

London Borough of Hounslow

Draft Site Allocations, Great West Corridor & West of Borough Local Plan Reviews

Joint Statement of Common Ground

Version 7, Date: 03/09/2020

Current local plan review stage: Submission to Secretary of State (Regulation 22)

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Statement of Common Ground (SCG) sets out how the Council has ensured that its proposed submission versions of the Local Plan reviews for both the Great West Corridor (GWC) and West of Borough (WoB) Opportunity Areas have been prepared on the basis of effective joint working on strategic cross-boundary matters, in line with both the statutory duty to cooperate, as imposed by Section 110 of the Localism Act which inserted section 33A into the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The SCG outlines: the key strategic matters being addressed by the statement; the plan-making authorities and other bodies responsible for joint working; governance arrangements for the cooperation process; a record of where agreements have (or have not) been reached on key strategic matters; and any additional strategic matters to be addressed by the statement which have not already been addressed.

LB Hounslow Local Plan reviews – The Great West Corridor and West of Borough

- 1.2. The Hounslow Local Plan was adopted on 15th September 2015. In order to find the Plan sound, the Inspector proposed two main modifications to the submitted plan, adding 2 policies (SV1 and SV2) requiring partial plan reviews to be undertaken in order to plan positively for the strategic scale of growth in two areas: the Great West Corridor area (now an Opportunity Area in the emerging New London Plan) and the West of Borough area (part of the Heathrow Opportunity Area shared with LB Hillingdon). LB Hounslow has since progressed with these local plan reviews and has now undertaken both Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultation, with a view to submitting the draft Plans to the Secretary of State in June 2020.
- 1.3. The SCG has been prepared in accordance with Paragraph 27 of the NPPF (February 2019) in order to demonstrate effective and on-going joint working on strategic cross-boundary matters, and will be maintained in order to document how these matters are being addressed and what progress has been made thus far. The statement has been produced using the approach set out in national planning guidance and will be made publicly available on the Council website alongside the draft submission version of the plan to provide greater transparency. The statement has also been prepared in accordance with best practise

advice as set out in the Planning Advisory Service's 'Statement of Common Ground Advice and Template' (January 2019).

Relationship between this statement and the Duty to Cooperate

- 1.4. The SCG provides a record of how LB Hounslow has engaged with local authorities and prescribed bodies in order to agree specific strategic issues that have arisen in the course of preparing the local plan reviews. Full details of how LB Hounslow has engaged with each of the prescribed bodies identified in Regulation 4 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and section 33A(1)(c) of the PCPA 2004 are detailed in the Duty To Cooperate Statement, to be included as part of the evidence base to support the local plan reviews when these are submitted to the Secretary of State in Summer 2020.
- 1.5. Full details of parties involved in this SCG are listed in section 3.1 below.

2. Statement structure

- 2.1. As per national guidance and best practise advice provided by PAS, this statement includes:
 - A list of parties involved in the SCG;
 - A list of signatories to the statement;
 - The strategic geography covered by the SCG (including map, description and justification);
 - Strategic matters covered and a record of agreement for each, including:
 - A. Housing needs (including Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People);
 - B. Employment needs;
 - C. Retail;
 - D. Green Belt and Environmental Matters;
 - E. Infrastructure (including transport, community and green infrastructure); and
 - F. Conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment
 - Governance arrangements; and
 - A record of on-going cooperation and a timetable for review

How this SCG relates to other annex SCGs

- 2.2. Whilst LB Hounslow has attempted to detail cooperation in a single statement as per national guidance, it has been appropriate in some instances to prepare separate SCGs with neighbouring boroughs and other parties as the most expedient way to evidence joint working on certain specific issues. Reference will be made to the arrangements detailed in these separate statements within this SCG where appropriate. Full details of the annex SCGs are provided in the Duty to Cooperate Statement, however a provisional list (correct at the time of writing) is provided here for easy reference:

- LB Hounslow and Mayor of London / GLA SCG
- LB Hounslow and Historic England SCG
- LB Hounslow and LB Richmond upon Thames/Royal Botanic Gardens Kew SCG
- LB Hounslow and LB Hillingdon SCG
- LB Hounslow and the Environment Agency (EA) SCG
- LB Hounslow and NHS Hounslow CCG
- LB Hounslow and Highways England SCG
- LB Hounslow-Surrey CC SCG
- LB Brent Local Plan 2020- 2041 SCG
- Heathrow Strategic Planning Group (HSPG) SCG to accompany Joint Spatial Planning Framework (JSPF) preparation
- LB Hounslow and Developer SCGs (various)

3. Statement of Common Ground

3.1 List of Parties involved:

Neighbouring and other authorities:


- Spelthorne Borough Council
- London Borough of Ealing
- London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham
- London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
- Slough Borough Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- LB Brent
- LB Barnet
- LB Harrow
- Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC)

Prescribed Bodies and additional signatories:

- TfL

3.2 Signatories:

The following table sets out the signatories to this Statement of Common Ground. The column labelled 'Strategic matters...' is intended to allow Parties to indicate which matters each are acting as a signatory to. See section 3.6 for a record of on-going cooperation on strategic matters addressed in this Statement of Common Ground.

Organisation	Name	Position	Signature / date	Agreed positions to which this party is a signatory (section / paragraph no).
LB Hounslow	Peter Matthew	Executive Director, Housing,	 03/09/20	(All positions)

		Planning and Communities		
Spelthorne BC	Cllr. Jim McIlroy	Deputy Leader/ Portfolio Holder Local Plan	<i>Jim McIlroy</i> 13/08/2020	Housing / GTTS: A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9. Employment: B1, B2, B3, B4, B5 Retail: C1, C2 Green Belt & Env.: D1, D2, D3 Infrastructure: E5, E6, E7, E8, E9, E10
LB Ealing	Mr. Steve Barton	Strategic Planning Manager	<i>Steve Barton</i> 18.08.20	Housing / GTTS: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9. Employment: B1, B2, B3, B4, B5 Retail: C1, C2 Green Belt & Env.: D1, D2, D3 Infrastructure: E4, E5, E6, E8, E10
LB Hammersmith and Fulham	Mr. Matt Patterson	Head of Spatial Planning	Matt Patterson 03.07.2020	Housing / GTTS: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9. Employment: B1, B2, B3, B5 Retail: C1, C2 Infrastructure: E4, E5, E8, E10
LB Richmond upon Thames	Ms. Jenifer Jackson	Assistant Director – Planning & Transport Strategy	<i>Jenifer Jackson</i> 5 August 2020	Housing / GTTS: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9. Employment: B1, B2, B3, B5 Retail: C1, C2 Green Belt & Env.: D1, D2, D3 Infrastructure: E5, E8, E10 Conservation: F1
Slough BC	Mr. Paul Stimpson	Planning Policy Lead	<i>P.S.</i> 06.07.2020	Employment: B1, B2, B3, B4, Retail: C1, C2
Runnymede BC	Cllr. Nick Prescott	Council Leader	<i>N. Prescott</i> 30.07.2020	Employment: B1, B2, B3, B4, B5
LB Brent	Mr. Paul Lewin	Team Leader,	<i>P. Lewin</i>	Housing / GTTS: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9.

		Planning Policy	08.07.2020	Employment: B1, B2, B3, B5
LB Harrow	Ms. Beverley Kuchar	Chief Planner	<i>B.C. Kuchar</i> 04.08.2020	Housing / GTTS: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9.
OPDC	Mr. Tom Cardis	Assistant Director of Planning (Interim)	<i>Tom Cardis</i> 31.07.2020	Housing / GTTS: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9 Infrastructure: E4
TfL	Ms. Josephine Vos	London Plan Team Manager, TfL City Planning	<i>Joe Vos</i> 01.08.2020	Infrastructure: E1, E2, E3, E4
LB Barnet	Mr. Nick Lynch	Planning Policy Manager	<i>Nick Lynch</i> 07.08.2020	Housing / GTTS: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9. Employment: B1, B2, B3, B5

3.3 Strategic Geography




Figure 1 Map of strategic geography covered by this Statement of Common Ground

3.3.1 Description and Justification

3.3.2 The map above (figure 1) describes the strategic geography considered for cooperation on strategic matters as part of this Statement of Common Ground. The area contains the

administrative areas of LB Hounslow and all neighbouring boroughs (Spelthorne BC, LB Hillingdon, LB Ealing, LB Hammersmith and Fulham and LB Richmond), the areas covered by the West London Alliance (WLA) group of boroughs, Old Oak and Park Royal Mayoral Development Corporation (OPDC) and the area covered by the HSPG.

- 3.3.3 This area is appropriate given that it reflects existing borough boundaries, it includes the West London sub-region and the 'best fit' Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) and linked boroughs identified by LB Hounslow's Employment land Review (ELR, 2016).
- 3.3.4 Heathrow airport is recognised as having a major economic influence upon LB Hounslow and the surrounding area. LB Hounslow is a member of the HSPG and the administrative area covered by its members is also included here to reflect the on-going cooperation on spatial planning matters undertaken through this group.
- 3.3.5 LB Hounslow is a member of the West London Alliance (WLA), a sub-regional partnership between seven West London local authorities - the London Boroughs of Barnet, Brent, Ealing, Hammersmith & Fulham, Harrow, Hillingdon and Hounslow. Although it is not formally a member, the WLA works closely with the OPDC. The partnership is committed to an enduring programme of collaboration and innovation to improve outcomes for West London, covering a remit which includes: increasing economic growth, employment and skills; improving health and wellbeing; delivering increased housing supply; and delivering innovation in joint working. It also has a programme of spatial development work (including commissioning evidence to support local plan-making and coordinating a West London Planning Policy Officers' Group) and works on delivery of strategic infrastructure (including the West London Orbital rail project). The administrative area covered by its members is included here to reflect the on-going cooperation undertaken through this group.
- 3.3.6 These linkages are considered to warrant the production of a Statement of Common Ground between London Borough of Hounslow and the local authorities outlined above in order to demonstrate joint working on strategic matters being undertaken by these authorities and to record where agreements have or have not been reached.

3.4 Strategic Matters and Record of Agreement

3.4.1 Housing (including Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People)

Housing Land Availability

- 3.4.1.1 All London local planning authorities work with the GLA to produce a London-wide Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). This assessment is used by the GLA to set each borough's housing target.
- 3.4.1.2 The most up-to-date SHLAA for London is the London SHLAA 2017, produced by the GLA as part of the Draft London Plan evidence base. This gives LB Hounslow a total 10 year target (2019/20 to 2028/29) of 17,820 dwellings, or 1,782dpa.
- 3.4.1.3 LB Hounslow has produced a housing trajectory which indicates that the borough has a pipeline of 19,120 new dwellings over period 2020/21-2029/30. The trajectory indicates that over the plan period 2020/21-2034/35 LB Hounslow can deliver 26,840 dwellings.

Housing Market and Need

- 3.4.1.4 The West London Sub Regional Strategic Housing Market Assessment (WL SHMA 2018) commissioned through the WLA confirms that Hounslow is within the London Housing Market Area. It is also acknowledged that in this part of the South East, HMAs tend to be overlap due to the density of transport networks, both road and rail. This results in localised links across HMA boundaries. As such, there are localised cross boundary links between Spelthorne and Hounslow for housing matters despite these authorities sitting within neighbouring (albeit overlapping) HMAs.
- 3.4.1.5 The most up to date assessment of Housing Need for LB Hounslow is the Hounslow Housing Market Assessment (2018). This sets a total Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) of dwellings, or 1,911dpa, over the period 2019-2034, and 44,525 dwellings, or 1,781dpa, over the period 2016-2041. The SHMA identified a need for 107,000 homes or 33% of need in West London to be affordable over the period. Within Hounslow, 767dpa, or 40%, need to be delivered in affordable tenures, with the majority at a high level of subsidy. The Local Plan reviews require sites capable of delivering affordable housing to seek to achieve a 50% strategic target of affordable housing with a 70%/30% split between London affordable rent and intermediate products.
- 3.4.1.6 The West London Sub Regional Strategic Housing Market Assessment (WL SHMA 2018) identified Hounslow and Spelthorne as being in separate Housing Market Areas, with Hounslow forming part of the London Housing Market Area. The WL SHMA 2018 considers LB Hounslow to have stronger linkages with the other West London Alliance Boroughs.

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People

- 3.4.1.7 The Council was part of the West London Alliance Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (GTTSAA) in 2019. The assessment uses the PPTS definitions to provide a robust revised assessment of current and future need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the borough for the period 2016-2041. It identifies a need for 7 Gypsy/Traveller pitches, of which 3 are needed in the next 5 years, and 18 travelling show-people plots, of which 10 are need in the next 5 years. Regarding the need for Travelling Showpeople, 3 of the 18 Travelling Showpeople plots are existing unauthorised plots which will be protected and safeguarded by LB Hounslow thereby leaving a total of 15 Travelling Show-people plots to be provided over the plan period. The Plan allocates sites to meet the five-year need of both communities. The Draft London Plan provides its own definition of Gypsies & Travellers. The GTTSAA 2019 identifies a need for 33 Gypsy & Traveller pitches under the draft definition.

Record of agreement

A1. In light of uncertainty around the adoption of the emerging New London Plan, LB Hounslow intend to base their Housing Requirement on the OAN for the borough, as established in the SHMA 2018, which equates to 1,781dpa between 2020 and 2035. In doing so, LB Hounslow will meet the (Intend to Publish) New London Plan 10 year target of 17,820 homes through delivery of the indicative capacities of 7,500 homes for the GWC Opportunity Area and part of the Heathrow Opportunity Area indicative capacity of 13,000 homes (shared with LB Hillingdon).

A2. LB Hounslow has engaged with neighbouring boroughs to identify the distribution of identified housing needs, including the capacity of each authority to meet their own needs and the extent of which they might have spare capacity that might help LBHo's to meet any unmet need. The following positions on meeting housing need are summarised in the table below:

Name	Current housing target (dpa)*	Capacity to meet own identified need	Capacity to meet unmet need
Spelthorne Borough Council	606**	Spelthorne BC plan to meet their housing need.	Spelthorne BC do not currently have any spare housing capacity to meet unmet need.
London Borough of Ealing	1297 (borough)/ 2157 (LPA)	LB Ealing plan to meet their housing need.	LB Ealing do not currently have any spare housing capacity to meet unmet need.
London Borough of Hillingdon	559 / 1083	<i>Please refer to LB Hounslow-LB Hillingdon SCG</i>	<i>Please refer to LB Hounslow-LB Hillingdon SCG</i>
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham	1031 / 1609	LB Hammersmith and Fulham adopted their Local Plan in February 2018 and are on track to meet their adopted plan housing target.	LB Hammersmith and Fulham do not currently have any spare housing capacity to meet unmet any need.
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames	315 / 411	LB Richmond are on target to meet their current adopted London Plan housing target.	LB Richmond do not currently have any spare housing capacity to meet unmet need.
LB Brent	1525 / 2325	LB Brent submitted their draft Local Plan to the inspector on 17 th March 2020. LB Brent are on target to meet their current adopted London	LB Brent do not currently have any spare housing capacity to meet unmet need.

		Plan housing target.	
LB Harrow	593 / 802	LB Harrow plan to meet their own housing target as published under the New London Plan (Intend to Publish) targets.	LB Harrow do not currently have any spare housing capacity to meet unmet need.
OPDC	1367	The WLA SHMA 2018 has been completed. It identifies OPDC's housing needs as comprising the combined needs in the constituent boroughs of Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith & Fulham. OPDC has the capacity to provide 25500 of these homes.	OPDC do not currently have any spare capacity to meet unmet need.
LB Barnet	2,349 / 2,364	LB Barnet plan to meet their own housing target of 3,060 new homes per annum based on their 2018 SHMA. This exceeds the target as published under the New London Plan (Intend to Publish).	LB Barnet do not currently have any spare housing capacity to meet unmet need.

Table 1: Housing Need

* For London boroughs both the published / emerging London Plan housing targets (updated to reflect the Intend to Publish version published 09/12/2019) are given here

**Spelthorne BC does not currently have an up to date Local Plan housing target. The figure given represents housing need based upon MHCLG guidance for calculating housing need using the standard method defined by government, and is being used in the interim to project housing growth. This figure should not be confused with a plan target. Updated to reflect 2020-2030 baseline.

A3. In line with paragraph 11 of the NPPF, plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and provide for objectively assessed need for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met with neighbouring areas, unless certain criteria apply. London Boroughs will continue to plan to meet housing targets set out in the London Plan.

A4. Spelthorne BC and LB Hounslow agree that Spelthorne Borough forms a HMA with Runnymede Borough and Hounslow is located within a single London HMA. However, as confirmed by the West London SHMA, Hounslow holds its strongest links with West London. Spelthorne and Hounslow therefore sit within neighbouring HMAs however both parties acknowledge that in this part of the South East, HMAs tend to be overlapping in nature due to the density of transport networks, both road and rail. This results in localised links across HMA boundaries. It is agreed that there are localised cross boundary links between Spelthorne and Hounslow for housing matters. At present neither authority is requesting assistance from neighbouring HMAs to meet unmet need.

A5. At present Spelthorne BC, LB Ealing, LB Hammersmith and Fulham, LB Richmond upon Thames, LB Brent, LB Harrow and the OPDC are not in a position to accommodate any of LB Hounslow's objectively assessed need for housing.

A6. LB Hounslow can demonstrate a 5 year housing supply and is not requesting assistance from neighbouring authorities to meet unmet need. This is currently evidenced through the housing trajectory which supported the Regulation 19 draft pre-submission version of the local plan reviews, and the trajectory has since been updated to support the Regulation 22 submission Plans. LB Hounslow will share this evidence with partners at the earliest opportunity.

A7. As housing supply evidence is completed by LB Hounslow and the boroughs outlined in the table above, the findings will be shared and discussed with each other at key milestones.

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People

A8. LB Hounslow policy is to identify sites to meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in accordance with national guidance. The Council considers that any additional sites to meet the draft London Plan definition will be found through the criteria based approach outlined in policy.

A9. The evidence base produced by London Borough of Hounslow and those of adjoining boroughs to assess the level of need for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople accommodation within the strategic area covered by this statement is robust. Each authority will endeavour to meet their identified accommodation needs for these groups within their individual borough boundaries through their respective Local Plans. The parties agree that they do not currently have capacity to meet any identified shortfall in Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Show People provision from other boroughs.

3.4.2 Employment

Employment Land Review

3.4.2.1 The 2016 Employment Land Review (ELR), carried out by consultants Peter Brett Associates, recommended that the 'best fit' Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) should include LB Hillingdon, LB Ealing, LB Richmond, Spelthorne BC and Slough BC. The ELR also suggests LB Hounslow may have further linkages and similarities with Hammersmith and Fulham and / or LB Brent.

3.4.2.2 The study – updated in 2020 by the same consultants, now known as Stantec - provided employment floorspace requirements for the borough for the period 2019-34. The largest jobs growth for the 2019-34 period is projected to be in the land transport, storage and post sector (1,658 additional jobs 2019-34), followed by media activities (1,620). The computing and information services sector comes in at fourth place, with a 1,300-jobs growth forecast.

3.4.2.3 When the latest Experian projections on economic growth by sector are translated into floorspace requirements for industrial and office uses, the overall demand figures in the ELR update are as follows:

	<i>Offices</i>	<i>Industrial</i>
Net development demand	55,571	199,230
Replacing permitted losses	128,939	53,554
Gross development demand	184,510	252,784
Pipeline of outstanding planning permissions	37,422	70,014
Requirement for plan reviews	147,088	182,770

Table 2: Summary of employment floorspace demand 2019-34 (all figures sqm)

Source: ELR Update 2020, Stantec

Type of space required

3.4.2.4 The requirement figures in Table 2 above show that the plan reviews should plan to provide additional land for 147,088sqm of office floorspace and 182,770sqm of industrial floorspace. The first of these figures relates to B1(a) office floorspace, whilst the second refers to B1(c), B2 and B8 use classes.

3.4.2.5 An analysis of the evidence relating to the economic profile of the borough suggests that the growth sectors are transport and logistics industries operating in large floorplate sheds near Heathrow airport, and media, software and computing industries who seek more flexible space in the GWC area, and where a range of policy designations – including SOLDC and CEZ - supports such an approach. Whilst the former typology requires large B8 distribution sheds near the airport and with convenient access to the strategic road network, the latter requires a very different product – versatile units which can be operated as offices but also as multi-functional workspaces. Such units would be likely to be small and medium-sized units and in close proximity to good public transport links to provide convenient access for the workforce.

3.4.2.6 As a result of these findings, the overall strategy in the GWC Local Plan Review is to allocate development sites which aim for no loss and an overall net gain in industrial uses, but which also introduce a mix of light industrial, offices and residential into specified parts of the plan area. This is to deliver a place-changing agenda for the GWC, introducing

more residents to the area and creating a vibrant leisure and retail offer, an improved public realm and, crucially, much-enhanced public transport to the area. In relation to the employment profile of the GWC area, the policy approach is designed to provide space for the creative, media, digital and ICT industries which have been found to be in demand of more floorspace in this area, much of which is of a type which can be used as offices, light industrial or flexible workspaces.

3.4.2.7 In the WoB, the strategy is to provide land for large format distribution and storage warehouses for transport and logistics businesses much of which is associated with activities at Heathrow Airport. As the ELR shows, there is a very significant demand for additional floorspace of this type of use, but studies have also shown that there is very little land available in the borough’s urban areas to meet this demand. The Council is therefore pursuing whether there is scope for this issue to be resolved under the duty to co-operate, as per the requirement in the NPPF (and which would therefore also cover the “substitution” approach outlined in the draft London Plan) before concluding whether exceptional circumstances are demonstrated to justify releases of Green Belt land to meet this need.

HSPG Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study (JEBIS) and Joint Spatial Planning Framework (JSPF)

3.4.2.8 The HSPG have produced a Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study (JEBIS) for member local authorities surrounding Heathrow (including LB Hounslow, LB Ealing, Spelthorne BC, Runnymede BC, South Bucks DC, Slough BC, Surrey County Council and Buckinghamshire County Council). The study analysed the potential economic development and labour market arising from possible expansion of Heathrow Airport, and explored how this relates to the background growth for which the authorities are already planning. This work has informed the preparation of the Joint Spatial Planning Framework (JSPF) which sets out a framework for the sustainable development of the sub-region, addressing the implications of both ‘baseline growth’ and the additional growth demand forecast to result from the expansion of Heathrow Airport over the next 30 years. The JSPF will sit alongside LB Hounslow’s Local Plan and will help inform the upcoming DCO from Heathrow Airport Limited.

3.4.2.9 At the time of writing there is some uncertainty as to the future of this work given the Appeal Court ruling handed down on 27/02/2019 concerning the legality of the ANPS. On 31st March 2020 the HSPG released a Position Statement outlining the group’s intention to publish the finalised JSPF (February 2020) and accompanying SCG. The statement also explains that HSPG members will continue with the next phase of the group’s work when the situation with regards to the Court of Appeal decision and the economic impacts of COVID-19 are better known

Record of agreement

B1. LB Hounslow has engaged with neighbouring boroughs, those within the ‘best fit’ FEMA and those other authorities identified within the ELR as having economic links with Hounslow. The following positions on meeting employment needs are summarised in the table below:

Name	Capacity to meet own identified need	Capacity to meet unmet need
Spelthorne BC	Spelthorne BC plan to	Spelthorne BC do not

			meet their employment need.	currently have any spare capacity to meet unmet employment need.
		LB Ealing	LB Ealing are on track to meet their own employment needs	LB Ealing do not currently have any spare capacity to meet unmet need
		London Borough of Hillingdon	<i>Please refer to LB Hounslow-LB Hillingdon SCG</i>	<i>Please refer to LB Hounslow-LB Hillingdon SCG</i>
		Slough BC	Slough BC are currently trying to meet their own employment needs but would be interested in further cooperation on this matter through the HSPG	Slough BC do not currently have any spare capacity to meet unmet need. Further engagement on this issue should be undertaken through the HSPG.
		LB Richmond upon Thames	LB Richmond have asked whether LB Hounslow has any additional capacity to meet their employment need. LB Hounslow are not currently in a position to take any further unmet need from LB Richmond.	LB Richmond do not currently have any spare capacity to meet unmet need.
		LB Hammersmith and Fulham	LB Hammersmith and Fulham intend to meet their own identified need for employment.	LB Hammersmith and Fulham do not currently have any spare capacity to meet unmet need
		Runnymede BC	Runnymede BC are looking to meet all of their employment need. Further engagement on this issue should be undertaken through the HSPG.	Runnymede BC do not currently have any spare employment land capacity to meet unmet employment needs from Hounslow within its area. Further engagement on this issue should be undertaken through the HSPG.
		LB Brent	LB Brent submitted their draft Local Plan to the inspector on 17 th March 2020. LB Brent intend to meet their own identified need for employment through their new Local Plan.	LB Brent do not currently have any spare capacity to meet unmet need

LB Barnet	LB Barnet plan to meet their employment need.	LB Barnet do not currently have any spare capacity to meet unmet employment need.
-----------	---	---

Table 3: Employment Floorspace Need

B2. LB Hounslow intends to meet its OAN for employment land through the draft GWC and WoB Local Plan reviews and draft site allocations. LB Hounslow will meet its Great West Corridor Opportunity Area indicative capacity of 14,000 new jobs and part of the Heathrow Opportunity Area (West of Borough) indicative capacity of 11,000 new jobs as set out in the London Plan.

B3. At present Spelthorne BC, LB Ealing, LB Hammersmith and Fulham, Slough BC, Runnymede BC, LB Richmond upon Thames and LB Brent are not in a position to accommodate any of LB Hounslow’s objectively assessed need for employment floorspace.

B4. LB Hounslow and the other HSPG members will continue to monitor the situation as regards Heathrow expansion in light of the recent Appeal Court ruling and the economic impacts of COVID-19.

B5. All parties agree with the conclusions drawn from analysis of the FEMAs to which they are part and acknowledge the robustness of one another’s evidence bases.

3.4.3 Retail

Retail and Town Centre Needs Study 2018

3.4.3.1 The main centres in the borough are Hounslow (a Metropolitan centre), Chiswick (a Major Centre), Brentford and Feltham (District Centres). Hounslow also contains a number of large and small neighbourhood centres.

3.4.3.2 LB Hounslow commissioned a Retail Needs Assessment (2017) to inform the approach taken toward retail provision and town centre development as part of the Local Plan review.

3.4.3.3 In terms of convenience goods floorspace provision, the study identifies that, with the exception of Feltham, there is capacity for additional convenience goods floorspace in the other town centres within the Borough, in particular Brentford. There is also no qualitative retail need for additional convenience goods floorspace within Hounslow, Chiswick or Feltham but Brentford could benefit from additional convenience goods provision. In terms of comparison goods provision, the study found that the majority of capacity is identified in Hounslow Town Centre with the High Street Quarter development contributing to meeting the current qualitative and quantitative need. Chiswick Town, Feltham, and Brentford could benefit from an increase in the comparison goods provision to offer a greater variety of comparison goods retailers.

3.4.3.4 The study also undertook a review of existing relevant retail policies, including those related to town centre hierarchy, local retail impact threshold, town centre boundaries and shopping boundaries.

Record of agreement

C1. LB Hounslow is actively pursuing regeneration opportunities in its town centres through the Local Plan reviews and the adopted Local Plan 2015 in order to improve their offer and choice. LB Hounslow is not looking to significantly alter the position of its centres in the wider retail hierarchy through the Local Plan reviews.

C2. All parties acknowledge the robustness of one another's retail evidence. There are currently no outstanding cross boundary retail issues and no parties are requesting one another to help meet any unmet retail needs at present.

3.4.4 Green Belt and Environmental Matters

Evidence base keys findings

Green Belt

- 3.4.4.1 LB Hounslow commissioned Arup to undertake a Stage 2 Green Belt Review (Draft 2019). This builds upon work undertaken in the Stage 1 Green Belt Review (2015) and LB Hounslow's draft study (2017). The review has been prepared in accordance with the revised NPPF (2018).
- 3.4.4.2 The study has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of land within the green belt with respect to its performance against the purposes set out in paragraph 134 of the NPPF. The starting point for the Green Belt Assessment was to assess how far individual parcels of land in the borough meet the Green Belt purposes set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Where it has been found that parcels do not meet these purposes strongly, they have been considered further to assess (a) whether they could contribute to sustainable development, (b) whether they are deliverable and developable and (c) whether the benefits they would bring amount to exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.
- 3.4.4.3 A number of the sites which were found in the first stage of the assessment as not performing strongly when assessed against Green Belt purposes were nevertheless assessed as performing an important role as open space, providing valued gaps in the borough's built form. These were therefore entered into a separate assessment to ascertain whether it would be appropriate to designate them as Metropolitan Open Land, a designation which affords a degree of protection equivalent to that for Green Belt.
- 3.4.4.4 The assessment and subsequent assessment work has concluded that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated justifying a release of Green Belt in a number of instances. Some of these are for employment development, recognising the very substantial requirement for additional land for industrial floorspace and lack of alternative sites for this type of development, together with the need for it to be located in close proximity to Heathrow Airport. Others are for housing development, recognising the inability of the Borough to meet the housing targets in the London Plan without releasing this land. Again, consideration has been given to the range of potential options to meet this need, including greater density of development in the built-up area and the possibility of neighbouring authorities taking up any unmet need. This has not offered any

alternative options for meeting the full housing need identified by the London Plan targets.

- 3.4.4.5 One parcel of land in Bedfont has been safeguarded to deliver strategic transport infrastructure improvements, in the form of the Southern Rail Access to Heathrow Airport and associated new railway station at Bedfont, which will also offer the unique opportunity to deliver mixed-use development in a highly accessible location.
- 3.4.4.6 Neither the Stage 2 Green Belt Review nor the policies outlined in the WoB Local Plan review recommend that any parcels of land which directly adjoin green belt land belonging to any neighbouring boroughs should be removed from the green belt.
- 3.4.4.7 The Spelthorne Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 finds that the band of Green Belt between Spelthorne and Hounslow is part of a narrow but essential arc of Green Belt preventing the sprawl of the Greater London built-up area and its coalescence with towns in Surrey. The Spelthorne Green Belt Assessment Stage 2, which comprises a finer grained assessment of smaller Green Belt parcels, similarly sets out that the band of Green Belt separating Spelthorne from Greater London performs an important strategic role in preventing urban sprawl.

Record of agreement

D1. Metropolitan Green Belt is a strategic cross boundary matter for LB Hounslow, LB Hillingdon, Spelthorne BC and LB Richmond upon Thames given that each borough contains areas of designated Green Belt land which span their respective administrative boundaries.

D2. All parties have taken into consideration the importance of the Green Belt within their respective areas as part of the integrity of the wider Metropolitan Green Belt, with particular reference to Green Belt land that acts as the strategic arc preventing the continued outward sprawl of London and the merging of London with Surrey Towns.

D3. Where there are proposals to amend the Green Belt boundary between LB Hounslow and any adjoining boroughs, opportunities will be sought to strengthen the remaining boundary and retain a strategic buffer between them, in particular where this exists between Greater London and Surrey.

3.4.5 Infrastructure (including transport, community and green infrastructure)

Transport Impact Studies

- 3.4.5.1 Two new transport studies were undertaken in 2019 to contribute to the transport evidence base for the Local Plan Reviews. Both were based on the results of strategic transport modelling carried out using TfL's suite of strategic modelling tools and assessed the current state of the transport network, the future impact of expected population growth and development and the effects of the introduction of transport improvements ('mitigations').

West of Borough Highways Impact study

3.4.5.2 This study analysed the results of highway modelling of the West of Borough area and included both low growth and high growth development scenarios. Both scenarios took account of expected background growth in the area, but the low growth scenario included only half of the London Plan development target for the Bedfont area. Mitigations included bus priority schemes, new cycle infrastructure, junction improvements and mode shift resulting from travel demand management measures such as School Travel Plans.

3.4.5.3 Key findings:

1. The impact of unmitigated growth on the transport network will be felt across Hounslow although most acutely in the Bedfont area under the high growth scenario, negatively impacting journey times.
2. The mitigation measures proposed will likely provide improved highway network conditions with journey times under the low growth scenario close to pre-development levels. The mitigation package does not however bring traffic levels back to pre-development levels. Their introduction is expected to reduce the impact of additional low growth development in the borough but only partially offset the impact of high growth development.
3. Other schemes such as Heathrow Southern Rail Access or equivalent bus improvements could further help reduce the transport impact from the proposed high growth scenario.

Great West Corridor Strategic Transport Study

3.4.5.4 This transport study has been carried out as a jointly funded and managed project between TfL and LB Hounslow and the final report and its conclusions have been agreed by both parties. The study analysed the results obtained from highway and public transport modelling of the ambitious housing and employment development targets for the Opportunity Area as defined in the London Plan.

3.4.5.5 Potential mitigations were wide ranging and included tube and rail line upgrades, a new rail link between Brentford and Southall, the West London Orbital (WLO) rail link and a bus rapid transit scheme along the A4. The study also took into account the mode shift expected as a result of applying TfL's Healthy Streets Framework to improve active travel connections. Mitigations were first tested individually and then grouped into indicative rail focused and bus focused packages to test their cumulative impact.

3.4.5.6 The study was completed in May 2019. Key conclusions indicate that:

1. The forecast growth in the GWC is considerable and if unmitigated has the potential to negatively impact journey times across all modes.
2. The mitigation packages are likely to reduce traffic levels to pre-development levels but may not fully offset the impact on journey times.
3. Potential issues such as overcrowding on the public transport network were successfully addressed by the mitigation packages.
4. New development will need to be phased and delivered concurrently with transport improvements if negative impacts on the transport network are to be avoided.
5. Ambitious targets for sustainable transport use (active travel and public transport) in line with the Mayor's Transport Strategy will be needed if the full levels of London Plan

proposed development are to be supported.

Southall rail link

- 3.4.5.7 A GRIP 2 level feasibility study was completed in early 2016. This concluded that the re-provision of passenger services on this link was technically viable. A business case was also completed that concluded that the link had a 'high' value for money with an expected benefit to cost ratio of 3.0:1 using the Department for Transport's assessment approach.
- 3.4.5.8 Network Rail completed their detailed optioneering report (GRIP 3) in 2019. The report made recommendations as to the single 'preferred' design option for the infrastructure required to realise this service. An update to GRIP3 is being carried out in 2020 to accommodate several design changes with the objective of reducing overall costs.
- 3.4.5.9 Once GRIP 3 is complete, GRIP 4 (Approval in Principle) will begin which will substantively agree the final form of the scheme, subject to consents and detailed design.
- 3.4.5.10 LBH are continuing to investigate potential funding source options. These include contributions from developers, contributions in the form of grants from Government bodies (e.g. DfT or TfL) and borrowing (from public or private sectors) repaid by increased business income or a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL).
- 3.4.5.11 Following a public consultation into the introduction of a WPL in Brentford, LB Hounslow are currently preparing a business case which will analyse in detail the benefits and feasibility of the scheme. Once complete, a further public consultation will take place over winter 2020/2021. The business case and results of the public consultation will be presented to Cabinet in spring 2021, with the intention of undertaking an initial trial run of the scheme over summer 2021 should the scheme be approved by The Mayor of London.
- 3.4.5.12 An outline business case for the shuttle rail link to Southall Crossrail was submitted to the Department for Transport in 2019. LB Hounslow have subsequently updated the Strategic Outline Business Plan (SOBC) following a detailed challenge session with DfT advisors. If successful, the SOBC will place the scheme on the Rail Network Enhancement Pipeline (RNEP) and could unlock a significant capital contribution. Further discussions with DfT are expected in 2020 to confirm the next stage of business case development.

West London Orbital (WLO)

- 3.4.5.13 The West London Orbital (WLO) is a proposed 11 mile long extension of the Transport for London Overground rail network that will link Hendon and West Hampstead to the north-east with Kew and Hounslow in the south-west. It would bring back into passenger use the Dudding Hill Line between Cricklewood and Acton; trains would then use the North London Overground line and the South Western mainline between Kew Bridge and Hounslow and serving intermediate stations at Lionel Road, Brentford, Syon Lane and Isleworth. It is supported by Proposal 88 in the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS): "The Mayor, through TfL, the West London Alliance boroughs and Network Rail, will work towards delivery of a new London Overground 'West London Orbital' line connecting Hounslow with Cricklewood and Hendon via Old Oak, Neasden and Brent Cross". This support was reaffirmed in TfL's 2018/19-2023/24 Business Plan. The project is included in the draft London Plan's indicative table of transport schemes (table 10.1).

3.4.5.14 Since publication of the MTS West London planning authorities (including Hounslow) have been working together and with Transport for London to develop the business case for the WLO, particularly in identifying development capacity around WLO stations. They have also ensured the WLO is fully supported in local plans. A strategic outline business case has been prepared (GRIP 1). The Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) for the WLO has been published and concluded that there was a strong case for the scheme to be taken forward

3.4.5.15 Work on the next phase began in autumn 2019 and will further develop the project, focussing on technical feasibility, identification of economic benefits and funding/financing (GRIP2). This stage will also include the first round of public consultation on the scheme. West London Boroughs will continue to be closely involved in development of the case for the project and options for its funding and financing.

Southern Rail Access

3.4.5.16 LB Hounslow has continued to promote a preferred alignment for this new link which would connect Feltham to Heathrow via a new station in Bedfont. There are several other possible alignments and all are to be assessed by DfT.

3.4.5.17 A meeting was held with the DfT in May 2019 to outline to stakeholders how a framework for the assessment of the various proposals would be created. LB Hounslow will be included in an engagement exercise regarding the objectives by which each alignment will be assessed. The objectives will then be used as the basis of a Strategic Outline Business Case which will be developed for each proposed alignment. This will include an investigation of the cost and benefits of each scheme as well as an indication of deliverability.

Gunnorsbury Station

3.4.5.18 Significant improvements to the capacity of Gunnorsbury Station are required to support development in the east of the Great West Corridor. The GWC Masterplan and GWC Plan policy GWC6 and GWC P3 support significant improvements to station capacity and environment, potentially with the opening of a secondary entrance from Wellesley Road. This will be facilitated through enabling development.

3.4.5.19 In February 2020 TfL in consultation with LB Hounslow submitted a funding application to the TfL Growth Fund for station capacity improvements. Feedback on the application is expected in Spring/Summer 2020.

Record of agreement

E1. TfL have been consulted on policy preparation and strategic policies in both local plan reviews (GWC6 'Connecting People and Places' and WoB6 'Connecting People and Places') have been prepared in line with the findings of the Strategic Transport Impact Assessments undertaken (Great West Corridor Strategic Transport Study and West of Borough Strategic Transport Study respectively).

E2. Should the Hounslow SRA proposal go ahead, TfL will work with LB Hounslow to identify the necessary interventions that would enable the scheme to be delivered and operate effectively, in order to ensure that it is well integrated with the wider network and does not result in unacceptable impacts to either stations or rail services.

E3. LB Hounslow and TfL will continue to work together to ensure that policies and projects relating to Gunnersbury Station are implemented in order to improve accessibility and to accommodate growth within the area.

E4 LB Hounslow, other West London local planning authorities and Transport for London will continue to work together to develop the case for the West London Orbital and identify the steps necessary to implement the project.

E5. All parties agree to keep each other updated as infrastructure evidence is produced and as discussions with infrastructure and service providers continue if any relevant cross boundary matters arise, or if further infrastructure projects are found to be necessary.

E6. HSPG member authorities will continue to work collaboratively through the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group in relation to matters associated with strategic cross boundary transport schemes.

E7. LB Hounslow and Spelthorne BC acknowledge each other's proposals for a Southern Rail Link to Heathrow. The parties involved in this agreement are not the decision makers and will await the outcomes of these plans to inform future discussions.

E8. The evidence base indicates that the unmitigated growth proposed in both plan areas would result in an impact upon the road network, however both the GWC STS and WoB HIA propose mitigation which in both cases should sufficiently address this. These measures have been incorporated into the strategic and place policies within the WoB and GWC Local Plan Reviews, and the site requirements/phasing set out in the draft Site Allocations.

E9. LB Hounslow and Spelthorne BC have robustly assessed the impacts of growth in their Local Authority areas on the highway network and will engage with one another and with any additional relevant bodies should any cross boundary issues arise.

E10. At present no specific cross boundary infrastructure issues between the parties to this agreement have been identified beyond those identified above.

3.4.6 Conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment

Key Evidence base findings:

Great West Corridor Masterplan

- 3.4.6.1 The Great West Corridor Masterplan was informed by guidance from Historic England, as well as engagement with Royal Botanical Gardens Kew and LB Richmond Upon Thames. This resulted in the development of a detailed and robust methodology which has been used to establish an appropriate building height for each tested location which is deemed to be acceptable in respect of the individual and cumulative impacts upon heritage assets in the context of the comprehensive re-development and regeneration of the Great West Corridor area.
- 3.4.6.2 The Views Assessment work carried out as evidence for the Great West Corridor Masterplan has shown that tall buildings (with height parameters as defined by the heights framework) can enable the Council to meet its housing and other strategic targets while protecting the significance of adjacent heritage assets, acknowledging that in the case of Kew Gardens any further harm would be unacceptable given the level of harm there already being near substantial in accumulation. Harm to other assets is not supported by the Council, but it is recognised the NPPF allows for less than substantial harm if public benefits outweigh that harm. The Council acknowledges that this is an exacting test to meet. In accordance with this ethos the Council's approach would result in no further harm to the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew UNESCO World Heritage site.

Feltham Masterplan and West of Borough Capacity Study

- 3.4.6.3 The Feltham Masterplan (2017) and West of Borough Capacity Study (2016) aims to optimise the potential of the area to support housing delivery, job creation and the provision of new infrastructures to serve the local community and new development. The studies have also played a role in shaping regeneration within the District Centre, with the rest of the WoB area allowing for smaller scale industrial buildings and housing to accommodate growth without causing unmitigated low level harm to any designated heritage assets.

Scheduled Ancient Monuments

- 3.4.6.4 In discussions LB Hounslow and Historic England on 14/11/18 it was agreed that it may be possible to build around the designated Scheduled Ancient Monuments located on the Mayfield Farm site (as part of 'Heathrow Gateway') allocated within the WoB plan in the far west of the borough and still achieve sustainable development whilst conserving and enhancing the heritage asset as a visitor's destination.

Record of agreement

F1. LB Hounslow, Historic England, Royal Botanical Gardens Kew and LB Richmond Upon Thames have engaged with one another in relation to the impact of tall buildings within the GWC area in order to confirm that the height parameters set out in the GWC Masterplan would not adversely impact designated heritage assets in the surrounding area. As set out under paragraph 2.2, separate SCGs have been entered into to allow the relevant parties to agree positions and minor modifications to both the GWC Masterplan and GWC Local Plan Review policy GWC5 and place policies GWC P1, GWC P2 and GWC P3.

3.5 Governance Arrangements

- 3.5.1 It is agreed that informal discussions will occur between neighbouring authorities on the cross boundary issues referred to in this Statement of Common Ground in the form of officer level meetings at least once every twelve months with escalation of matters to Member level where necessary. This is in addition to the opportunities for inter-borough discussion of strategic matters provided by the three meetings each year of the WLA Chief Planners', and quarterly meetings of the WLA Planning Policy Officers', groups.
- 3.5.2 HSPG members will continue to engage with one another through the HSPG secretariat and will continue to monitor the situation with regards to the future work of the group, including that of its Spatial Planning Sub Group
- 3.5.3 It is agreed that this Statement of Common Ground will be reviewed by all authorities at a joint duty to cooperate meeting which will be held on an annual basis.
- 3.5.4 Where any one of the parties to this Statement of Common Ground is undertaking a Regulation 18 consultation, Regulation 19 publication or submitting a Local Plan to the Secretary of State, it will be the responsibility of that party to co-ordinate the review and updating of relevant aspects of this SCG for agreement with appropriate parties for that event (as necessary).

3.6 Record of on-going cooperation and timetable for review

- 3.6.1 The following table is intended to monitor the progress made toward gaining agreement on strategic matters addressed in this statement of common ground. The table will be updated as and when further progress has been made.

LPA / Body	Statement sent date	Status	Outstanding Issues to be resolved	Summary of engagement to date
Spelthorne BC	V6 sent 22/06/2020	Joint SCG Signed	-	Local Plan Reviews and strategic cross boundary issues discussed by officers at meeting on 18/07/2017 and on 13/04/2018.

				<p>LB Hounslow and Spelthorne BC have engaged on preparation of draft annex LBH-SBC SCG which this SCG seeks to update. A meeting was held on 08/10/18, followed by email correspondence.</p> <p>A meeting was held on 12/12/19 to discuss points raised at Regs19 and how these might be addressed in the SCG. LBH and Spelthorne continue to engage with one another on highways related matters.</p>
LB Hillingdon	LB Hounslow-LB Hillingdon SCG sent 11/06/2020	Awaiting response	Review of LB Hounslow-LB Hillingdon SCG	<p>Local Plan Reviews and Heathrow Opportunity Area discussed by officers at meetings on 19/06/2017 and 23/03/2018. Strategic cross boundary matters discussed at a duty to cooperate workshop on 15/03/2019.</p> <p>On-going email correspondence to discuss matters raised at meetings.</p> <p>A meeting was held in January 2020 to discuss matters arising from LB Hillingdon's Regs19 response. At the meeting it was decided that a separate SCG should be entered to agree position on 4 main matters: housing need; green belt release (including site allocation and Land South of Western International Market); the Heathrow Opportunity Area and employment demand implications; and Heathrow expansion uncertainty for forward plan making. A revised SCG was sent to LB Hillingdon on 11/06/2020 along with key evidence base documents.</p>

LB Ealing	V6 sent 22/06/2020	Joint SCG Signed	-	Local Plan Reviews and strategic cross boundary issues discussed by officers at meeting on 18/07/2017 and at an HSPG meeting (between LB Hounslow, LB Ealing and HSPG staff members) on 03/04/2019.
LB Hammersmith and Fulham	V6 sent 22/06/2020	Joint SCG Signed	-	Local Plan Reviews and strategic cross boundary issues have been discussed by officers during a conference call on 11/06/2019 and subsequently via email.
LB Richmond upon Thames	V6 sent 22/06/2020	Joint SCG Signed	Note separate GWC Heritage / Masterplan SCG also being agreed.	<p>Local Plan Reviews and cross boundary strategic matters discussed by officers at meeting on 18/01/2016, 19/07/2017 and at a duty to cooperate workshop on 12/03/2019.</p> <p>LB Richmond attended a workshop to discuss the emerging GWC Masterplan on 17/10/2017.</p> <p>Specific meetings on the development of the GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study were held between LB Hounslow, GLA, Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, Historic England and LB Richmond on 13/11/18, 19/03/19 and 26/06/2019. After a meeting on 30/01/20 and subsequent engagement it was agreed that entering into a separate SCG to agree positions on the draft GWC Masterplan and Heights Framework within the emerging GWC LPR was the best course of action.</p>
Slough BC	V6 sent 22/06/2020	Joint SCG Signed	-	Local Plan Reviews and strategic cross boundary issues discussed by officers at a duty to cooperate workshop on 15/03/2019 and subsequently via email.
Runnymede	V6 sent	Joint SCG	-	Runnymede Local Plan review

BC	22/06/2020	Signed		<p>and strategic issues discussed at meeting on 22/04/2016.</p> <p>LB Hounslow Local Plan Reviews and strategic cross boundary issues discussed at duty to cooperate workshop on 15/03/2019 and subsequently via email.</p>
The Mayor of London / GLA	<p>1st draft LB Hounslow-GLA SCG sent 04/06/2020</p> <p>2nd draft LB Hounslow-GLA SCG sent 12/08/2020</p>	Awaiting response	Review of SCG	<p>LB Hounslow and GLA have engaged with one another throughout preparation of the WoB and GWC local plan reviews. Both Local Plan Reviews were discussed at a meeting on 28/07/2017, and the GWC plan review was discussed at further meetings on 16/04/2018, 16/05/2018, 15/06/2018, 11/07/2018, 25/09/2018.</p> <p>A meeting was held between GLA and LB Hounslow on 25/06/2019 to discuss employment, affordable housing, the Heathrow Opportunity Area, Green belt issues and duty to cooperate. A meeting was held on 23/04/2020 to discuss general conformity matters. It was decided that entering into an LB Hounslow-GLA SCG would be the most expedient way to evidence joint working. A further meeting was held on 15/07/2020 to clarify outstanding issues and further information was shared with the GLA on 12/08/2020.</p> <p>Specific meetings on the development of the GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study were held between LB Hounslow, GLA, Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, Historic England and LB Richmond on 09/10/18, 13/11/18, 19/03/19 and 30/01/20.</p>

Surrey CC	V5 sent 17/04/2019	Further engagemen t	Agree evidence to be supplied and draft LB Hounslow- Surrey CC SCG	<p>Surrey CC submitted a representation at Regulation 19 consultation raising issues around the potential impact of growth within the WoB area upon roads in Spelthorne. A meeting was held on 10/02/2020 to address these matters and further clarification was sought from consultants.</p> <p>A subsequent meeting was held on 04/06/2020 to discuss next steps and to discuss the potential of entering into a LB Hounslow-Surrey CC SCG.</p>
LB Barnet	V6 sent 22/06/2020	Joint SCG Signed	-	Local Plan Reviews and strategic cross boundary issues discussed by officers at West London Alliance Planning Policy Officers Group meetings, and subsequently via email.
LB Brent	V6 sent 22/06/2020	Joint SCG Signed	-	Local Plan Reviews and strategic cross boundary issues discussed by officers at a duty to cooperate workshop on 11/12/2019, and subsequently via email.
LB Harrow	V6 sent 22/06/2020	Joint SCG Signed	-	Local Plan Reviews and strategic cross boundary issues discussed by officers via email between November 2019 – August 2020
OPDC	V6 sent 22/06/2020	Joint SCG Signed	-	OPDC submitted a representation at Regulation 19 consultation stage. Information on the Local Plan Reviews and strategic cross boundary issues were set out in the draft versions of the SCG and circulated to OPDC for comment and agreement via email between November 2019 – August 2020.
TfL	V6 sent 22/06/2020	Joint SCG Signed	-	LB Hounslow and TfL have engaged with one another throughout preparation of the WoB and GWC local plan

				<p>reviews. Local Plan Reviews were discussed at a meeting on 28/07/2017 with GLA, and on 13/10/2017.</p> <p>Subsequent engagement on Local Plan Review matters has also been undertaken through regular, on-going bi-lateral meetings to discuss local and strategic transport issues.</p>
Historic England	LB Hounslow-Historic England SCG sent 04/06/20	Awaiting response	Separate GWC Heritage / Masterplan SCG also being agreed.	LB Hounslow and Historic England have engaged with one another throughout the preparation of the GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study. Specific meetings were held between LB Hounslow, GLA, Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, Historic England and LB Richmond on 09/10/18, 13/11/18 and 19/03/19. After a meeting on 30/01/20 and subsequent engagement it was agreed that entering into a separate SCG to agree positions on the draft GWC Masterplan and Heights Framework within the emerging GWC LPR was the best course of action.

3.6.2 The following table provides information on the plan review, update and submission timetables for the local authorities which are signatories to this statement

Authority	Present plan adoption date	Proposed review date	Target Reg.18 date	Target Reg.19 date	Target submission date	Proposed date for adoption
Spelthorne BC	2009	2014	November 2019 – January 2020	Jan – Feb 2021	April 2021	March 2022
LB Hillingdon	2012 / 2019	2020	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC
LB Ealing	2012/2013	2019	Autumn / Winter 2020	Autumn 2021	Winter 2021	Spring 2022
LB Hammersmith	2018	-	-	-	-	-

and Fulham						
LB Richmond upon Thames	2018	2019	Spring 2021	Spring / early Summer 2022	Autumn / Winter 2022	Spring 2024
Slough BC	2006	2015	February 2020	Summer 2021	Winter 2021	Summer 2020
Runnymede BC	2001	2016	Summer 2016	January – February 2018 / May – June 2018	July 2018	Summer 2020
GLA	2016	2017	-	December - March 2017	December 2019	2020
LB Barnet	2012	2019	January – March 2020	Autumn 2020	Winter 2020/21	Winter 2021
LB Brent	2010	2017	November 2018 – January 2019	October – December 2019	Spring 2020	Late 2020
LB Harrow	2012/2013	2020	November - December 2020	Autumn 2020	Spring 2023	Autumn 2023
OPDC	-	-	-	-	Submitted October 2018	TBC

Table 4: Record of on-going cooperation

3.6.3 The SCG will be reviewed annually to take account of plan preparation updates and/or local developments. As set out in the Governance Arrangements section above, it will be the responsibility of the party in question to co-ordinate the review and updating of this SCG where they are undertaking a Regulation 18 consultation, Regulation 19 publication or submitting a Local Plan to the Secretary of State.