The implication is that local planning authorities should work together to assess the opportunities that exist for the substantiated unmet development requirements of one local authority to be met within the area of one or more nearby local authorities within the housing market area. The Act and the NPPF were published well before the LPCS was submitted for examination in 2014.
6. As well as the legal requirement regarding the duty, the LPCS must also be found sound, which includes a requirement for it to be positively prepared and effective. This means it must be based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.
7. I have taken into account the fact that there is no duty on local planning authorities to agree to accommodate the needs of a neighbouring authority but if that is the conclusion that has been reached, it must be based on clear and robust evidence and on a proper consideration of all the issues by all the relevant parties. I am also aware that nearby local planning authorities are at different stages in the plan making process, but that does not negate the requirement for co-operation.

Processes Undertaken

8. The Council did not establish a robust framework or methodology within which 'co-operation' could be progressed or monitored – for example in terms of frequency, issues to be addressed, outcomes to be anticipated, outcomes delivered and bodies to be involved. I accept that there is no specific requirement in the legislation to take a structured approach. However, the Council needs to demonstrate co-operation, co-ordination and continuous engagement and one way this may be achieved is through a more transparent process that can be appropriately managed and monitored.
9. Core document RUN 007, in paragraph 9, seeks to report how the Borough Council has co-operated with others during the preparation of the LPCS. The fifth bullet point refers to consultation and engagement with adjoining planning authorities and the County Council to discuss cross-boundary issues, although the issues are not specified. Paragraph 10 (third bullet point) takes the reader to Appendix B (Cross Boundary Co-operation with Neighbouring Authorities), which the paragraph states will demonstrate more clearly how the Council has discharged its responsibilities. In Appendix B is a list of nearby local planning authorities and a row entitled 'strategic cross-boundary issues and evidence of how these have been addressed'. However, there is no reference to housing or employment as being a strategic cross-boundary issue.
10. I was told at the hearing that this is only meant to be a list of issues where some progress has been made, although that is not clear in the document itself. The Council then referred me to Appendix D which is a list of meetings with other planning authorities. However, these meetings

were mostly held during the consultation period (14th Feb to 28th March 2013) and it specifically says that they are 'part of the consultation'. Issues discussed include Housing Strategy and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment/Housing Need but the issues are framed as questions and there is no question related to the housing and employment needs of the wider area. Whilst the involvement of nearby local planning authorities during periods of public consultation is appropriate, it could not accurately be described as constituting sustained joint working on an on-going basis. It also does not demonstrate that co-operation was sought in the early stages of plan preparation.

11. There is a row in the Table entitled 'Actions Arising from the Meeting' but there is no commitment to any further meetings or to the consideration of issues pertinent to the duty. The only such reference relates to Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC) where it is stated that it has raised duty to co-operate objections but there is no indication of any consideration of how or if those objections could be resolved.
12. Meetings with SHBC were held on 16th October 2012 and 11th April 2013. They related to the DERA site (which is on the boundary between the two authorities) and other strategic matters. It was agreed that 'housing shortfall' is a strategic matter but there is no indication of how any shortfall would be further considered.
13. I turn now to the Addendum to RUN 007, which covers the period June 2013 to January 2014. The Introduction states that the document 'seeks to detail the methods of co-operation and the outcomes'. The first section deals with the period between June and August 2013 but relates primarily to co-operation on a Strategic Housing Market Assessment. There was a meeting on 14th June 2013 at which representatives of planning departments across Surrey were present. A presentation was given by consultants, part of which referred to the duty. A briefing note was prepared following the meeting but although there is a section entitled 'Current Situation and Next Steps' there is no clear framework to demonstrate how it was intended to take the issue forward.
14. The Addendum then considers the period between August 2013 and January 2014. However, the only significant co-operation that is referred to is an e-mail sent by the Borough Council on 3rd September 2013 to 11 nearby local planning authorities which formed part of the public consultation exercise on the pre-submission version of the LPCS. This did not confirm that Runnymede could not meet its OAN – the question in the e-mail was framed loosely: *If it emerged that Runnymede was unable to accommodate the level of housing development sufficient to meet its objectively assessed need, would your Council be prepared to accept that a proportion of our housing requirement could be provided for in your area?*
15. Firstly this e-mail was sent very late on in the plan preparation process, way beyond the 'initial thinking' stage. Secondly the Council were aware at that stage that its OAN could not be met within the Borough, so it is a little disingenuous for the question to imply that the Council may not need to seek the co-operation of nearby local planning authorities.

16. I was told at the Hearing that because no positive responses were received to those e-mails, the Council saw no benefit in continuing the process. This does not demonstrate co-operation, co-ordination or continuous engagement. It does not reflect a pro-active approach. I understand that in many circumstances engendering co-operation is not an easy process but the Council appear to have given up at an early hurdle.
17. There appears to have been little involvement of elected Members. I was told that discussions about the duty took place at a Workshop on 26th March 2014 at which Council Leaders, Planning Portfolio Holders, Chief Executives and Heads of Planning were present. However, at the time of the Hearing there was no reported outcome from that meeting, although there was a reference to the potential for a Memorandum of Understanding² – albeit too late for me to take into account should it emerge.
18. In answer to my question 1.1³, regarding co-operation, the only organisational structure referred to which was 'set up specifically to deal with sub-regional issues' is the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Joint Strategic Partnership Board. There is no reference to any similar approach being taken with regard to meeting housing or employment needs.

Has Engagement been Constructive?

19. There has been engagement between nearby local planning authorities but in terms of meeting housing and employment needs I would not describe it as being focussed or thorough. A relatively small number of meetings have been held but there does not appear to have been any impetus or concerted effort to address the issues around strategic priorities. It has not been demonstrated that appropriate conclusions have been drawn at those meetings and that the Councils have acted on those conclusions. The meetings do not appear to have improved the likelihood of effective co-operation or progressed the matter in any significant way and they could not accurately be described as constructive.

Has Engagement been Active?

20. In the Minutes of the meetings that I refer to in paragraph 3 there are few significant references to the duty. At the meeting of SPOA on 20th September 2013 there is a reference (attributed to Runnymede Borough Council) to a signed letter of agreement and a Memorandum of Understanding 'through Surrey Leaders' but I am not aware of any progress being made on these. On 24th January 2014 there is a reference to the need to 'drive' the issue forward (i.e. the duty) but no timetable is given and there is no clear indication of how that 'drive' would be achieved.

² See paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Council's answer to my question 1.3 in document RBC/16.

³ See RBC/16

21. At the 28th February 2014 SPOA meeting there was a reference to the Workshop on 26th March 2014 (see paragraph 17 above) but I note that at the 28th March SPOA meeting it is recorded that there was 'some concern that the meeting on the 26th was not quite what was advertised'. In any event I have not been advised of the outcome of that Workshop which in any case was held after the submission of the LPCS.
22. In terms of PWG meetings there are a number of brief references to the duty and at the meeting on 13th April 2012 it was confirmed that 'the process should start as soon as possible'. However, no detailed cross-boundary actions appear to have been agreed.
23. On the evidence that I have been given I am unable to conclude that the Council has been sufficiently active in trying to garner co-operation. There is little evidence that engagement has been active, or indeed constructive and collaborative. The number of meetings specifically to consider the issues appears to be relatively low and the reliance only on an exchange of e-mails between Councils (at the pre-submission stage) and some limited exchanges on the matter at the group meetings, does not demonstrate a sufficient level of activity.

Has Engagement been On-going?

24. Co-operation should start with the 'initial thinking' (NPPF paragraph 181) and evidence of effective co-operation should be demonstrated at the time the Local Plan is submitted. There is little evidence that this principle was embedded in the Council's approach during the earlier stages of plan preparation. The Act came into force in 2011 and the NPPF in March 2012. There would therefore have been the opportunity for the Council to consider its approach to fulfilling the duty prior to the publication of the plan for consultation in February 2013 and again before the second consultation in August 2013.
25. In a letter dated 3 April 2012, from the Chief Executive of Surrey Heath Borough Council to the Chief Executive of Runnymede Borough Council, it is suggested that a meeting be arranged to include discussion of the duty. Runnymede's Chief Executive confirmed that he would be pleased to take up the offer of a meeting⁴ but the representatives of both the Councils at the hearing confirmed that no such meeting took place. In my opinion this is an indication that engagement has not been on-going, despite opportunities being available for a constructive approach to be adopted from the outset. The first meetings that are specifically referred to as 'duty to co-operate meetings' were mostly held in February 2013 and are summarised in Appendix D of RUN 007 (see paragraphs 10 and 11 above). There is no indication that any further similar meetings were suggested or arranged. Engagement could not accurately be described as frequent or on-going and the evidence does not demonstrate that consideration of cross-boundary issues has been taking place from 'initial thinking'.

⁴ See RBC/20

Has Engagement been Collaborative?

26. My broad conclusion is that the evidence submitted by the Council does not demonstrate that appropriate mechanisms are in place to engender co-operation. Without clear objectives (which should have been established at the earliest opportunity following the commencement of the legal duty) regarding what the Council was seeking to achieve through co-operation, it is not possible to conclude that engagement has been collaborative. I accept that it is inevitable that different Councils will be at different stages in terms of plan preparation but I would have expected more robust evidence of collaborative engagement. No joint committees have been established specifically to address the Duty to Co-operate; no joint planning policies are proposed; and no Memoranda of Understanding have been signed. This reflects a lack of positivity and commitment to joint working.

Has Engagement been Diligent?

27. No in-depth analysis of the issues facing the local planning authorities in the wider area has been undertaken and no robust assessment of how those issues should be addressed has been prepared. There appears to be a lack of commitment to seeking a way forward. Therefore in terms of fulfilling the duty I would not describe the approach of the Borough Council as being diligent.

Has Engagement been of Mutual Benefit (the broad outcomes)?

28. Mutual benefit has not been sought yet alone achieved. As I have suggested elsewhere, it may not be possible to achieve a high level of mutual benefit but if that is the case then the evidence has to be available to demonstrate that at least the achievement of mutual benefit has been sought.

29. The Minutes of the Working Group Meetings (referred to earlier) do not report on any significant outcomes, for example there are no jointly commissioned documents proposed and this was confirmed by the Council at the Hearing.

30. The outcomes of the limited engagement are minimal and it can be concluded that strategic housing priorities across boundaries have not been properly addressed or co-ordinated and that any engagement has not been of mutual benefit.

Conclusion on the Duty to Co-operate

31. Co-operation should produce effective and deliverable policies on strategic cross boundary matters, which in this instance includes housing and employment. Effective co-operation is likely to require sustained joint working and there should be clear outcomes, one way or another. However, there is insufficient comprehensive and robust evidence to enable me to conclude that every effort has been made by Runnymede Borough Council to seek co-operation with other nearby local planning

authorities. Although there has been recent activity with regards to the duty, it is too late in the process for me to give it significant weight. It is an indication, however, that progress on the matter may be achieved in the near future.

THE COUNCIL'S BROAD APPROACH TO HOUSING PROVISION

32.Paragraph 159 of the NPPF advises that local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area and should 'prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working closely with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries'.

33.The Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was published in 2009 and this identified a need for 1,316 dwellings a year (of which market housing is 775 dwellings). The Council accepted, however, that the weight to be attached to the SHMA is limited and it was confirmed that a new SHMA is being prepared, with completion scheduled by the end of this year. Bearing in mind the current SHMA is based only on the Borough boundary of Runnymede (and the Council are currently considering a SHMA based on a much wider geographical area⁵), I agree that it should be afforded little weight.

34.Although the Council does not have an up-to-date SHMA, covering a more appropriate housing market area, it has nevertheless concluded that its objectively assessed housing need (OAN) is 595 dwellings a year⁶. This figure is based on the interim 2011 based sub-national population predictions and the 2011 DCLG household projections. Although I have not tested the evidence on which the Council's conclusions are based, I note that a number of representors agree that the Council's OAN figure can be broadly justified on that basis.

35.Whilst I have attached some weight to the Council's findings, I remain concerned that the figures may not accurately reflect the situation over the housing market area as a whole and have not taken into account market signals (e.g. land prices, house prices etc.) or fully encompassed the needs for different types of housing.

36.Having concluded that the OAN is 595 dwellings a year, the Council considered the constraints to development in the Borough. These are identified in The Housing Context Technical Paper and include areas of flood risk, Green Belt and Special Areas of Conservation. I agree that these are significant constraints. Primarily as a consequence of these constraints, the Council has concluded that the housing target should be a minimum of 220 dwellings a year (i.e. 37% of OAN). This is a significant shortfall and further emphasises the need for the Council to have fulfilled the duty to co-operate in a more collaborative and robust way, with the objective of seeking to meet a greater proportion of its housing need, either within the Borough or elsewhere in an appropriately defined housing market area.

⁵ Area 55+ (see RUN 007 Addendum)

⁶ See Core Document RUN 019

37. Within the 3,300 additional dwellings proposed over the plan period, the Council is placing significant reliance on the DERA site (1,500 dwellings), which is currently identified as a major developed site in the Green Belt. This may be an appropriate strategy for the Council to follow but there needs to be a clearer justification for the release of this site, as opposed to other sites within the Green Belt. An Assessment of Reasonable Alternative Sites⁷ was undertaken by Barton Wilmore on behalf of Crest Nicholson and Aviva Investors (the promoters of the DERA site). The efficacy of such an approach was questioned by a number of respondents and although I understand that the impartiality of the authors could be questioned, the Council confirmed that it was satisfied with the approach taken.
38. My concerns relate more to the details in the Assessment which was published in 2012. Firstly the Report is prepared on the premise that the Council is seeking to provide 161 new dwellings a year, as opposed to the 220 referred to in policy LP02; and secondly, bearing in mind the significant shortfall in meeting housing need, there is insufficient justification as to why the minimum site thresholds have been set at 10ha and 300 dwellings. Smaller sites have only been considered 'in combination with other identified sites where these immediately adjoin one another'.
39. Policy LP02 identifies 5 reserve sites 'which may be required to meet long-term housing needs'. Although some of the sites are comparatively small, it is nevertheless my opinion that the Council should have given greater consideration to the role that these sites could play in helping to address the unmet housing needs in the short and medium term.
40. With regard to the Green Belt, I note that the Council is commissioning a Borough-wide Green Belt Review, which I was told will be completed by October 2014. This work will enable the Council to assess whether or not there are any potential sites that could be released from the Green Belt.

Conclusion on the Council's Broad Approach to Housing Provision

41. For the reasons given above I consider that the Council's evidence with regard to housing need and provision is not sufficiently robust. In other circumstances it may have been possible to suspend the Examination to enable the Council to undertake further work and I am mindful that work on the SHMA and the Green Belt Review is already programmed but is unlikely to be fully concluded until the end of this year. The Council would then need to consider amendments to the submission LPCS in order to accommodate the findings of the work, thus causing further significant delay to the Examination. In any event, whatever my conclusions may be with regard to housing provision, they would not overcome the failure to meet the duty to co-operate.

Overall Conclusion and the Way Forward

42. I am not satisfied that all available options for co-operation have been properly explored, that the Council has engaged constructively, actively

⁷ Core document RUN 022

and on an on-going basis and that the guidance in the NPPF has been given sufficient regard. My finding that the duty to co-operate has not been fulfilled is sufficient on its own to request that the Council withdraws the LPCS.

43. In terms of the Council's approach to identifying and seeking to meet housing demand I consider the evidence base to be inadequate, insufficiently up-to-date and not reflective of all relevant market and economic signals. The quality of the evidence not only has consequences for the Council's policies but also devalues any co-operation that may have been sought because it is reasonable to expect co-operation to be based on a strategy that seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing in a sustainable way.

44. In summary, whilst recognising the significant constraints to development within the Borough, I do not consider that the Council has positively sought opportunities to meet the development needs of Runnymede.

45. I understand that this is not the conclusion that the Council would have wanted. However, the up-dated SHMA will be completed by the end of the year, as will the Green Belt Assessment. These two documents, together with other existing evidence, will enable the Council to produce an up-to-date plan for the Borough, within a relatively short timescale, based on robust and justified information. This delay in plan preparation will also ensure that effective co-operation with other nearby local planning authorities can be sought. It was suggested at the Hearing that any delay to the adoption of the Plan may result in housing needs not being met in the short term and I agree that any delay in the plan making process should be avoided if possible. However, in order to be effective plans should be based on up-to-date appropriate evidence. That is not the case here and in these circumstances I must advise the Council to withdraw the Plan (under S22 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 - as amended), up-date the evidence base and undertake a more rigorous assessment of cross-boundary issues. In so-doing the Council must ensure that it meets the requirements of the Duty to Co-operate. Having carried out the necessary consultation, sustainability and viability work, the Council should re-submit the Plan as soon as possible. The alternative would be for me to write my Report but it would conclude with a finding of legal non-compliance and unsoundness. I would be grateful if you could confirm the Council's position via the Programme Officer as soon as possible.

46. This also means that the Runnymede Community Infrastructure Levy: Draft Charging Schedule will have to be withdrawn because there will be no up-to-date relevant Plan for the area.

Yours sincerely

David Hogger
Inspector

29th April 2014

Contents

Section	Page
Section 1-Background	5
Introduction	5
Background to the Runnymede Local Plan	5
Section 2-LDS Supporting Statement	7
Planning Policy Context for Runnymede (National, Regional, County level and Local level documents)	7
The Evidence Base	9
Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	10
Monitoring and Review	10
Resources	11
Risk Assessment	11
Changes to the Local Development Scheme	13
Section 3-Local Plan Documents-timetables for production	14
Statement of Community Involvement	14
Runnymede Local Plan	15
IDP and CIL DPD	17
Policies Map	19
Section 4-Programme Management	20
Schedule 1 - Policies Saved and Not Saved from the 2001 Runnymede Borough Local Plan	21
Schedule 2 – Supplementary Planning Guidance and other local level policy guidance documents	25
List of abbreviations and key staff	26

This page has been left blank intentionally

Section 1- Background

Introduction

- 1.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduced the requirement for Councils such as Runnymede Borough Council to prepare and keep up to date a Local Development Scheme (LDS).
- 1.2 The purpose of the LDS is to help the local community and other stakeholders in the development process to understand the range of plans that the Council has produced and intends to produce.
- 1.3 The 2004 Act was amended by provisions in the Localism Act 2011. Some of these provisions are relevant to the regulations relating to LDS. For example, the Council is no longer under obligation to submit a copy of its LDS to the Secretary of State to bring the Scheme into effect. Instead the Local Planning Authority must resolve that the scheme is to have effect and in its resolution specify the date from which the scheme is to have effect. The format of the LDS is a matter for the Council, but the regulations do specify a number of key points that the Scheme must address (including the subject matter and geographical area to which each document relates, and the timetable for the preparation and revision of the documents).
- 1.4 This LDS sets out the current development plan for the Borough and the planning work programme for the Council over a 20-year period (subject to review). The Council will continue to maintain a 'live work programme' on its website www.runnymede.gov.uk/planningpolicy.

Background to the Runnymede Local Plan

- 1.5 There is a substantial amount of relevant history that is considered to be worthy of mention in this LDS. This can be summarised in the chronology below:

First Core Strategy - Withdrawn

- 1.6 The Council decided at its meeting on 19 July 2007 to withdraw the Core Strategy that it had submitted to the Secretary of State in February 2006. As the Core Strategy was withdrawn it was necessary to completely revise the LDS including the timing of document production. Subsequently changes to LDF Regulations and particular changes emerging from the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) led to the need for further changes. The opportunity was also taken to review the content and type of Local Development Documents (LDD's) that the Council intended to produce and to streamline the LDS to be fully reflective of the three year LDF programme.

Second Core Strategy - Withdrawn

- 1.7 The Council commenced work on its second Local Plan in 2008 and the Local Plan Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State on 20 January 2014 for Examination. The Inspector appointed to hold the Examination chaired a one-day Initial Hearing session on 9 April 2014. On 29 April his Conclusions Letter was received by the Council. Besides being concerned that the Council's evidence with regard to housing need and provision was insufficiently robust, he also found that the Duty to Co-operate – established by the Localism Act 2011 - had not been fulfilled. The latter point was sufficient in itself for the Inspector to request the Council to withdraw the Local Plan

Core Strategy. The Planning Committee meeting of 25 June and Council meeting of 24 July authorised the withdrawal of the LPCS with immediate effect.

Structure of the new Runnymede Local Plan

- 1.8 The new Local Plan will contain all policies (both strategic policies and more detailed Development Management level policies), and all land use allocations necessary to guide development in the Borough up to 2030/5.
- 1.9 In view of the withdrawal of the second Core Strategy and the necessity of producing a new Local Plan, it is appropriate to devise a new LDS; this will be a 'living document', to be revised as circumstances necessitate during preparation of the Plan. This is the fifth iteration of the LDS that the Council has produced since starting work on the new Local Plan.
- 1.10 A series of timetables setting out more detail on the completion of the new Local Plan and the preparation of other documents is set out later in this document.

Section 2-LDS: Supporting Statement

Planning Policy Context for Runnymede

- 2.1 National, Regional and County level planning policies apply to Runnymede. The planning policies that will make up the Runnymede Local Plan and any supporting SPD's that are produced will need to comply with these policies and set out how they are to be applied at the local level to reflect local needs and priorities.

National Policy

- 2.2 The Government sets out its national planning policies in the NPPF (March 2012) and PPTS (August 2015). These policy documents replace the range of documents that previously provided the national planning policy context in a variety of formats (Planning Policy Statements, Planning Policy Guidance Notes and some Circulars). National policies should not be repeated in the Local Plan except to interpret into local circumstances.
- 2.3 Furthermore, in March 2014, the Government launched the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) as a web based resource. This guidance is also a material consideration in the plan making and development management processes.

Regional Policy

- 2.4 The adopted Surrey Structure Plan 2004 was originally saved for three years until December 2007. This plan was wholly replaced by the RSS for the region known as the South East Plan in May 2009 which covers the period up to 2026. The Government partially revoked the South East Plan on 25 March 2013 and the only retained policy relevant to Runnymede is NRM6 which relates to new residential development near the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. This policy requires the provision of mitigation to overcome identified harm to this habitat from recreational disturbance associated with additional residents in the nearby areas.

County Policy

- 2.5 The County Council produces a number of strategies and plans that must be considered as part of the development process. These are listed below as well as the years of adoption of the documents currently relied upon/referred to:

Part of the Development Plan for Runnymede

- Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted July 2011)
- The Primary Aggregates DPD (adopted July 2011)
- The Surrey Waste Plan (adopted 2008)
- The Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD for the Minerals and waste Plans (adopted February 2013)
- Minerals Site Restoration SPD.

Other relevant documents

- Surrey Connects Strategy and Action Plan (August 2011) (which has been informed by the Surrey Local Economic Assessment-December 2010)
- Surrey Rural Strategy 2010-2015

- Surrey Design – A strategic guide for quality built environments (adopted 2002)
- The Surrey Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (adopted in June 2011)
- The Surrey Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (published in draft form in 2012)
- The Surrey Transport Plan (updated 2014).

Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership

- 2.6 The Enterprise M3 is also considered worthy of mention. The LEP area stretches from the outskirts of London along the wider M3 corridor to the New Forest in the south and is one of the largest of the LEP's (by population) in the country with a population of 1.6 million and 86,500 businesses.
- 2.7 The Enterprise M3 Strategy for Growth was published in May 2013 and is also a non-statutory document, which should be considered as part of the plan making and development processes. Furthermore, the LEP also manages funding for local infrastructure on behalf of Central and European Government and produces a Growth Deal which seeks to allow significant investment in skills and technology centres, improvements to roads, sustainable transport measures and unlocking of housing developments to ensure the Enterprise M3 area remains at the forefront of technological development and innovation. Another document of note is 'Working Towards a Smarter Future: The Enterprise M3 Strategic Economic Plan (2014 – 2020)', which is the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan. This sets out that the majority of investment will be focussed on certain towns; two major investments in Egham – the Runnymede Roundabout and the Egham Sustainable Transport Package - are included in the Growth Package for Staines-upon-Thames. LEP funding is also available to other locations, especially for projects that support development and promotion of the Sci-Tech Corridor.

Local Level Documents (most relevant listed below in the context of this document but not an exhaustive list)

Saved Policies

- 2.8 A number of the policies from the Runnymede Borough Local Plan (2001) were 'saved' in 2004, with some being deleted. In April 2007 the Council's Planning Committee decided to save a wider range of policies from the 2001 Local Plan. On 25 September 2007 the Secretary of State sent a letter to Runnymede Borough Council, advising which of the 2001 Local Plan policies had been 'saved'; the Secretary of State's final list of saved Local Plan policies is shown in schedule 1.
- 2.9 It is intended that the adopted 2001 Local Plan and its saved policies will be replaced by the new Runnymede Local Plan when it is adopted. The new Runnymede Local Plan together with the relevant documents produced by Surrey County Council (as discussed in para 2.5), and South East Plan policy NRM6 will comprise the statutory development plan for the Borough.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- 2.10 Until such a time that the Runnymede Local Plan is adopted, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on issues including Affordable Housing, development in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA zone of influence, and Planning

Obligations will continue to be relied upon (for a full list of the Council's existing SPG, please refer to Schedule 2 in this document).

The Evidence Base

Baseline Evidence

2.11 The Council's Policy and Strategy team are producing various baseline and contextual studies to underpin the Runnymede Local Plan. Existing studies are also being refreshed to ensure that they reflect changes in local circumstances and current national planning policy requirements. These documents will be managed and maintained by the Council's Policy and Strategy team officers, and will relate to:

- The physical, economic, social and environmental characteristics of the area
- The purposes for which land is used
- The size, distribution and composition of population, housing and employment uses
- Travel and communications: modes, volumes, direction, time and purpose
- Services and infrastructure including health, education, shops, leisure, highways, utilities, public transport; and
- Environmental evidence relating to biodiversity, and the condition of open space, SSSIs, water and air quality, flooding, etc..

2.12 It is anticipated that the following studies will make up the Council's evidence base:

- Functional economic area analysis
- Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) (housing completions and permissions; land availability monitoring)
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)
- Site Selection Methodology and Assessment
- Site Capacity Analysis
- Green Belt Reviews (GBR)
- Technical Review of Green Belt boundary
- Longcross Garden Village Infrastructure and Viability review
- Employment Land Review (ELR)
- Town and Local Centres Study
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)
- Strategic Flooding Sequential Test
- Water Cycle Study
- Retail / Land Use / Town Centre Survey
- Urban Area Character Appraisal
- Annual Monitoring Reports
- Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) and Strategic Highways Assessment Report
- Infrastructure Needs Assessment (INA)
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)
- A320 Corridor Study
- Thames Basin Heaths Interim Advice Note
- Open Space Study (OSS) and Local Green Space Assessment
- Playing Pitch Strategy
- Travellers Accommodation Assessment (TAA)

- Local Plan Viability Assessment.
- Sustainability Appraisal Reports
- Habitats Regulations Assessment

2.13 The evidence base will also contain documentation that details how the Council has sought to meet the requirements of the Duty to Co-operate.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

2.14 The Runnymede Local Plan will be subject to SEA and SA in accordance with European Directives, national legislation and guidance. This will be co-ordinated by the Council's Policy and Strategy Team. The Local Plan will also be supported by a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).

Monitoring and Review

2.15 The LDS will be subject to review and this will be reported in the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). This will review the production of the Runnymede Local Plan documents against the timetable set out in the LDS and it will review the performance of existing 'saved' and emerging policies and proposals against national and local planning targets. It will also assess the need for new or updated Local Plan policies in light of new national or other guidance and any changes in local priorities.

2.16 The review will cover the period from 1 April to 31 March and the review process will be conducted during May and June of each year. The AMR will be published in December of each year. The AMR will form part of the evidence base as it will show trends and changes over time in the amount and location of development. Previous AMRs are displayed on the Council's website.

2.17 The AMR also includes a trajectory showing projected future housing supply against the current strategic housing requirements.

Resources

Internal resources

2.18 The table below identifies the in-house staff resources that will be available for the ongoing preparation of the Local Plan. Current resources are restricted and delivery of the content of the LDS will be challenging.

Permanent Posts	% time	Notes
Corporate Director of Planning and Environmental Services	5%	Full time
Local Plans Manager	95%	Full time
Senior/Principal Policy and Strategy Team Officer	90%	Full time
Senior Policy and Strategy Team Officer	45%	Part time - 90% of 0.5 fte
Senior Policy and Strategy Team Officer	90%	Full time
Policy and Strategy Team Assistant	90%	Full time
Planning Information Officer	90%	Full time
Graphics Officer	5%	10% of 0.5 fte
GIS Officer	30%	Full time
Total – Permanent Posts	540%	5.4 FTE
Time limited resources		
Senior Policy and Strategy Team Officer	70%	Part time – 90% of 0.8 fte
Development Management Officer(s)	10%	Equivalent to 10% of 1fte overall
Total –Time limited resources	80%	0.8 FTE
TOTAL - ALL	620%	6.2 FTE

External Consultants

2.19 The Council has employed external consultants to undertake/peer review a number of the evidence base studies required, in particular where specialist technical advice has been needed.

Risk Assessment

Internal Resources

2.20 Ensuring an adequate budget to retain and recruit staff and pay for consultants to complete specialist aspects of evidence gathering is a key risk in meeting the timetable of the LDS. This risk can be partly managed through the consideration of seconding staff from elsewhere within the Council to support the Strategy and Policy Team when appropriate, and ensuring the correct skills are developed in house and budgets are kept under review as work progresses on the Local Plan.

- 2.21 Additional potential pressure has in recent times been placed on the Council to guarantee delivery of the Plan. The Government has given consideration to introducing new powers, and using existing powers under recent legislation, to 'intervene' if they feel local plan preparation is unduly delayed. While such intervention is of course a potential risk, it must be remembered that the ability and intention to make an 'intervention' in plan making is clearly aimed at Local Planning Authorities that are unnecessarily delaying their plans. Any such intervention is therefore unlikely to be used for a positive authority like Runnymede, which can clearly explain the reasoning behind its revised timetable, and which is actively seeking a plan that radically increases the supply of housing in its area.
- 2.22 Another matter that has implications for the production of the Local Plan is Neighbourhood Plans. These are locally created plans that constitute part of the development plan. Although they are created and driven by Neighbourhood Forums in Runnymede, such plans nevertheless do require some input from the Policy and Strategy team. The Thorpe Neighbourhood Forum is now working on its Neighbourhood Plan, and interest has been expressed in bringing forward a Neighbourhood Plan for Englefield Green.
- 2.23 Similarly, in achieving the Council's own LDS, it should be noted that the remit of the Policy and Strategy team goes further than simply dealing with the Local Plan. The work, and staffing in the team, both in terms of number of staff and expertise, will be monitored carefully to ensure that the work programme remains realistic and achievable.

Political Issues

- 2.24 Changes to political structure or direction can be a significant risk to a Plan, which takes a number of years from inception to adoption to complete. Runnymede has a stable political composition, which ameliorates this risk, but in order to ensure a consistency in the vision underpinning the Local Plan, Members are engaged throughout the Local Plan process. This engagement is through the Planning Committee, involvement in the Local Plan Members' Working Group and the SHMA Joint Member Liaison Group, and as part of their political responsibility for other Council strategies, including the Corporate Plan.

Soundness / Legal Challenge

- 2.25 Evolution in the interpretation of legislation by practitioners and PINS, usually demonstrated through other Examinations and sources is a key risk to the adoption of a Local Plan. To mitigate this risk, PINS will continue to be kept informed of Runnymede's progress with its emerging Local Plan so that they can alert the Council to any concerns regarding its soundness. Decisions issued by PINS and commentary within the industry and government will be monitored to ensure soundness is maintained.
- 2.26 Following the withdrawal of the Local Plan Core Strategy in July 2014, the Policy and Strategy team has been working to address the concerns raised by the Inspector (as summarised in section 1 of this LDS). This has included the production of a new Strategic Housing Market Assessment and also a Green Belt Review. Officers have also engaged with Members to put a robust framework in place (through the production of a Local Strategic Statement (LSS)) to ensure that the Council is better able to meet the requirements of the Duty to Co-operate.

External Resources

- 2.27 There is concern that the programme may be affected by the capacity of PINS to examine a large number of Local Plans and other DPDs over the next few years. Statutory consultees such as the Environment Agency, Highways England, the County Council and adjoining local authorities may also have difficulty in handling the large number of consultation documents that they are likely to receive in the next few years. These factors may affect Runnymede's programme but are outside the Council's control.

Changes to the Local Development Scheme

- 2.28 The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) will be the main mechanism for reviewing progress with the Local Plan and identifying any necessary changes. In certain circumstances it may be appropriate to change the LDS at short notice.

- 2.29 The protocol for such changes will be as follows:

1. Seek approval from the Planning Committee (and then Full Council) for proposed change(s) to the LDS; and
2. Proceed through the formal stages of DPD/SPD production having received approval for the proposed change(s).

Section 3 - Local Plan Documents - timetables for production

Statement of Community Involvement

General	
Subject Matter	Statement setting out how the Council will engage with the local community in the preparation of the Runnymede Local Plan and other associated documents as well as in the determination of significant planning applications.
Geographical Area	Boroughwide and involving organisations beyond the Borough
Status	Required Document
Conformity	To meet the requirements of the planning regulations and have regard to the Council's Communications Strategy
Timetable	
Commencement	July 2014
Public Consultation(s)	Oct 2014
Date Adopted	December 2014
Review Date	TBC
Production	
Organisational Lead	Local Plans Manager
Political Management	Planning Committee to approve consultation and participation processes and proposals; and review the representations made at the different stages of Plan preparation. Planning Committee to make recommendations to Full Council at the submission stage.
Internal Resources	Staff in the Policy and Strategy Team
External Resources	None identified
Stakeholder Resources	None identified
Data / Studies Required	Review of Regulations / Communications Strategy Consideration of potential of existing stakeholder links. Maintain Consultee database.
Action	Local Plans Manager / Officers in the Policy and Strategy Team

Runnymede Local Plan

General	
Subject Matter	The Runnymede Local Plan will set out all of the policies and land use allocations to guide development in Runnymede up to 2030/5. This will be based on an agreed vision for the Borough and a general strategy for its achievement. It will include a key diagram.
Geographical Area	Borough wide
Status	Development Plan Document
Conformity	NPPF, PPTS, PPG, SAR, South East Plan policy NRM6. The document will have regard to the Corporate Plan for Runnymede, the results of monitoring and changes in evidence.
Timetable	
Preparation of Issues & Options	June 2016 (<i>completed</i>)
Consultation on Issues & Options	June to August 2016 (<i>completed</i>)
Consultation on Additional Sites & Options	May to June 2017
Completion of outstanding Local Plan Evidence Base	December 2017
Compilation of Pre-Submission Plan	October to December 2017
Consultation on Pre-Submission Plan	January/February 2018
Submit Plan to Sec of State	March 2018
Pre Examination Meeting	2018 - dependent on the Secretary of State
Examination	2018 - dependent on the Secretary of State
Estimated date for adoption	2018 - dependent on the Secretary of State
Review date	TBC
Production	
Organisational lead	Local Plans Manager
Political management	Planning Committee to approve issues, options and proposals and review results of consultation. Planning Committee required to make recommendations to Full Council at the submission stage.
Internal Resources	The Policy and Strategy team with support from GIS, Development Management and the Leadership Team Office (for Corporate Policy and Community Strategy input).

External Resources	Stakeholders, specialist consultants as necessary
Stakeholder Resources	Studies/evidence produced by developers when seeking planning consent. e.g. Retail and Transport impact studies. Evidence and studies produced by Government agencies and infrastructure providers e.g. Surrey CC, Environment Agency, Natural England, DCLG, Thames Water, Health Authorities, Highways Agency, Runnymede Business Partnership.
Data / Studies Required	SFRA, ELR, Retail Study, SHMA, SLAA, Site Selection Methodology and Assessment, Affordable Housing viability work, Transport Impact Assessment, Open space survey, Infrastructure Needs Assessment, Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Character Appraisal, TBHSPA Strategy, TAA, GBR, Technical Review of Green Belt boundary, FEA analysis, Town and Local Centres Study, Whole Plan Viability Assessment.
Action	Local Plans Manager / Officers in the Policy and Strategy team

IDP and CIL DPD

General	
Subject matter	CIL is a mechanism for collecting and pooling contributions from developers for the purpose of providing new/improved infrastructure required to support growth. Since 6 April 2015, the circumstances in which the Council is able to rely on section 106 contributions for this purpose has been limited. In view of this, if the Council wishes to fund infrastructure improvements in the Borough through developer contributions, it will need to implement a CIL charging regime as soon as is practically possible. The IDP is a key part of the evidence base supporting the formulation of the charging schedule and outlines the essential infrastructure needed to meet the demands of the growing population in the Borough.
Geographical Area	Boroughwide
Status	IDP-evidence based document, CIL-DPD
Conformity	CIL regulations (as amended), NPPF
Timetable	
Evidence base and early stakeholder engagement	2018 – dates to follow in later edition of LDS
Public Consultation(s)	2018 – dates to follow in later edition of LDS
Submission to Sec of State	2018 – dates to follow in later edition of LDS
Pre examination meeting	TBC - dependent on the Secretary of State
Examination	TBC - dependent on the Secretary of State
Estimated date for adoption	TBC - dependent on the Secretary of State
Review date	TBC
Production	
Organisation lead	Local Plans Manager
Political Management	Planning Committee to approve proposed CIL charges at PDCS stage and DCS stage for public consultation. Planning Committee to make recommendations to Full Council at DCS and Submission stages.
Internal Resources	The Policy and Strategy team with support from GIS and Development Management
External Resources	Stakeholders
Stakeholder Resources	IDP: evidence from infrastructure providers (including SCC, Environment Agency and internal Council departments) on existing capacity, future provision, funding sources. CIL: Studies/evidence produced by developers when seeking planning permission, the Council's monitoring data and any data provided by developers during the preparation of the CIL viability

	work.
Data / Studies Required	IDP: various-as produced by infrastructure providers. CIL: IDP, independent viability work to identify appropriate levels for CIL charges.
Action	Local Plans Manager / Officers in the Policy and Strategy team

Policies Map

General	
Subject Matter	Map split into 3 parts (north of Borough, south of Borough and inset maps) showing the extent of policy areas referred to in all DPDs.
Geographical Area	Boroughwide
Status	Part of the Runnymede Local Plan
Conformity	To conform with adopted DPD's.
Timetable	To tie in with the timetables for the production of the Runnymede Local Plan (refer to relevant section of this document for further information in this regard).
Review Date	To tie in with the review of the DPD's.
	NOTE: The policies map will be revised at the same time that any Development Plan Document is revised or adopted. The policies map will show strategic allocations and the spatial coverage of policies. It will be submitted with the Runnymede Local Plan to the SoS in March 2018.
Production	
Organisational Lead	Local Plans Manager
Political Management	Adoption delegated to the Corporate Head of Planning and Environmental Services.
Internal Resources	Policy and Strategy Team, GIS, IT support to web-enable
External Resources	None
Stakeholder Resources	None
Data / Studies Required	None
Action	Local Plans Manager / Policy and Strategy team officers /GIS

Section 4 - Programme Management

- 4.1 Programme management will be the responsibility of the Local Plans Manager.
- 4.2 It is proposed to have two Examinations in Public: one for the Runnymede Local Plan (in 2018), and one for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (date to be confirmed).
- 4.3 A cross-party Members Local Plan Working Group provides elected members of the Council with an early opportunity to consider Local Plan matters in greater depth than is practicable at Planning Committee meetings. It comprises five elected members from the Planning Committee and is attended by officers from the Policy and Strategy team. The Local Plan Working Group scrutinises and comments on draft documents prior to consideration by the Planning Committee and approval for adoption by Full Council where appropriate.

Schedule 1 - Schedule of Policies Saved and Not Saved from the 2001 Runnymede Borough Local Plan

- 5.1. The Runnymede Borough Local Plan (Second Alteration) was adopted in April 2001. This document forms part of the Development Plan for Runnymede until it is superseded by the Local Plan documents proposed in this 2016 Local Development Scheme.
- 5.2. The schedule below lists all the 2001 adopted Local Plan policies and identifies which of them were 'saved' in September 2007. The weight to be accorded to the saved policies is dependent on their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

2001 Local Plan Policy	Policy title	Status at 2007 (i.e. saved or not saved by SoS direction)
GEN1	Phasing large scale development	Saved
GEN2	Existing uses	Not saved
GB1	Development within the Green Belt	Saved
GB2	Thorpe settlement in the Green Belt	Saved
GB4	Agricultural workers dwellings	Saved
GB5	Outdoor sports & leisure	Saved
GB6	Rebuilding & residential extensions in GB	Saved
GB7	Re-use of rural buildings	Saved but context set at strategic level
GB8	Safeguarding long term housing sites	Not saved
GB9	Motorway service areas	Not saved
GB10	Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	Saved
GB12	Wentworth	Saved
GB13	Hurst Lane, Stroud	Saved
HO1	Maximising housing potential	Saved
HO2	Conversion of dwellings	Saved
HO3	Dwelling type	Saved
HO4	Housing Need	Saved
HO5	New housing provision 1991-2001	Not saved
HO6	New housing provision post 2001	Saved
HO7	Housing provision post 2006	Saved
HO8	Phasing housing provision	Saved
HO9	New Housing Development design etc	Saved
HO10	Mobile homes, caravans	Saved
HO11	Gypsy Caravan sites	Not saved
LE1	General economic policy	Saved
LE2	Scale, quality of econ dev in town centres	Not saved
LE3	Economic development in Chertsey	Not saved
LE4	Existing Economic Sites	Saved
SHO1	General level of provision	Saved
SHO2	Core areas in Town Centres-Acceptable Uses	Saved
SHO3	Retail development within core areas	Saved
SHO4	Town centres outside core areas	Saved
SHO5	Local Shops (retail uses outside town centres)	Saved
SHO6	Superstore developments, need & sequential test	Not saved
SHO7	Uses within class A3 (Food and Drink) (<i>now</i>)	Saved

Runnymede Borough Local Development Scheme. December 2017

2001 Local Plan Policy	Policy title	Status at 2007 (i.e. saved or not saved by SoS direction)
	<i>Classes A3 – A5 are related to food and drink premises although this is not reflected in the policy)</i>	
TC1	Town Centre Strategies	Saved
TC2	Town Centres outside Revitalisation Areas	Saved
TC3	There is no TC3 policy	
TC4	Addlestone Revitalisation Area	Saved
TC5	1-23 High St/2-4 Church Rd, 1 Simplemarsh Rd, Addlestone	Saved
TC6	6 - 22 High St	Saved
TC7	2-4 High St/1-11 Station Rd	Saved
TC8	13-21 Station Road /1 Crouch Oak Lane	Saved
TC9	Chertsey Revitalisation Area	Not saved
TC10	Pycroft Rd /Guildford Street access	Not saved
TC11	Guildford St /Eastworth Rd/Pycroft junc	Not saved
TC12	Guildford St / Pycroft Rd redev	Not saved
TC13	Pycroft Rd / Guildford Street redev	Not saved
TC14	Goosepool redev	Not saved
MV1	Land use & transport studies	Not saved
MV2	Highway works & traffic management	Not saved
MV3	Transport infrastructure contributions	Saved
MV4	Access and circulation arrangements	Saved
MV5	Access to public transport	Saved
MV6	Bus Facilities	Not saved
MV7	Rail Services	Saved
MV8	Lorry movements	Not saved
MV9	Parking Standards	Saved
MV10	Car park provision in town centres	Not Saved
MV11	Private non-residential parking	Not saved
MV12	Servicing Agreements	Saved
MV13	Cyclists	Saved
MV14	Pedestrians	Saved
NE1	Use of agricultural land	Not saved
NE2	Impact of new development	Not saved
NE3	Fragmentation of agricultural holdings	Saved
NE4	Intensive agriculture	Not saved
NE7	Restoration - mineral sites	Saved
NE8	Areas of Landscape Importance	Saved
NE10	Landscape Problem Area	Saved
NE11	Countryside management	Saved
NE12	Tree protection	Saved
NE13	TPOs	Saved
NE14	Trees and development	Saved
NE15	Landscaping schemes	Saved
NE16	Sites of International and National Nature Conservation Importance.	Saved
NE17	SNClS in the County	Saved
NE18	Enhancement of SNClS	Saved
NE20	Species protection	Saved
BE1	Planning briefs/design guidance	Not saved

Runnymede Borough Local Development Scheme. December 2017

2001 Local Plan Policy	Policy title	Status at 2007 (i.e. saved or not saved by SoS direction)
BE2	Townscape character	Saved
BE4	Designation and review of Conservation Areas	Saved
BE5	Development with in Conservation Areas	Saved
BE5A	Demolition in Conservation Areas	Saved
BE6	Additional Design guidance for Developments in Conservation Areas	Saved
BE7	Enhancement schemes in Conservation Areas	Saved
BE8	Historic parks & gardens	Saved
BE9	Proposals affecting Listed Buildings	Saved
BE10	Development affecting the setting of Listed Buildings	Saved
BE11	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Saved
BE12	Change of Use of Listed building	Saved
BE13	Buildings of Local Architectural or Historic Interest	Saved
BE14	Ancient Monuments and Sites of Archaeological Interest	Saved
BE15	Areas of High Archaeological Potential	Saved
BE16	Preservation and Recording of Archaeological remains	Saved
BE17	Chance Archaeological finds	Saved
BE18	Control of advertisements	Saved
BE19	Advertisement guidelines	Saved
BE20	Unauthorised adverts	Not saved
BE21	Horse keeping and riding	Saved
BE22	Aircraft Noise	Saved
BE23	Traffic Noise	Saved
BE24	River Bourne floodplain land, Chertsey	Saved
BE25	Access for the disabled	Saved
R1	Recreational provision	Saved
R2	Playing fields	Saved
R3	Play areas in housing developments	Saved
R4	Built recreation facilities - dual use	Saved
R5	Mineral sites	Saved
R6	River Thames leisure uses	Saved
R7	Access to the River Thames	Saved
R8	Chertsey Meads	Saved
R9	Basingstoke Canal & Wey Navigation	Saved
R10	Allotments	Not saved
R11	Hotels & Guest Houses	Saved
R12	Runnymede Meadows	Saved
R13	Chertsey historic site	Not saved
R14	Camping & caravanning	Not saved
R15	Informal recreation e.g. walking	Not saved
R16	Amenity space standards	Saved
SV1	Land drainage	Saved
SV2	Flooding	Saved
SV2A	Water quality	Saved
SV3	Telecommunications	Saved
SV4	Satellite dishes/antennae	Saved
C1	Community Infrastructure Provision	Not saved
C2	Day centres	Not saved

Schedule 2 - Supplementary Planning Guidance and other existing local level policy guidance documents

5.3. The existing Supplementary Planning Guidance and other local level policy guidance documents listed in the schedule below are currently a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and in negotiating planning obligations.

Document Title	Date Adopted	Saved Local Plan
Householder Guide SPG	July 2003	HO9, BE2
Trees Woodlands & Hedgerows SPG	July 2003	NE12, NE13, NE14
Addlestone Town Centre Strategy	September 1999	TC1
Surrey Design SPG	January 2002 (Surrey LGA)	BE2
Residential extensions and Replacement Dwellings in the Green Belt SPG	November 2004	GB6
Shopfronts 1992 Design guidelines	2001 Local Plan Appendix G (former Chertsey Cons Area leaflet 4/94)	BE2
Shop Security (no date)	April 2001 (Local Plan Appendix I)	BE2
Chertsey Conservation Area January 1998	2001 Local Plan Appendix J	BE6
Egham Conservation Area	April 2001 (Local Plan Appendix J)	BE6
SPG on Car Parking October 2001 (this document has 3 appendices)	Local Plan Appendix B	MV9, MV10
Affordable Housing SPG	13 December 2007	HO4
Renewable Energy Interim Advice Note (not an SPG)	February 2010	
Planning Obligations SPG	December 2007	
Thames Basin Heaths SPA SPG 2008	March 2007 (revised November 2007 and November 2009)	Habitats Directive and SEP policy NRM6
Housing sites Planning Brief SPG (Bridge Wharf, Chertsey, St Ann's Heath, Virginia Water, Franklands Drive, Addlestone, Wick Road, Englefield Green)	August 2001	HO6 (reserve housing sites policy)

Abbreviations

AMR	Annual Monitoring Report
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
DCS	Draft Charging Schedule
DPD	Development Plan Document
ELR	Employment Land Review
FEA	Functional Economic Area
GBR	Green Belt Review
IDP	Infrastructure Delivery Plan
INA	Infrastructure Needs Assessment
LDD	Local Development Document
LDF	Local Development Framework
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LPCS	Local Plan Core Strategy
LSS	Local Strategic Statement
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NRM	Natural Resource Management
OSS	Open Space Study
PDCS	Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule
PINS	Planning Inspectorate
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PPTS	Planning Policy for Traveller Sites
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy (which, for Runnymede, is the South East Plan)
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SAR	Sustainability Appraisal Report
SCC	Surrey County Council
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SEP	South East Plan
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document (The national or regional planning policies for which the Council has provided additional local guidance)
SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance (additional guidance provided by the Council in support of adopted Local Plan policies)
TAA	Travellers Accommodation Assessment
TBHSPA	Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

Key Staff resources involved in Local Plan Production

CDPES	Corporate Director of Planning and Environmental Services
LPM	Local Plans Manager
PSO	Policy and Strategy Team Officers
GIS	Geographical Information Systems
DM	Development Management

Appendix 4 – Areas of Biodiversity Importance

Site Name	LNR	SNCI	SSSI	RAMSAR	NNR	Natura 2000	
						SAC	SPA
Abbey Lake Complex SNCI		✓					
Addlestone Bourne at Birch & Hoyt Wood SNCI		✓					
Basingstoke Canal			✓				
Basingstoke Canal, Scotland Bridge to River Wey SNCI		✓					
Birch Wood & Hoyt Wood SNCI		✓					
Chertsey Bourne at Abbey Lake Complex SNCI		✓					
Chertsey Bourne at Chertsey Meads SNCI		✓					
Chertsey Meads SNCI	✓	✓					
Chertsey Water Works - Well Field SNCI		✓					
Chobam Common [#]			✓		✓	✓1	✓2
Fan Grove SNCI		✓					
Hall's Farm Wood and Grassland SNCI		✓					
Hardwick Court Farm Fields SNCI		✓					
Knowle Grove SNCI		✓					
Laleham Burway Golf Course SNCI		✓					
Langham Pond			✓				
Longcross Churchyard SNCI		✓					
Monk's Walk North & West (incl. M3 Exchange Land) SNCI		✓					
Pannells Farm SNCI		✓					
Park Wood SNCI		✓					
Queenwood Golf Course SNCI		✓					
River Thames - Runnymede SNCI		✓					
River Wey - Runnymede SNCI		✓					
Riverside Walk, The Bourne SNCI	✓	✓					
Runnymede SNCI (including Cooper's Hill and Cooper's Hill Slopes)		✓					
Simplemarsh Farm SNCI		✓					
Spinney Wood SNCI		✓					
The Dell - Ancient Woodland SNCI		✓					
The Moat, Woodcock Farm SNCI		✓					
Thorpe Hay Meadow			✓				
Thorpe Park No.1 Gravel Pit []			✓	✓			✓
Trumps Mill SNCI		✓					
Wentworth Golf Courses - West Wood SNCI		✓					
Wentworth Golf Courses - Duke's Copse and Wentworth Pond SNCI		✓					
Wentworth Golf Courses - Fish Ponds Wood SNCI		✓					
Wentworth Golf Courses - Knowle Hill SNCI		✓					
Wentworth Golf Courses - Valley Wood (inc. Great Wood) SNCI		✓					
Wey Navigation (including Addlestone Mill Pond) SNCI		✓					
Windsor Forest			✓			✓	
Windsor Great Park (Combined) SNCI		✓					
Woburn Park Stream SNCI		✓					

Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) are for both people and wildlife. They offer people special opportunities to study or learn about nature or simply to enjoy it.
source: <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/designatedareas/lnr/default.aspx>

Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) - is a designation used in many parts of the United Kingdom to protect areas of importance for wildlife at a county scale

Sites of special scientific interest (SSSIs) - are the country's very best wildlife and geographical sites. They include some of the most spectacular and beautiful habitats; wetlands teeming with wading birds, winding chalk rivers, flower-rich meadows, windswept shingle beaches and remote upland peat bogs.
source: <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/designatedareas/sssi/default.aspx>

Ramsar Sites

Ramsar sites are wetlands of international importance, designated under the Ramsar Convention.
source: <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/designatedareas/ramsars/default.aspx>

National Nature Reserves (NNR) - Many of the finest sites in England for wildlife and geology are National Nature Reserves. There are currently 222 across the country and almost all are accessible and provide great opportunities for people to experience nature.
source: <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/designatedareas/nnr/default.aspx>


Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) - SACs are areas which have been given special protection under the European Union's Habitats Directive. They provide increased protection to a variety of wild animals, plants and habitats and are a vital part of global efforts to conserve the world's biodiversity.
source: <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/designatedareas/sac/default.aspx>

Special Protection Areas (SPAs) - SPAs are areas which have been identified as being of national and international importance for the breeding, feeding, wintering or the migration of rare and vulnerable species of birds found within European Union countries. They are European designated sites, classified under the 'Birds Directive 1979' which provides enhanced protection given by the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) status all SPAs also hold.
source: <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/designatedareas/spa/default.aspx>

Natura 2000 In May 1992 European Union governments adopted legislation designed to protect the most seriously threatened habitats and species across Europe. This legislation is called the Habitats Directive and complements the Birds Directive adopted in 1979. At the heart of both these Directives is the creation of a network of sites called Natura 2000. The Birds Directive requires the establishment of Special Protection Areas (SPAs) for birds. The Habitats Directive similarly requires Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) to be designated for other species, and for habitats. Together, SPAs and SACs make up the Natura 2000 series. All EU Member States contribute to the network of sites in a Europe-wide partnership
source: <http://www.natura.org/about.html>

Notes

[#] Thorpe Park No.1 Gravel Pit Is a component of South-West London waterbodies SPA
[*] Chobam Common not located in Runnymede, but its close proximity to the borough is significant
1 - Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC
2 - Thames basin heaths SPA



All enquiries about this paper should be directed to:

Policy & Strategy Team
Planning Business Centre

Runnymede Borough Council
The Civic Centre
Station Road
Addlestone
Surrey KT15 2AH

Tel 01932 838383

Further copies of this publication can be obtained from the above address,
or email: planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk

www.runnymede.gov.uk

2017

