

# Runnymede 2035 Duty to Co-operate update statement



May 2017

*This page is intentionally blank*

## Contents Page

Chapter title	Page number
<b>Chapter 1:</b> Introduction	3
<b>Chapter 2:</b> Overarching Duty to Cooperate groups attended by the Council which cover various strategic matters	4
<b>Chapter 3:</b> Cooperation with other bodies and organisations that do not fall under the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate	9
<b>Chapter 4:</b> Housing	12
<b>Chapter 5:</b> Gypsies and Travellers	19
<b>Chapter 6:</b> Economic Development	23
<b>Chapter 7:</b> Green Belt	30
<b>Chapter 8:</b> Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA	35
<b>Chapter 9:</b> Transport	39
<b>Chapter 10:</b> Flooding	44
<b>Chapter 11:</b> Infrastructure- Education; Health; Utilities; Community and Culture; Open Space and Recreation	50
<b>Chapter 12:</b> Other strategic matters not listed in chapters 4-11	54

## Appendices

**Appendix 1-**Minutes of the West Surrey Local Plan working group

**Appendix 2-**Email trail between Woking and Runnymede BCs 5<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> October 2017

**Appendix 3-**Email sent to Local Authority partners on the Green Belt Review Part 2 and responses received.

**Appendix 4-**Meeting note. Runnymede Borough Council and Natural England, 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016

**Appendix 5-**Agenda from JSPB meeting of 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016

**Appendix 6-**Meeting agenda and minutes from meeting with Highways England on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2016

**Appendix 7-**Correspondence between Highways England and Surrey County Council over the months of October and November 2016 which relate to the Runnymede transport modelling work.

**Appendix 8-**Comments on the Council's draft strategic sequential test from the Environment Agency (11<sup>th</sup> August 2016)

**Appendix 9-**Minutes from conference call with the Environment Agency dated 26<sup>th</sup> September 2016

**Appendix 10-**Email correspondence between the Council and the Environment Agency in February/March 2017

**Appendix 11-**Minutes of meeting with Sport England, December 2016

*This page is intentionally blank*

## Chapter 1: Introduction

- 1.1 This Duty to Cooperate statement seeks to update the reader on how the Council has continued to comply with the requirements of the Localism Act (2011) which relate to the Duty to Cooperate since:
  - The publication of the Council's Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework in October 2015, and
  - Since the publication of the Council's Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework in July 2016.
- 1.2 This update statement must be read in conjunction with the earlier scoping framework and update statement referred to above as all three documents, when read together, seek to provide a continuous dialogue of the steps that the Council has taken to cooperate with relevant partners on strategic cross boundary matters since the commencement of Plan preparation up to May 2017.
- 1.3 The 2015 scoping framework sets out in detail the Council's intended approach to cooperation for all cross boundary matters over the course of Local Plan preparation. The update statements produced during the preparation of the Local Plan seek to follow the approach set out in this scoping framework.
- 1.4 In the chapters below, each of the strategic matters highlighted in the Council's 2015 scoping framework will be considered in turn with a commentary on:
  - The key strategic planning issues identified in each topic area
  - The key actions taken by the Council and outcomes achieved through cooperation between July 2016 up until the publication of this statement in May 2017.
- 1.5 The format in chapters 4 to 11 of this document follows that recommended by the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) in their August 2015 'Duty to Cooperate Statement template'<sup>1</sup> paper.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.pas.gov.uk/events-and-support2/-/journal\\_content/56/332612/6387362/ARTICLE](http://www.pas.gov.uk/events-and-support2/-/journal_content/56/332612/6387362/ARTICLE)

## **Chapter 2: Overarching Duty to Cooperate groups attended by the Council which cover various strategic matters**

- 2.1 Representatives from Runnymede Borough Council attend a number of groups which engage on a range of cross boundary matters, on a regular basis. An overview of these groups is provided in the paragraphs below.

### **The Surrey Planning Officers Association (SPOA)**

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

### **Planning Working Group (PWG)**

- 2.4 This is a group for Planning Policy Managers in Surrey and the County Council that meets five or six times a year. Members discuss and seek to resolve cross-boundary policy issues, share relevant information and experiences, and prepare joint responses to consultations of pan-Surrey interest. From time to time, the group is required by SPOA to carry out research or projects that are directed at improving the understanding and experience of an aspect of planning policy. The Planning Working Group has been instrumental in progressing the County's LSS work. The minutes from the PWG meetings that Runnymede has attended since July 2016 (8<sup>th</sup> July, 9<sup>th</sup> September, 18<sup>th</sup> November, 20<sup>th</sup> January, 17<sup>th</sup> March and 12<sup>th</sup> May) can be provided on request.

### **Wider South East Officer Working Group**

- 2.5 South East and East of England Leaders and the Deputy Mayor of London for Planning meet informally on a regular basis to discuss common strategic planning and economic growth issues supported by an officer working group. The purpose of this policy and infrastructure collaboration across the Wider South East is to coordinate strategic planning and infrastructure investment more effectively. This process is carried out alongside and helps to inform engagement between planning authorities through the Duty to Cooperate and the Mayor's Duties to inform and Consult on strategic planning matters.
- 2.6 Representatives from Surrey authorities – the chair of the Surrey Planning Officers' Association (substitute - chair of Planning Working Group) and Surrey County Council's spatial planning manager are members of the Wider South East Officer

Working Group. At SPOA and PWG meetings, future WSE agenda items are discussed and feedback provided. Current priorities for joint working are the review of the London Plan, tackling housing barriers, strategic infrastructure (especially transport) and gaining a common understanding of evidence, in particular population and household forecasts to support plan making and delivery.

- 2.7 The current Wider South East Officer Working Group supersedes the Strategic Spatial Planning Officer Liaison Group (SSPOLG), which was set up following the publication of a discussion paper by the Mayor of London in October 2012 that explored options for future cross-boundary work on strategic planning for London and the Wider South East. During 2013, the Mayor also held two officer workshops with representatives from planning authorities across the Wider South East to discuss relevant strategic planning issues. As a result of these discussions, SSPOLG was established with a focus on housing, infrastructure and demography matters. The Group also supported Member level Roundtables and Summits and following a series of political roundtables and the second summit in 2015, a Political Steering Group was established to steer and agree strategic collaboration activities across the Wider South East, including supported by an Officer Working Group. All agendas and minutes from the meetings of SSPOLG, WSE Political Steering Group and WSE Officer Working Group alongside a calendar of future meetings can be viewed on the Mayor of London web pages<sup>2</sup>.
- 2.8 During the period covered by this update statement, 3 meetings of the Officer Working Group have been held (9th September 2016, 9th November 2016 and 21st February 2017). In addition, a third Wider South East Summit was held on 9th December 2016 titled, 'shaping the new London Plan and addressing growth challenges across the wider South East'.

### **West Surrey Local Plan Working Group**

- 2.9 This is a group for planning officers in the West Surrey Boroughs of Runnymede, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Woking, Guildford and Waverley, that meets three or four times annually in order to discuss issues affecting the authorities on the western side of the County. The group has previously sought to identify opportunities for joint working in a number of policy areas (authorities in the east of the County are represented by a similarly-constituted group). Since the publication of the July 2016 DtC update statement, there has only been one meeting of the West Surrey Local Plan Working Group. Minutes from that meeting can be found in Appendix 1.

### **The Surrey Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership (SSPIP)**

- 2.10 Runnymede Borough Council has continued to work collaboratively with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey boroughs and districts in the preparation of the Surrey LSS. Since the production of the July 2016 Duty to Cooperate Update

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/organisations-we-work/policy-and-infrastructure-collaboration-across-wider-south-east>

Statement was published, key actions and outcomes over the period related to the LSS can be listed as follows:

-Templates for each of the sub areas were completed and the LSS was drafted.  
-PWG provided feedback on the draft LSS at its meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> July 2016. It was agreed that the Strategy should:

- Cover themes and key strategic sites;
- Set out the links between sub-areas and where appropriate links with wider areas, e.g., the River Thames Strategy;
- Demonstrate how the spatial priorities will address identified challenges; and,
- Show what Duty to Cooperate working in Surrey will look like.

-A structure for the sub area write ups was agreed. Representatives from each sub area met to draft their write ups for the LSS. These draft sub area write ups were discussed at the PWG meeting of 9<sup>th</sup> September 2016.

-The LSS was then amended in line with the discussions and the document was presented to SPOA on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2016.

-Following discussion at SPOA, the LSS editorial team further refined the document to reflect the comments made.

-The Surrey Chief Executives were asked to consider the draft LSS document at their meeting of 20<sup>th</sup> January 2017 and endorse the development of an interim LSS. After considering the document and covering report, they agreed with the recommendation that the Memorandum of Understanding be signed and the LSS document be presented to Surrey Leaders for their consideration.

-The LSS was presented to Surrey Leaders on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2017. The officer recommendation was accepted with a few minor changes.

-Following the endorsement of the LSS, a targeted consultation on the content of the document is now proposed to be carried out. This consultation is being prepared by Surrey County Council; its commencement date and duration have yet to be confirmed.

### **The 3SC devolution proposals**

- 2.11 The 3SC steering group is producing an infrastructure study across the 3SC area. An officer from Runnymede attended a workshop event in connection with the preparation of this study on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2017. Timescales for the completion of this study have not yet been confirmed.

### **The Heathrow Strategic Planning Group**

- 2.12 The Heathrow Strategic Planning Group and its sub groups have continued to meet since the July 2016 Duty to Cooperate Update Statement was published. Officers from Runnymede have attended the following meetings.

Main Group meetings: 12<sup>th</sup> July 2016, 13<sup>th</sup> September 2016, 18<sup>th</sup> October 2016, 6<sup>th</sup> December 2016, 13<sup>th</sup> December 2016, 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017, 21<sup>st</sup> March 2017, 18<sup>th</sup>



April 2017.

Transport sub group meetings: 7<sup>th</sup> February 2017, 15<sup>th</sup> March 2017.

Spatial planning sub group: 11<sup>th</sup> July 2016, 28<sup>th</sup> March 2017, 18<sup>th</sup> April 2017, 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2017.

Heathrow Summit (officer pre meeting 27<sup>th</sup> October 2016 at Council offices): On the evening of 10 November, there was a summit meeting of the HSPG. This provided an opportunity for the leadership and senior management of all the organisations – including Runnymede Borough Council - that have so far collaborated on the work of the HSPG, to come together and review the findings of the work carried out so far and consider the next steps. Two elected Members, the Chief Executive and an officer from the Planning Policy and Strategy team attended the summit.

At the HSPG meeting of 6th December, the focus was on what the next steps should be following the summit, looking ahead to what needs to be done in the coming months, and potentially years.

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

The key strategic outcomes achieved following the meetings that have occurred over the period covered by this update statement are:

- The production of a shared Vision and Development Principles Document to guide the work of Heathrow Airport and the HSPG in preparing its Development Consent Order application
- Preparing the relevant material for, and holding the Heathrow Summit on 10<sup>th</sup> November. The Summit provided the opportunity to give Members and senior managers at Local Authorities in the area surrounding Heathrow more information on the work carried out by the HSPG including the actions and outcomes achieved (for example the formulation of the technical sub groups, the production of terms of reference for each group and scoping of the necessary work streams)
- The production of a Key Messages plan to identify cooperative work around the National Planning Policy Statement and resultant DCO
- The agreement of Heads of Terms for a Service Level Agreement between the HSPG and Heathrow Airport Limited.
- An indicative timetable was agreed showing short, medium and long term targets for agreeing transport related matters for 3<sup>rd</sup> runway growth at Heathrow. This included the date HAL will release multi modal transport demand model specification and time the sub-group will have to consider this as well as model verification and preparation of Statement of Common

Ground between HAL and the sub-group on Transport matters.

- 2.13 It is also considered noteworthy that Runnymede BC has also set up a Heathrow Airport Expansion Members Working Group to consider how Runnymede might be affected and to ensure that the best possible case is presented for mitigation measures in Runnymede. This working group first met on 24th January 2017 and met again on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2017.

### **Chapter 3: Cooperation with other bodies and organisations that do not fall under the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate**

- 3.1 The Council recognises that it is not only the prescribed bodies defined in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 that should be engaged with during the preparation of its Local Plan. The national Planning Practice Guidance is also clear that a number of other groups should be proactively engaged with, including:
- Developers
  - Those with land interests
  - Land promoters; local property agents
  - Partner organisations
  - Local Enterprise Partnerships
  - Neighbourhood Forums (and town and parish councils although none exist in Runnymede)
  - Local communities; and businesses, and
  - Business representative organisations
- 3.2 As such, in the latter part of 2015, the Council established two panels to allow it to better engage with a number of these groups. These groups are described below.

#### **The Community Planning Panel**

- 3.3 The Community Planning Panel (CPP) is made up of residents'/community associations from across the Borough to act as a channel for engagement and collaboration with the Borough's communities as sought by the NPPF.
- 3.4 The CPP is made up of the following residents'/community associations who are invited to send a representative to each meeting:
- Egham Residents' Association
  - Englefield Green Village Residents' Association
  - Hamm Court Residents' Association
  - The Chertsey Society
  - The Ottershaw Society
  - Thorpe Residents' Association
  - Virginia Water Community Association
  - Wentworth Residents' Association
  - West Addlestone Residents' Association.
- 3.5 The Terms of Reference for the CPP and the meeting agendas and minutes can be found on the Council's website<sup>3</sup>. Since the July 2016 Duty to Cooperate Update Statement was produced, the CPP has met once on 26<sup>th</sup> January 2017 and another meeting is scheduled on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2017.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/5276/Statement-of-Community-Involvement-SCI>

### **The Development Market Panel**

- 3.6 The Development Market Panel (DMP) is made up of members who include developers, those with land interests, land promoters and local property agents. The Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership was also invited to be part of the DMP although they do not sit on the panel at present. The purpose of this panel is to advise the Council on technical aspects of land availability, such as providing market commentary and commenting on development viability using their local industry knowledge of housing and employment land markets.
- 3.7 The Terms of Reference for the DMP and the meeting agendas and minutes can be found on the Council's website<sup>4</sup>.
- 3.8 Several meetings of the DMP have taken place since its inception, the outcomes of which can be found in the relevant chapters of this statement; namely the housing; economic development and infrastructure chapters. The most recent meeting of the DMP took place on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2017. At this meeting, the DMP were given a presentation regarding proposed assumptions for the Runnymede Local Plan Viability Assessment. Members of the DMP were asked to feedback at the meeting whether proposed assumptions to feed into the viability model were correct or whether any assumptions needed amending to reflect the local development market. The outcome of this meeting is that the discussions had have fed into the assumptions used in the Council's Local Plan viability assessment. The draft viability assessment will be presented to the DMP at a later date for sense checking.
- 3.9 For further information about how the Council intends to involve and engage with the local community and stakeholders in the preparation of all planning policy documents (including the Local Plan) please view the Council's Statement of Community Involvement<sup>5</sup>.

### **Surrey Nature Partnership**

- 3.10 Local Nature Partnerships have been set up across the UK with the purpose of championing the value of the natural environment in decision making at all levels. The Surrey Nature Partnership (SNP) is one of several Local Nature Partnerships, which were recognised by DEFRA in August 2012. Officers from the Council sit on the biodiversity working group of the SNP, which includes members from other LPAs; Natural England and the Environment Agency, as well as amongst others the Surrey Wildlife Trust, RSPB and the Forestry Commission.
- 3.11 The outcomes of discussions at the working group meetings are covered in more detail in the Climate change, biodiversity and TBHSPA chapter.
- 3.12 Officers attended a meeting of the biodiversity working group on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016 and 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2017.

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=11732&p=0>

## **Neighbourhood Planning**

3.13 The Thorpe Neighbourhood Forum continues to work on the production of its neighbourhood plan at the time of writing. No other neighbourhood plans are currently being developed in the Borough of Runnymede.

## Chapter 4: Housing

### 1. Strategic Planning issue

#### *Define the issue*

Meeting the identified housing needs in full for Runnymede Borough and the wider Housing Market Area (HMA) given the constraints to development that exist in the Borough and the wider HMA. Exploring how the housing needs, if they cannot be met within the HMA, could be met in neighbouring HMAs.

### 2. Evidence base

#### *What is the evidence used to develop the LP's strategic policies?*

- Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) November 2015
- Interim SLAA 2016 (June 2016)
- Arup Green Belt Review December 2014 (see Chapter 7 which relates to the Green Belt for more information)
- Green Belt Villages Review February 2016 (see Chapter 7 which relates to the Green Belt for more information)
- Green Belt Review Part 2 (March 2017)
- Site Selection Methodology and Assessment v2 (May 2017)
- Site capacity analysis (May 2017)
- Strategic Sequential Test (work in progress) (see chapter 10 which relates to flooding for more information)

### 3. Strategic Partners

#### *List of bodies engaged with (details of each, make up and constitution etc to be listed in appendix 3)*

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

### 4. Relevant actions carried out since last DtC update statement was published in July 2016 in pursuit of achieving outcomes outlined in the DtC Scoping Framework (October 2015)

#### *How have you worked collaboratively with your partners?*

#### *What actions did you take to manage the strategic issue?*

*Was there any joint evidence developed e.g. SHMA? Who was involved? Include timescales for the evidence in an annex to demonstrate how and when key decisions were made (appendix 2).*

<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC, Hart DC and East Hants DC.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Hart DC. (East Hampshire DC in attendance on account of ongoing working arrangements between the two authorities.)</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> It was agreed that Runnymede and Hart are not located in the same HMA, but in adjoining HMA's. As such, if it became apparent that housing needs could not be met in either HMA at a later date, it was likely to be the case that an approach would be made to ask for assistance with meeting unmet needs under the DtC, albeit that the expectation of a positive outcome was very low. It was agreed that a Memorandum of Understanding focussed on the issue of Housing would be acceptable in principle, but it was anticipated that it would make reference to the point concerning the low expectations relating to either side meeting reciprocal external unmet housing needs. It was made clear that Runnymede was not expecting East Hants. to meet any of its unmet need.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 8 September 2016</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and Woking BC.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Woking BC</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> It was agreed that Runnymede and Woking are not located in the same HMA, but in adjoining HMA's. As such, if it became apparent that housing needs could not be met in either HMA at a later date, it was likely to be the case that an approach would be made to ask for assistance with meeting unmet needs under the DtC. However, as Spelthorne was not anticipating commencing its Reg.18 consultation until late 2017, it could not be confirmed for some time to come whether identified housing needs would be met in full in the Runnymede/Spelthorne HMA. Woking stated that they were not prepared at that time to enter into a MoU.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 6 October 2016</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and LB Hillingdon.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> LB Hillingdon</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> It was agreed that Runnymede and Hillingdon are not located in the same HMA, but adjoining HMA's. As such, if it became apparent that housing needs could not be met in either HMA at a later date, it was likely to be the case that an approach would be made to ask for assistance with meeting unmet needs under the DtC. However, as Spelthorne was not anticipating commencing its Reg.18 consultation until late 2017, it could not be confirmed for some time to come whether identified housing needs would be met in full in the Runnymede/Spelthorne HMA.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 7 October 2016</p>

**Action:** Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and RBWM. RBWM confirmed their intention of having a number of bilateral Memorandums of Understanding (MoU) with surrounding Boroughs. Runnymede were supportive of this approach, having previously proposed a similar methodology. RBWM intends to meet housing need in full. Runnymede advised that its Local Plan anticipated meeting 56-82% of identified housing need; the ideal would be to meet 100% of housing need. Further work on Green Belt sites was anticipated, with a spring consultation likely.

**Partner(s):** RBWM

**Outcome:** Agreed that may be a need for two MoU's, one from each Borough's perspective. RBWM proposed to make changes to the draft and then circulate for amendment by Runnymede. All acknowledged that a meeting would be required to sign off the memorandums. Runnymede noted that RBWM would very soon be receiving a letter at Chief Executive level regarding ongoing importance of Duty to Co-operate.

**Date:** 6 December 2016

**Action:** Through the Reg 18 consultation, a small number of representations were received that made detailed comments on the content of the SHMA evidence. Since the close of the consultation, officers have met with officers at Spelthorne Borough Council and different elements of the SHMA were discussed. It was agreed that the Councils' consultants would be asked to revisit the evidence to ensure that the most up to date household projections were reflected and include an element of sensitivity analysis/sense checking of assumptions used in the original SHMA. The representations that Runnymede has received during the IOPA consultation will also be considered by GL Hearn during the update work that they undertake, and the SHMA would be revised if this was found to be necessary on the basis of the comments made.

It was agreed that the timing of such an update was important as new SHMA guidance is expected to be issued by the Government and it would not make sense to update the SHMA until the contents of this guidance was known. Agreed that officers at Runnymede and Spelthorne would both draw up a list of assumptions relied upon in the original SHMA that GL Hearn would be asked to re look at and would await the new guidance before updating the SHMA, although this position would be reviewed if the publication of the guidance was delayed.

**Partner(s):** Spelthorne Borough Council

**Outcome:** Engagement in this area is ongoing

**Date:** 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017



**Action:** Officers have begun work to progress the Local Plan SLAA, including undertaking the annual call for sites. Concerns were raised by Spelthorne Borough Council through the Reg 18 consultation about some of the assumptions used within the interim SLAA in relation to C2 accommodation, density and non-implementation.

Officers have been working on collating evidence to ensure that all assumptions made in relation to non-implementation and the contribution of C2 homes are robust. The findings of this work to date were discussed with officers at Spelthorne Borough Council on 16<sup>th</sup> January. The findings will also be discussed with the Runnymede DMP. In addition the Council has committed to producing a paper which will analyse the impact of household extensions on the Borough's housing stock which may then impact on the mix of dwelling sizes required in the Borough over the Local Plan period. It is hoped that this paper will be completed by the Council's pre submission consultation in Autumn 2017.

**Partner(s):** Spelthorne Borough Council

**Outcome:** Engagement in this area is ongoing

**Date:** Meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017

**Action:** Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and Guildford BC.

**Partner(s):** Guildford BC

**Outcome:** It was agreed that Runnymede and Guildford are not located in the same HMA, but adjoining HMA's. As such, if it became apparent that housing needs could not be met in either HMA at a later date, it was likely to be the case that an approach would be made to ask for assistance with meeting unmet needs under the DtC. However, as Spelthorne was not anticipating commencing its Reg.18 consultation until late 2017, it could not be confirmed for some time to come whether identified housing needs would be met in full in the Runnymede/Spelthorne HMA. Runnymede passed over copies of two draft MoU's (the one originally forwarded last year) and a revised (shorter) one, for Guildford's consideration.

**Date:** 18 January 2017

**Action:** Officer meeting of the East Surrey Local Plans Group

**Partner(s):** Elmbridge BC; Epsom and Ewell BC; Reigate and Banstead BC; Tandridge DC (Mole Valley DC not present)

**Outcome:** Runnymede joined the meeting to remind attendees of the matter of the original draft MoU that was circulated last year and to inform of the revised (shorter) one that was now being suggested for use. (Electronic copies were subsequently circulated, including to Mole Valley DC.) It was agreed that all would review in readiness for further approaches from Runnymede for agreement to a way forward.

**Date:** 24 February 2017

<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and Slough BC</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Slough BC</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> It was agreed that Runnymede and Slough are not located in the same HMA, but adjoining HMA's. As such, if it became apparent that housing needs could not be met in either HMA at a later date, it was likely to be the case that an approach would be made to ask for assistance with meeting unmet needs under the DtC. However, as Spelthorne was not anticipating commencing its Reg.18 consultation until late 2017, it could not be confirmed for some time to come whether identified housing needs would be met in full in the Runnymede/Spelthorne HMA. Runnymede passed over copies of two draft MoU's (the one originally forwarded last year) and a revised (shorter) one, for Slough's consideration.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 20 March 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC, Surrey Heath BC, Woking BC and Surrey CC</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Surrey Heath BC, Woking BC, Surrey CC.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The discussion centred on the matter of proposed large scale development in the Green Belt in each of the three Boroughs attending, with a particular emphasis on the implications for already congested highways infrastructure. It was agreed that a jointly-funded study focussing on the A320, both assessing the existing position and identifying what mitigation would be required for development to be accommodated, would be the most effective means of making progress. As Runnymede is the furthest ahead in terms of the stage at which its large scale development is likely to come forward, it was charged with drawing up a timetable for this project.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 29 March 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> The evidence gathered during the preparation of the Local Plan suggests that Runnymede cannot meet identified housing and employment land requirements on land outside the Green Belt, and so the preferred approach as identified in the Regulation 18 consultation is to consider possible strategic releases from the Green Belt. Following on from this consultation, further work is currently being undertaken to identify smaller scale sites which could also potentially be released from the Green Belt. This work is discussed in more detail in chapter 7 of this document. The sites identified in the Green Belt Review Part 2 which Arup consider that the Council could seek to remove from the Green Belt to meet housing (and other) needs have since been tested by through the Council's Site Selection Methodology and Assessment, SA and HRA. The sites which are considered suitable for allocation following consideration through all of these processes will be the subject of public consultation in May 2017.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Core Local Authority Partners and Secondary Local Authority Partners as identified in the <i>Meeting the Duty to Co-operate</i> document</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The outcome of this additional work has been to potentially identify additional sites which could be removed from the Green Belt to help the Council meet its identified proportion of the OAN. This was considered particularly important by the Council given that the outcome of the meetings that the Council has held with partner Local Authorities since the publication of the last Duty to Co-operate Update Statement (July 2016) indicate that there are no Local Authorities in the Council's identified list of partners which would be able to accommodate any unmet housing needs from Runnymede</p> <p><b>Date:</b> January to April 2017</p>

## 5. Outcomes from strategic working

*What was the result of the strategic cooperation and how has this influenced the plan (include specific references to relevant policies where possible)? Include any issues that remain unresolved and how the authority plans to manage these. Outline what the implications are of these unresolved matters*

### Results

-The Council has positively responded to the comments made by Spelthorne Borough Council in relation to the non-implementation buffer, the contribution of C2 housing, and density. On the basis of the evidence collated by the Council, it has been able to justify lowering its non-implementation buffer from 20% to 15% and is now able to evidence that it is appropriate to incorporate an element of the C2 permissions granted in its housing supply forecasts (although work in this area continues). The Council is also making positive progress with its householder extensions paper, although this work has not been completed at the time of writing.

-As result of the bullet point above (and other work undertaken to respond to suggestions made during the IOPA consultation, including the Green Belt Review Part 2 which identified potential additional sites for allocation through the Local Plan-see Green Belt chapter for more information), the Council is currently consulting on a revised housing target for the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan of 408-427dpa. This is an increase from the 302 to 383dpa consulted on at the IOPA stage. This is considered by the Council to have been one positive outcome of the cooperation undertaken with partners to date.

### Unresolved issues

-Notwithstanding the updates that have been made to Runnymede's housing evidence as described in the 'results' section above, Runnymede is still unable to demonstrate that it can meet 100% of its proportion of the HMA's OAN.

-It is also still unclear whether the objectively assessed housing needs can be met across the HMA. This will not be known until both Runnymede and Spelthorne BC have completed their Green Belt Review work and SLAA evidence and until the updated SHMA has been completed. Runnymede Borough Council is not in a position to wait to produce its Local Plan until the Spelthorne evidence has been completed. The implication of not knowing whether the OAN can be met in the HMA is that if ultimately the needs of the wider HMA cannot be met by Runnymede and Spelthorne, this may not be confirmed for some time and on the basis of Duty to Cooperate discussions with Local Authorities in neighbouring HMAs to date, it is unlikely that unmet needs from the Runnymede/Spelthorne HMA will be able to be accommodated in the surrounding area given constraints to development in the area surrounding Runnymede.

-The Government has stated in the Housing White Paper that it intends to consult on a standardised methodology for the production of housing needs evidence. Whilst such an approach is considered to be potentially beneficial, it is unknown when this methodology will be published and what the impacts of complying with this methodology will be for the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA. A higher OAN number could further compromise Runnymede's ability to meet its identified needs in full.

### **Action Plan moving forwards**

- Whilst the engagement with neighbouring HMA's (and other Local Authorities identified as partners for Housing matters in the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework) to date has not provided any outcomes in terms of assistance with meeting any unmet needs for housing from Runnymede in other Local Authority areas, the Council will continue to engage. Contact was originally made by Runnymede officers with officers in other authorities, followed by approaches to their Chief Executives; the Council will shortly commence writing from the Chief Executive/Portfolio Holder to their equivalents in other authorities.
- The Council aims to complete its evidence relating to the contribution that C2 accommodation can make to its housing supply calculations and complete its householder extensions paper by the next round of consultation on the Local Plan (scheduled for autumn 2017). Depending on how the latter affects the mix of unit sizes required over the Plan period, this could also potentially assist the Council in meeting a greater proportion of its OAN (for example if this evidence points to a greater proportion of smaller units being required which could reduce unit numbers on allocated sites, and other sites delivered over the Local Plan period).
- The Council will aim to complete its 2017 SLAA in summer 2017. This may identify additional sites which could boost the Council's housing delivery over the Plan period.
- Runnymede will contact Spelthorne Borough Council again to discuss the timing of the SHMA update, to ensure that this work is updated prior to Runnymede going to EiP.

### **6. Ongoing cooperation**

*How will the strategic issues be managed on an ongoing basis? What are the mechanisms/structures being used to do this? How will this be monitored?*

- Officers at Runnymede Borough Council remain committed to working with partners to effectively resolve outstanding strategic issues. The Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework outlines the methods of engagement that the Council intends to rely upon to cooperate with partners on strategic cross boundary issues relating to the housing. The Council intends to rely on its Duty to Cooperate Framework to monitor success and to highlight issues which still require cooperation at each key stage of Plan preparation.
- The Runnymede-Spelthorne Joint Member Liaison Group (JMLG) can be called upon, as appropriate to discuss ongoing issues and suggested ways forward in relation to meeting housing across the HMA.
- Both Authorities in the HMA are producing their SLAA evidence. As soon as the evidence is available, officers from both Authorities will need to meet to discuss if the OAN can be met in the HMA and if not, how to proceed.
- The Council is also advocating the production of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) (originally referred to as MoUs in early discussions with partners) with its partners to agree positions on a range of cross boundary matters including meeting housing needs. Discussions around the scope and possible content of these SoCG continue to be discussed with partners with the anticipation that SoCG would be signed by Leaders by the end of 2017 to set out the agreed position between Runnymede and other Local Authorities prior to the Examination of the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan.

## Chapter 5: Gypsies and travellers

### 1. Strategic planning issue

#### *Define the issue*

Ensuring the delivery of sufficient sites to meet the needs of local Gypsies and Travellers given the planning constraints that exist in the Borough, most notably relating to Green Belt and flooding.

### 2. Evidence base

#### *What is the evidence used to develop the LP's strategic policies?*

- The Runnymede Travellers Accommodation Assessment, September 2014 (completed in line with 'Preparing Travellers' Accommodation Assessments (TAAs): The Surrey Approach' (April 2014)).
- The Council carried out a periodic review of caravans in accordance with the requirements of the Housing Act 1985 and following Draft Guidance issued in March 2016. (This sought to make contact with as many of the community as possible in a short timescale, and so individual households were not visited.)
- In view of the changes made to the national definition of 'traveller' since the production of the 2014 TAA, and the implications arising therefrom, the Council anticipates the production of a new TAA in 2017, although this has not been produced at the time of writing.

### 3. Strategic Partners

#### *List of bodies engaged with (details of each, make up and constitution etc, to be listed in appendix 3)*

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

### 4. Relevant actions carried out since last DtC update statement was published in July 2016 in pursuit of achieving outcomes outlined in the DtC Scoping Framework (October 2015)

#### *How have you worked collaboratively with your partners?*

#### *What actions did you take to manage the strategic issue?*

*Was there any joint evidence developed e.g. SHMA? Who was involved? Include timescales for the evidence in an annex to demonstrate how and when key decisions were made (appendix 2).*

**Action:** Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and LB Hillingdon.

**Partner(s):** LB Hillingdon.

**Outcome:** It was agreed that there was no evidence to suggest that there were functional links between the two authority areas for travellers. As such, on the basis of the existing evidence, co-operation would not be sought in regard to meeting the traveller needs arising in the other authority.

**Date:** 7 October 2016

<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and Woking BC</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Woking BC</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> It was agreed that Runnymede and Woking are not located in the same HMA, but in adjoining HMA's. As such, if it became apparent that housing needs (including Gypsy and Traveller accommodation) could not be met in either HMA at a later date, it was likely to be the case that an approach would be made to ask for assistance with meeting unmet needs under the DtC. However, as Spelthorne was not anticipating commencing its Reg.18 consultation until late 2017, it could not be confirmed for some time to come whether identified housing needs would be met in full in the Runnymede/Spelthorne HMA. Woking stated that they were not prepared at that time to enter into a MoU.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 6 October 2016</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and Guildford BC.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Guildford BC</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> It was agreed that Runnymede and Guildford are not located in the same HMA, but adjoining HMA's. As such, if it became apparent that housing needs (including Gypsy and Traveller accommodation) could not be met in either HMA at a later date, it was likely to be the case that an approach would be made to ask for assistance with meeting unmet needs under the DtC. However, as Spelthorne was not anticipating commencing its Reg.18 consultation until late 2017, it could not be confirmed for some time to come whether identified housing needs would be met in full in the Runnymede/Spelthorne HMA. Runnymede passed over copies of two draft MoU's (the one originally forwarded last year) and a revised (shorter) one, for Guildford's consideration.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 18 January 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and Slough BC</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Slough BC</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> It was agreed that Runnymede and Slough are not located in the same HMA, but adjoining HMA's. As such, if it became apparent that housing needs (including Gypsy and Traveller accommodation) could not be met in either HMA at a later date, it was likely to be the case that an approach would be made to ask for assistance with meeting unmet needs under the DtC. However, as Spelthorne was not anticipating commencing its Reg.18 consultation until late 2017, it could not be confirmed for some time to come whether identified housing needs would be met in full in the Runnymede/Spelthorne HMA. Runnymede passed over copies of two draft MoU's (the one originally forwarded last year) and a revised (shorter) one, for Slough's consideration.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 20 March 2017</p>

<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting of the East Surrey Local Plans Group</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Elmbridge BC; Epsom and Ewell BC; Reigate and Banstead BC; Tandridge DC (Mole Valley DC not present)</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Runnymede joined the meeting to remind attendees of the matter of the original draft MoU that was circulated last year and to inform of the revised (shorter) one that was now being suggested for use. (Electronic copies were subsequently circulated, including to Mole Valley DC. It was agreed that all would review in readiness for further approaches from Runnymede for agreement to a way forward.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 24 February 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and RBWM. RBWM confirmed their intention of having a number of bilateral Memorandums of Understanding (MoU) with surrounding Boroughs. Runnymede were supportive of this approach, having previously proposed a similar methodology.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> RBWM</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Agreed that may be a need for two MoU's, one from each Borough's perspective. RBWM proposed to make changes to the draft and then circulate for amendment by Runnymede. All acknowledged that a meeting would be required to sign off the memorandums. Runnymede noted that RBWM would very soon be receiving a letter at Chief Executive level regarding ongoing importance of Duty to Co-operate.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 6 December 2016</p>
<p><b>5. Outcomes from strategic working</b></p> <p><i>What was the result of the strategic cooperation and how has this influenced the plan (include specific references to relevant policies where possible)? Include any issues that remain unresolved and how the authority plans to manage these. Outline what the implications are of these unresolved matters</i></p>
<p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Despite the extensive engagement sought by Runnymede with its partners on meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers over the Plan period, no local authority partner has expressed that it would be able to assist Runnymede with accommodating any unmet needs for traveller pitches which arise from the Borough.</p>
<p><b>Unresolved issues</b></p> <p>As above</p>

### **Action plan moving forwards**

-Whilst the engagement with the Local Authorities partners identified in the Gypsies and Travellers chapter of the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework that has been carried out to date has not provided any outcomes in terms of assistance with meeting any unmet needs for gypsies and travellers from Runnymede in other Local Authority areas, the Council will continue engagement. Contact was originally made by Runnymede officers with officers in other authorities, followed by approaches to their Chief Executives; the Council will shortly commence writing from the Chief Executive/Portfolio Holder to their equivalents in other authorities.

-The Council has made the decision to update its Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) to ensure that the level of need that the Borough needs to accommodate is correct. This is considered particularly important given that the Council's current TAA was published in September 2014, prior to the amendment to the national definition of 'traveller' in August 2015.

### **6. Ongoing cooperation**

*How will the strategic issues be managed on an ongoing basis? What are the mechanisms/structures being used to do this? How will this be monitored?*

Officers at Runnymede Borough Council remain committed to working with partners to effectively resolve outstanding strategic issues. The Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework outlines the methods of engagement that the Council intends to rely upon to cooperate with partners on strategic cross boundary issues relating to gypsies and travellers. The Council intends to rely on its Duty to Cooperate Framework to monitor success and to highlight issues which still require cooperation at each key stage of Plan preparation.

The Council is advocating the production of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) (originally referred to as MoUs in early discussions with partners) with its partners to agree positions on a range of cross boundary matters including meeting the needs of gypsies and travellers. Discussions around the scope and possible content of these SoCG continue to be discussed with partners with the anticipation that SoCG would be signed by Leaders by the end of 2017 to set out the agreed position between Runnymede and other Local Authorities prior to the Examination of the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan.



## Chapter 6: Economic Development

### 1. Strategic Planning issue

#### *Define the issue*

The Borough has a strong economy that has grown well in recent years. A key element of the Council's employment strategy should be to maintain the existing strong economy and allow conditions for sustainable growth over the plan period. Balancing the Council's economic and housing strategies will be a key challenge.

The Council's 2016 ELR demonstrates that whilst the Council is able to meet and exceed even the highest recommended floorspace requirement for office floorspace in the Borough over the Local Plan period through existing pipeline supply, in the two growth scenarios which recommend an increase in storage and distribution floorspace in the Borough, there is a significant shortfall of pipeline supply to meet identified needs.

The Enterprise M3 LEP Commercial Property Market Study 2016 has found that *'there remains a persistent shortage of both industrial space and land with development potential in most market areas [within the LEP]. The undersupply of industrial space transcends LEP boundaries, with very strong demand for any sites that can serve the London market. The need is there, the task now is to identify those areas, inside and in neighbouring LEP areas, that can best supply the land and space for these vital business requirements'*.

### 2. Evidence base

#### *What is the evidence used to develop the LP's strategic policies?*

- Functional Economic Area analysis, June 2015
- Runnymede Town and Local Centres Study, November 2015
- Runnymede and Spelthorne Strategic Land Availability Assessment methodology, December 2015
- Draft Employment Land Review, March 2016
- Draft interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment, June 2016
- The Runnymede Economic Development Strategy 2016
- The Runnymede Economic Assessment 2016

### 3. Strategic Partners

#### *List of bodies engaged with (details of each, make up and constitution etc, to be listed in appendix 3)*

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

**4. Relevant actions carried out since last DtC update statement was published in July 2016 in pursuit of achieving outcomes outlined in the DtC Scoping Framework (October 2015)**

*How have you worked collaboratively with your partners?*

*What actions did you take to manage the strategic issue?*

*Was there any joint evidence developed e.g. SHMA? Who was involved? Include timescales for the evidence in an annex to demonstrate how and when key decisions were made (appendix 2).*

**Action:** Runnymede emailed officers at Woking Borough Council to provide an update on where Runnymede was with its employment work and to seek to agree a position between the two authorities moving forward for future work. This is in light of the conclusions of Runnymede's FEA work which identifies functional links between the two authorities in relation to employment matters.

**Partner(s):** Woking Borough Council

**Outcome:** Woking BC advised that they felt that they had stronger functional links with Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils and their evidence concluded that these three authorities formed a logical FEMA. In any instance it was confirmed that Woking would be unable to meet any of Runnymede's unmet needs for employment floorspace.

**Date:** 5<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup> October 2016 (email trail included at Appendix 2)

**Action:** Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and Woking BC

**Partner(s):** Woking BC

**Outcome:** It was stated by Runnymede that, with regard to employment needs, it is on the edges of two different FEA's. In one direction, the Council engages with Spelthorne and Hounslow (through the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group) regularly. In the other direction, the Council is looking to engage more proactively with Elmbridge, and have already done so with Woking, with officers meeting as recently as the previous week, when it was concluded that Runnymede would continue to keep Woking informed of any key actions that emerged from any meetings /discussions with any of the Council's other FEA partners. It was explained that Runnymede had not been able to identify any suitable sites for B8 use in the Borough, and for that reason, the discussions with other authorities would be ongoing. (It was noted that this issue is not exclusive to Runnymede.)

**Date:** 6 October 2016

<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and LB Hillingdon.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> LB Hillingdon</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Runnymede's evidence demonstrates that there are functional links between the northern part of the Borough and Heathrow Airport in south Hillingdon. Runnymede was waiting on the production of the Heathrow Economic Needs Assessment commissioned by Heathrow Airport and would seek to engage through the HSPG, to see if it helped establish where B8 needs could be accommodated closer to Heathrow and where Runnymede's unmet needs might possibly be met. Hillingdon was identified as having a surplus of employment land and was proposing to release some for other use over the Plan period. It was stated that there is likely to be scope for further discussions on cross boundary economic issues. Runnymede agreed to draft and forward some text on cross boundary employment matters as a basis for agreement on future work.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 7 October 2016</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> An officer from Runnymede attended and contributed to discussions at the London and wider South East workshop: offices, industry and logistics (West London workshop). Information was provided on both the office and industrial markets in Runnymede, and on the work being carried out by the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group. One option being considered by the GLA was encouraging storage and distribution uses to move outside of London and redeveloping these sites for housing. Runnymede advised of the difficulties it was having in meetings its B8 storage and distribution needs and therefore suggested that it was highly unlikely that Runnymede would be in a position to meet any displaced/unmet B8 needs arising in London.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Greater London Authority, various local authority partners including the London Borough of Hillingdon, the London Borough of Hounslow and Spelthorne Borough Council.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Unknown at the current time how the GLA will respond to the points raised by individual local authorities at this workshop in their evidence gathering.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 12<sup>th</sup> October 2016.</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and RBWM. RBWM confirmed their intention of having a number of bilateral Memorandums of Understanding (MoU) with surrounding Boroughs. Runnymede were supportive of this approach, having previously proposed a similar methodology.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> RBWM</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> RBWM advised that trend figures are being used to calculate employment supply. Agreed that may be a need for two MoU's, one from each Borough's perspective. RBWM proposed to make changes to the draft and then circulate for amendment by Runnymede. All acknowledged that a meeting would be required to sign off the memorandums. Runnymede noted that RBWM would very soon be receiving a letter at Chief Executive level regarding ongoing importance of Duty to Co-operate.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 6 December 2016</p>

<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting of the East Surrey Local Plans Group</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Elmbridge BC</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Runnymede joined the meeting to remind attendees of the matter of the original draft MoU that was circulated last year and to inform of the revised (shorter) one that was now being suggested for use. (Electronic copies were subsequently circulated.) Elmbridge BC was the only member of the Group that had previously been identified as having economy links that would need referencing in the MoU. It was agreed that the MoU would be reviewed by Elmbridge in readiness for further approaches from Runnymede for agreement to a way forward.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 24 February 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and Slough BC</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Slough BC</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Slough confirmed that a Berkshire-wide Economic Development Needs Assessment indicated that Slough requires 180 hectares of employment land, the office market having picked up of late. In the way that Runnymede has not been able to identify any suitable sites for B8 use in the Borough, Slough will be unable to meet the B8 requirement identified in the EDNA. Slough and Runnymede are hoping that B8 use can be taken by Heathrow. Runnymede passed over copies of two draft MoU's (the one originally forwarded last year) and a revised (shorter) one, for Slough's consideration.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 20 March 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Continuing to produce collaborative evidence of economic needs through the SSPIP as part of the LSS to create a common picture across Surrey in relation to the needs of the economy.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> All Surrey local authorities and Surrey County Council</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Actions and outcomes achieved since the production of the July 2016 update statement can be viewed in chapter 2 of this statement.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Engagement ongoing during period covered by update statement.</p>

**Action:** Continuing to be an active participant of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group and its sub groups. Since the publication of the Council's July 2016 Duty to Cooperate Update Statement, regular meetings of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group have occurred and a number of sub group meetings. Runnymede has been a regular attendee of these meetings. A list of the meetings attended by Runnymede BC can be viewed in Chapter 2 of this statement. For this economic development chapter, the work of the spatial planning sub group is considered to be particularly relevant. As at May 2017, this group has worked/is working collaboratively to:

- Provide comments on the emerging Heathrow Employment Study,
- Provide a joint response to the Airports NPS in relation to local planning issues,
- Explore the potential to align evidence bases and timetables
- Produce a scope for a potential sub regional 'framework' document relating to expansion at Heathrow which would also cover employment provision in the surrounding area.

**Partner(s):** Various partners. Details of membership are set out in the Terms of reference for the main HSPG group which can be viewed at Appendix 6 of the July 2016 Duty to Cooperate Update Statement.

**Outcome:** In relation to employment matters specifically, at the time of writing, work on the Heathrow Employment Land Study which has been commissioned by Heathrow Airport Ltd is ongoing. This work will help define the functional economic area of Heathrow Airport and make recommendations on the employment needs generated by different scenarios of growth at the airport. The findings will be important if Runnymede is concluded to be in the functional area of influence for the airport. It is anticipated that this is likely to be the case given the findings of the Council's functional economic area analysis. The evidence will be considered in the development of the Council's Local Plan policies.

The wider outcomes of the HSPG are discussed in chapter 2 of this statement.

**Date:** Engagement ongoing during period covered by update statement.

## 5. Outcomes from strategic working

*What was the result of the strategic cooperation and how has this influenced the plan (include specific references to relevant policies where possible)? Include any issues that remain unresolved and how the authority plans to manage these. Outline what the implications are of these unresolved matters*

### Results

-Despite the extensive engagement sought by Runnymede with its partners on meeting unmet employment needs from Runnymede over the Plan period, no local authority partner has expressed that it would be able to assist Runnymede with accommodating any unmet needs which arise from the Borough.

### **Unresolved issues**

-As above

-At the time of writing it is not possible to confirm whether Runnymede will be able to meet its identified needs for town centre uses across the Borough over the Plan period. However opportunities for town centre regeneration schemes are being explored in the Borough at the current time. Further details of these schemes should be known later in the plan preparation period. This should help the Council ascertain whether identified needs can be met in full or whether the Council will need to approach partners for assistance.

-There is disagreement between Local Authorities on whether they are in the same Functional Economic Area as Runnymede. Whilst Spelthorne and Elmbridge recognise the functional links between these authority areas and Runnymede, Woking considers that it is located in a different FEMA.

### **Action Plan moving forwards**

-Whilst the engagement with FEA partners to date (and other Local Authorities identified as partners for Economic Development matters in the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework) has not provided any outcomes in terms of assistance with meeting any unmet needs for B8 floorspace from Runnymede in other Local Authority areas, the Council will continue engagement. Contact was originally made by Runnymede officers with officers in other authorities, followed by approaches to their Chief Executives; the Council will shortly commence writing from the Chief Executive/Portfolio Holder to their equivalents in other authorities.

-The Council has reassessed sites for their suitability to meet B8 needs. One employment allocation is now proposed and this allocation is currently the subject of public consultation. The comments made on this potential allocation will be considered before a decision is made as to whether the allocation will be included in the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan.

-The Council awaits the findings of the Heathrow Airport Employment Land Study. This could raise matters which the Council needs to consider and respond to in its Local Plan.

-The Council will contact the Enterprise M3 LEP to confirm if any progress has been made sub regionally to meet B8 needs across the wider area.

-Liaise with the Council's commercial services team to get a better understanding of whether town centre regeneration schemes in the Borough are likely to meet identified needs for town centre uses over the Plan period. If it becomes apparent that needs cannot be met in full, the Council will contact partners, starting with Spelthorne Borough Council to explore whether any unmet needs from Runnymede can be met in adjoining local authority areas which share the same catchment.

### **6. Ongoing cooperation**

*How will the strategic issues be managed on an ongoing basis? What are the mechanisms/structures being used to do this? How will this be monitored?*

Officers at Runnymede Borough Council remain committed to working with partners to effectively resolve outstanding strategic issues. The Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework outlines the methods of engagement that the Council intends to rely upon to cooperate with partners on strategic cross boundary issues relating to the Economic Development. The Council intends to rely on its Duty to Cooperate Framework to monitor success and to highlight issues which still require cooperation at each key stage of Plan preparation.

The Council is advocating the production of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) (originally referred to as MoUs in early discussions with partners with its partners to agree positions on a range of cross boundary matters including those related to economic development. Discussions around the scope and possible content of these SoGC continue to be discussed with partners with the anticipation that SoCG would be signed by Leaders by the end of 2017 to set out the agreed position between Runnymede and other Local Authorities prior to the Examination of the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan.

## Chapter 7: Green Belt

### 1. Strategic Planning issue

#### *Define the issue*

All land outside the settlement areas in the Borough is designated as Metropolitan Green Belt, which accounts for over 78% of the total land area. National planning policy restricts the amount and type of development that is defined as 'appropriate' in the Green Belt. The high percentage of Green Belt land in the Borough is likely to restrict the amount of development that can be delivered over the Plan period.

If during the preparation of the emerging Local Plan it becomes apparent that Runnymede cannot meet identified housing and employment land requirements on land outside the Green Belt, it may be necessary to consider whether these needs could be met through the release of Green Belt land in line with the NPPF (para 85), which states that release of Green Belt land may be appropriate in exceptional circumstances and considered through the preparation of the Local Plan.

#### **2017 Update**

The evidence gathered during the preparation of the Local Plan suggests that Runnymede cannot meet identified housing and employment land requirements on land outside the Green Belt, and so the preferred approach as identified in the Regulation 18 IOPA consultation in summer 2016 was to consider possible strategic releases from the Green Belt. Following on from this consultation, further Green Belt Review work was carried out through the Green Belt Review Part 2 which identified smaller scale sites which could also potentially be released from the Green Belt. Any changes to Green Belt boundaries through the Local Plan will require the Council to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist which warrant such changes.

### 2. Evidence base

#### *What is the evidence used to develop the LP's strategic policies?*

- The Runnymede Green Belt Review (GBR) (December 2014)
- The Green Belt Boundary Technical Review (March 2016)
- The Green Belt Villages Review (stage 1 published was published in February 2016 and stage 2 was published in May 2016).
- The Green Belt Review Part 2 (GBR Part 2) (March 2017)

#### **NOTE:**

- Following consideration of the outcomes from the Regulation 18 IOPA consultation and the publication of the GBR Part 2, the Green Belt Technical Review will be amended if necessary to reflect any proposed strategic and small scale releases of land from the Green Belt.
- Following consideration of the outcomes from the Regulation 18 IOPA consultation and the publication of the GBR Part 2, the Green Belt Villages Review will be amended if necessary to reflect any proposed strategic and small scale releases of land from the Green Belt.



### 3. Strategic Partners

*List of bodies engaged with (details of each, make up and constitution etc, to be listed in appendix 3)*

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

### 4. Relevant actions carried out since last DtC update statement was published in July 2016 in pursuit of achieving outcomes outlined in the DtC Scoping Framework (October 2015)

*How have you worked collaboratively with your partners?*

*What actions did you take to manage the strategic issue?*

*Was there any joint evidence developed e.g. SHMA? Who was involved? Include timescales for the evidence in an annex to demonstrate how and when key decisions were made (appendix 2).*

**Action:** Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and Woking BC

**Partner(s):** Woking BC

**Outcome:** Both Runnymede and Woking boroughs include land within the Metropolitan Green Belt and are therefore linked in this respect. Both authorities have carried out a Strategic Green Belt Review, which have fed into their respective Reg. 18 consultations; these look at Green Belt releases as a way of meeting part of the assessed housing need.

**Date:** 6 October 2016

**Action:** Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and LB Hillingdon

**Partner(s):** LB Hillingdon

**Outcome:** Both authorities contain land within the Metropolitan Green Belt and are therefore linked in this respect. Runnymede has carried out a Strategic Green Belt Review, which has fed into its Reg. 18 consultation. Hillingdon was not looking at Green Belt releases to accommodate growth, although the London Plan will consider potential Green Belt releases.

**Date:** 7 October 2016

**Action:** Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and RBWM

**Partner(s):** RBWM

**Outcome:** Both Runnymede and RBWM include land within the Metropolitan Green Belt and are therefore linked in this respect. Both authorities have carried out a Strategic Green Belt Review, which have fed into their respective Reg. 18 consultations; these look at Green Belt releases as a way of meeting part of the assessed housing need.

**Date:** 6 December 2016

<p><b>Action:</b> Consultation was undertaken with DtC partners on the proposed methodology for the GBR Part 2</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Elmbridge Borough Council, Epsom &amp; Ewell Borough Council, Mole Valley District Council, Reigate &amp; Banstead Borough Council, Royal Borough of Windsor &amp; Maidenhead, Spelthorne Borough Council, Surrey Heath Borough Council, Guildford Borough Council, Tandridge District Council, Woking Borough Council, Waverley Borough Council, London Borough of Hillingdon, Bracknell Forest Council, London Borough of Hounslow, Slough Borough Council, Surrey County Council, Greater London Authority</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Three responses were received, from Waverley, Mole Valley and Hillingdon. All three responses were no comment. The email sent to partners and the responses received can be found in Appendix 3.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> The consultation took place between 13<sup>th</sup> January 2017 and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and Guildford BC</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Guildford BC</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Both Runnymede and Guildford include land within the Metropolitan Green Belt and are therefore linked in this respect. Both authorities have carried out a Strategic Green Belt Review, which have fed into their respective Reg. 18 consultations; these look at Green Belt releases as a way of meeting part of the assessed housing need.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 17 January 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting of the East Surrey Local Plans Group</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Elmbridge BC; Epsom and Ewell BC; Reigate and Banstead BC; Tandridge DC (Mole Valley DC not present)</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Both All authorities contain land within the Metropolitan Green Belt and are therefore linked in this respect. Most authorities have carried out a Strategic Green Belt Review, which has into their respective Reg. 18 consultations; these look at Green Belt releases as a way of meeting part of the assessed housing need.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 24 February 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officer meeting between Runnymede BC and Slough BC</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Slough BC</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Both authorities contain land within the Metropolitan Green Belt and are therefore linked in this respect. Runnymede has carried out a Strategic Green Belt Review, which has fed into its Reg. 18 consultation. The majority of the representations on Slough's Issues and Options consultation related to the proposed northern expansion into the Green Belt. Runnymede passed over copies of two draft MoU's (the one originally forwarded last year) and a revised (shorter) one, for Slough's consideration.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 20 March 2017</p>

**Action:** Officer meeting between Runnymede BC, Surrey Heath BC, Woking BC and Surrey CC

**Partner(s):** Surrey Heath BC, Woking BC, Surrey CC.

**Outcome:** The Both authorities contain land within the Metropolitan Green Belt and are therefore linked in this respect. Both authorities have carried out a Strategic Green Belt Review, which have fed into their respective Reg. 18 consultations; these look at Green Belt releases as a way of meeting part of the assessed housing need.

**Date:** 29 March 2017

### 5. Outcomes from strategic working

*What was the result of the strategic cooperation and how has this influenced the plan (include specific references to relevant policies where possible)? Include any issues that remain unresolved and how the authority plans to manage these. Outline what the implications are of these unresolved matters*

#### Results

The 2014 Runnymede Green Belt Review was part of the evidence base used to develop the IOPA consultation document which was the subject of the Regulation 18 consultation in Summer 2016. All relevant partners in the Council's Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework 2015 were included in the consultation. Through the regulation 18 consultation, and other engagement which has taken place between July 2016 and the publication of this update statement, it is clear that Duty to Co-operate Partners still have concerns that Runnymede cannot meet its Objectively Assessed Needs for housing (and other uses). Despite the extensive engagement sought by Runnymede with its partners on meeting unmet housing and employment needs from Runnymede over the Plan period, no local authority partner has expressed that it would be able to assist Runnymede with accommodating any unmet needs which arise from the Borough.

-Agreed methodology with partners for Green Belt Review Part 2. This additional piece of work (in addition to the SSMA, SA and HRA processes) has helped the Council identify additional sites which it is now proposing to allocate through its Local Plan to help meet identified housing needs.

#### Unresolved issues

As above

### **Action Plan moving forwards**

Following the completion of the Regulation 18 IOPA consultation, work is continuing to develop approaches with a view to meeting identified needs as far as sustainably possible, and this includes continuing to look at the extent of the Green Belt through the Green Belt Review Part 2, considering the Exceptional Circumstances which exist to warrant amendment of the current Green Belt. The Council will continue to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities in the development of this work. Contact was originally made by Runnymede officers with officers in other authorities to discuss matters relating to meeting identified needs (partly through the making of amendments to Green Belt boundaries), followed by approaches to their Chief Executives; the Council will shortly commence writing from the Chief Executive/Portfolio Holder to their equivalents in other authorities.

For other relevant actions, please refer to the action plans for housing, gypsies and travellers and economic development above.

### **6. Ongoing cooperation**

*How will the strategic issues be managed on an ongoing basis? What are the mechanisms/structures being used to do this? How will this be monitored?*

Officers at Runnymede Borough Council remain committed to working with partners to effectively resolve outstanding strategic issues. The Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework outlines on page 31 the methods of engagement that the Council intends to rely upon to cooperate with partners on strategic cross boundary issues relating to the Green Belt. The Council intends to rely on its Duty to Cooperate Framework to monitor success and to highlight issues which still require cooperation at each key stage of Plan preparation.

The Council is advocating the production of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) (originally referred to as MoUs in early discussions with partners with its partners to agree positions on a range of cross boundary matters including meeting employment needs. Discussions around the scope and possible content of these SoGC continue to be discussed with partners with the anticipation that SoCG would be signed by Leaders by the end of 2017 to set out the agreed position between Runnymede and other Local Authorities prior to the Examination of the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan.

## Chapter 8: Climate change, biodiversity and TBHSPA

### 1. Strategic Planning issue

#### *Define the issue*

Climate change is an issue that is not constrained by local authority boundaries and affects the whole of the UK. It poses risks to our communities, our environment and service/infrastructure provision in the Borough.

For TBHSPA, a key issue is that new housing development is whether there are sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANG) available to mitigate the level of development required through the Local Plan, given the OAN across the Runnymede- Spelthorne HMA.

For other biodiversity matters, a number of these valued areas of nature conservation could be impacted by delivering the HMA's housing needs, either through direct redevelopment of these sites; through reducing the connectivity of nature by removing valuable green corridors; or if the increase in population has a significant negative impact on the conservation of these areas.

### 2. Evidence base

#### *What is the evidence used to develop the LP's strategic policies?*

- Surrey Landscape Character Assessment, January 2015
- Local Green Space Study, June 2016

Following from the national State of Nature 2016 report, a state of nature report for Surrey is currently being drafted, which is hoped will provide some useful information that can assist with policy formulation.

In addition to the evidence, the Surrey Local Strategic Statement, which is currently being progressed contains an objective that relates to the Natural Environment, the purpose of which is to support environmental sustainability, natural resource management, conserving and enhancing the countryside and maintaining the Green Belt, all of which the Local Plan will need to take account of.

### 3. Strategic Partners - list of bodies engaged with

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

### 4. Relevant actions carried out since last DtC update statement was published in July 2016 in pursuit of achieving outcomes outlined in the DtC Scoping Framework (October 2015)

*How have you worked collaboratively with your partners?*

*What actions did you take to manage the strategic issue?*

*Was there any joint evidence developed e.g. SHMA? Who was involved? Include timescales for the evidence in an annex to demonstrate how and when key decisions were made (appendix 2).*

**Action:** Arrange meetings/liaise by email with relevant bodies such as Natural England, Environment Agency and the Surrey Nature Partnership to discuss/agree the proposed scope of the Local Plan in relation to this subject matter, as well as discussion of SANG/SAMM issues.

1) A meeting took place between Natural England and officers on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016. The meeting note can be found at appendix 4.

2) Environment Agency –a meeting was held with the Environment Agency on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2017 although matters associated with the natural environment were not discussed in detail at this meeting.

**Partners:** Natural England and Environment Agency

**Outcome:** In relation to point 1 above, at this meeting the Council confirmed with NE the agreed position in 2013 position that Chertsey Meads is suitable in principle to be designated as SANG and that the agreed capacity of over 1900 is justified. NE advised that the Council should have the SANG management plan in place in readiness for the Local Plan examination. This work is being undertaken by officers in the Council's green spaces team and is ongoing at the time of writing. At the time of writing, engagement also continues in relation to policy development with all three consultees.

**Date:** Engagement ongoing.

**Action:** An officer from Runnymede Borough Council attended a meeting of the Joint Strategic Partnership Board. This is a member level meeting at which officers observe.

**Partners:** Those identified in the October 2015 *Meeting the Duty to Cooperate*

**Outcome:** The agenda for the meeting can be viewed in appendix 5. This shows the range of topics that Members considered. Key outcomes for the meeting were that Members noted the current financial position and projected financial position for the three financial years to 31 March 2019, and agreed that the Financial Task Group needed to meet to consider the transfer of any unused Maintenance Fund balance to the Endowment Fund, and an investment strategy for the endowment fund.

**Date:** 30 September 2016

**Action:** An officer from Runnymede Borough Council attended a meeting of the Joint Strategic Partnership Board. This is a Member level meeting at which officers observe.

**Partners:** Those identified in the October 2015 *Meeting the Duty to Cooperate*

**Outcome:** Key outcomes for the meeting were that Members noted the current financial position, an update to the SAMM project and bird survey results.

**Date:** 3 March 2017

*Although the following does not strictly fall under the Duty to Cooperate, officers attend the Surrey Nature Partnership biodiversity working group (detail of the group's function can be found in chapter 3)*

**Action:** Discussion was had in this meeting about Runnymede's SNCIs being reviewed.

**Partners:** Surrey Wildlife Trust

**Outcome:** Although it was agreed that a further review would be helpful, officers have been advised the funds are not currently available. However, there remains a commitment by Runnymede that the SNCIs will be reviewed when funds are available and it is suggested that the appropriate hook is included within the Local Plan to do so.

**Date:** 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016

**Action:** The Council sent an early draft of potential wording for the Local Plan TBHSPA policy to Natural England and Surrey Wildlife Trust for comment.

**Partners:** Natural England and the Surrey Wildlife Trust

**Outcome:** Both organisations provided comments which the Council will take into account prior to the policy being finalised for public consultation in autumn 2017 as part of the pre submission version of the Local Plan.

**Date:** April 2017

*Although the following does not strictly fall under the Duty to Cooperate, officers attend the Surrey Nature Partnership biodiversity working group (detail of the group's function can be found in chapter 3)*

**Action:** SWT had produced a draft State of Nature (SoN) Report for Surrey, which officers commented on. The final report is to be circulated to portfolio holders (officers from Local Authorities agreed to pass this information forward)

**Partners:** Surrey Wildlife Trust

**Outcome:** The SoN report will be circulated in due course to relevant personnel, for consideration by Local Planning Authorities.

**Date:** 3 May 2017

## 5. Outcomes from strategic working

*What was the result of the strategic cooperation and how has this influenced the plan (include specific references to relevant policies where possible)? Include any issues that remain unresolved and how the authority plans to manage these. Outline what the implications are of these unresolved matters*

### Results

Through engagement with Natural England it has been confirmed that the Council can continue moving forwards the designation of Chertsey Meads as SANG.

**Unresolved issues**

In terms of unresolved issues, the Chertsey Meads SANG Management Plan needs to be completed prior to submission of the Local Plan. Officers in Planning will liaise with officers in the Green Spaces team to ensure the draft is produced so that Natural England can comment. It is anticipated this will be prepared by September 2017.

**Action Plan moving forwards**

-As policy development work for the Local Plan continues, officers will continue to liaise with the relevant consultees with the aim of agreeing policy wording.  
- Officers to liaise with the Council's Green Spaces team to allow for a timetable for the production of the management plan for the Chertsey Meads SANG to be agreed. Progress against the key milestones in this timetable can then be monitored. The management plan is to be prepared in readiness for the Chertsey Meads Management Liaison Group at their meeting in September.

**6. Ongoing cooperation**

**How will the strategic issues be managed on an ongoing basis? What are the mechanisms/structures being used to do this? How will this be monitored?**

Officers at Runnymede Borough Council remain committed to working with partners to effectively resolve outstanding strategic issues. The Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework outlines on pages 36/37 the methods of engagement that the Council intends to rely upon to cooperate with partners on strategic cross boundary issues relating to climate change, biodiversity and the TBHSPA. The Council intends to rely on its Duty to Cooperate Framework to monitor success and to highlight issues which still require cooperation at each key stage of Plan preparation.

In regard to the TBHSPA specifically, the JSPB officer group is regularly attended by officers from the boroughs and districts that are affected by the TBHSPA as well as Natural England. The JSPB Member group is also well attended by RBC. It is through these meetings that strategic issues relating to the TBHSPA are discussed and minuted, and that future actions/areas where cooperation are required are agreed.

On other matters, officers are proactive in engaging with DtC partners, such as Natural England and the Environment Agency, and an open dialogue is maintained. Engagement occurs particularly before a Local Plan consultation is prepared by securing expert advice from the relevant stakeholders to ensure that key issues are appropriately addressed.



## Chapter 9: Transport

### 1. Strategic Planning issue

#### *Define the issue*

Runnymede benefits from a strategic location at the junction of the M25 and M3 motorways enabling easy access to London, the rest of the South East region and further afield. It also has excellent connections to the rail network and Heathrow Airport. This accessibility (combined with the quality of the natural environment in Runnymede) makes it a desirable place to live and work, and for businesses to locate. However this accessibility brings with it associated problems of high dependency on the car and congestion which has knock on effects for businesses and residents alike. Growth in the borough over the Plan period could exacerbate these existing problems.

### 2. Evidence base

#### *What is the evidence used to develop the LP's strategic policies?*

- Infrastructure Delivery Plan, February 2013
- Surrey Infrastructure Study, January 2016
- Runnymede Transport Impact Assessment, June 2016
- Runnymede Infrastructure Needs Assessment, May 2017

(multiple other evidence base studies which have been produced by other bodies have also been referred to in the transport chapter of the Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document. For a full list, this document should be referred to).

At the time of writing an updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is being prepared by the Council to underpin the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan although this work is not completed at the time of writing.

### 3. Strategic Partners

#### *List of bodies engaged with (details of each, make up and constitution etc, to be listed in appendix 3)*

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

### 4. Relevant actions carried out since last DtC update statement was published in July 2016 in pursuit of achieving outcomes outlined in the DtC Scoping Framework (October 2015)

#### *How have you worked collaboratively with your partners?*

#### *What actions did you take to manage the strategic issue?*

*Was there any joint evidence developed e.g. SHMA? Who was involved? Include timescales for the evidence in an annex to demonstrate how and when key decisions were made (appendix 2).*

<p><b>Action:</b> Runnymede arranged and attended a meeting with Highways England and Surrey County Council to discuss the comments that Highways England had made on the Council's regulation 18 TIA (comments made by Highways England can be viewed at appendix 14 of the Council's July 2016 DtC Update Statement).</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Highways England and Surrey County Council</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Officers from Highways England (and Parsons Brinkerhoff on their behalf), Surrey County Council and Runnymede discussed the key points made in the letter from Highways England dated 16<sup>th</sup> June 2016. The meeting agenda and the minutes from this meeting which set out the topics discussed and the agreed outcomes can be viewed at appendix 6.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 6<sup>th</sup> July 2016</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officers from Runnymede attended the Runnymede TIA workshop which was held at Surrey County Council. The purpose of the meeting was for Runnymede officers to discuss with County experts the expected effects of the proposed developments anticipated to come forward through the Local Plan on highway and other transport infrastructure to help identify mitigation schemes.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Surrey County Council</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Potential mitigation schemes were identified for testing as part of the Council's Reg 19 assessment. Such mitigation schemes will also inform the Council's Infrastructure Schedule and Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 17<sup>th</sup> October 2016</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Runnymede and Surrey County Council liaised via email and conference calls to agree how best to proceed with the Council's TIA to ensure that the points raised by Highways England relating to the average peak hour versus single/2 hour peak, addition of a PM peak and which of SCC's models Runnymede was best using in TIA work moving forward were addressed.</p> <p><b>Partner(s):</b> Surrey County Council</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Based on the discussions with the Council as referenced above, Surrey County Council wrote to Highways England on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2016 to confirm how the Council proposed to move forward with the Runnymede TIA following the consideration of the comments made by HE in their letter of 16<sup>th</sup> June 2016 and discussed at the meeting with Highways England of 6<sup>th</sup> July 2016. This email can be viewed in appendix 7. The response received from Highways England on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2016 can also be viewed in appendix 7.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> October/November 2016</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Runnymede attended a further workshop/meeting of the M25 South West Quadrant Study Reference Group led by Highways England and DfT. Meeting gave update on study progress and workshop discussed how well study objectives related to key parameters.</p> <p><b>Partners:</b> Highways England/DfT are the key partners.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Workshop discussion points to be taken on board by Highways England and DfT. Shortened list of interventions to be published with the draft study by end of March 2017.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> February 2017</p>

<p><b>Action:</b> Following the receipt of the Council's Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR. Previously called the TIA) in February 2017, officers sent the draft report to Highways England for comment to see if Highways England would be satisfied that the report addresses the points that they previously raised on the Council's regulation 18 TIA.</p> <p><b>Partners:</b> Surrey County Council and Highways England</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> A response from Highways England is awaited at the time of writing.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> February/March 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> An officer at Runnymede met with officers at Surrey County Council to discuss the outcomes of the SHAR and possible next steps in the modelling process given that it was looking likely that the Council would be proposing additional sites for allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Partners:</b> Surrey County Council</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> It was agreed that if the Council's preferred spatial strategy approach was to change from SS3 (as set out in the IOPA document), the Council would need to re do its SHAR as the February 2017 SHAR would not accurately reflect the level of growth proposed by the Council if such a scenario occurred. If the Council had to re commission its SHAR, Surrey County Council advised that it was of the opinion that Runnymede should rely on their new strategic highway model instead of the strategic model relied upon previously.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 24th March 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officers from Runnymede, Woking, Surrey Heath and Surrey County Council met to discuss the possibility of commissioning a joint feasibility study to consider possible mitigation that could be implemented on the A320 to ensure that growth in the Boroughs of Runnymede, Surrey Heath and Woking would not cause critical infrastructure problems on this road which had been highlighted as a key hotspot in the Borough by residents and through Runnymede's Local Plan transport modelling.</p> <p><b>Partners:</b> Surrey Heath Borough Council, Woking Borough Council, Surrey County Council</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> It was agreed that the matter would be included in the proposed Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) negotiations with the developers of Longcross and Fair Oaks, who would make financial contributions so that the TIA can be produced jointly. The overall timetable would be dependent on the Longcross scheme, which will be the first to come forward, and for this reason, Runnymede is charged with drawing up a project timetable. It has been agreed that a project manager is to be identified to co-ordinate progress.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 29th March 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Given that the Council is recommending through its Additional Sites and Option consultation that a higher housing target is proposed to be delivered over the period of the Local Plan, and given that the capacity of a number of the preferred allocations is recommended to be amended, the Council considered it prudent to secure the services of a consultant to produce an amended SHAR after the completion of the Additional Sites and Options consultation.</p> <p><b>Partners:</b> Surrey County Council</p> <p><b>Outcomes:</b> Officers from Runnymede Borough Council met with an officer from Surrey County Council on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2017 to draft a specification for the modelling works required. A consultant has not been secured at the time of writing but this process is continuing.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> April/May 2017</p>

## 5. Outcomes from strategic working

*What was the result of the strategic cooperation and how has this influenced the plan (include specific references to relevant policies where possible)? Include any issues that remain unresolved and how the authority plans to manage these. Outline what the implications are of these unresolved matters*

### Results

- The Council has agreed to work collaboratively with Surrey County Council and Woking and Surrey Heath Borough Councils to commission an A320 feasibility study.
- The Council is clear on the way forward with its Strategic Highway Modelling work which will underpin its Local Plan. A specification has been drafted for the amended Runnymede SHAR with the assistance of Surrey County Council and the Council is confident that it will be ready to commission a consultant to carry out the necessary work in June 2017.

### Unresolved issues

- The details of the specification for the A320 feasibility study need to be finalised and the services of a consultant(s) secured to take this piece of work forward in a timely manner so that any mitigation recommended through the study can be considered as part of the strategic highway modelling which will underpin the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan.
- It is yet to be seen whether any amended strategic highway modelling work undertaken by the Council will overcome the concerns raised previously by Surrey County Council.

### Action plan moving forwards

- Officers at Runnymede Borough Council remain committed to working with partners to effectively resolve outstanding strategic issues. The Council's Duty to Cooperate Framework outlines on page 40 the methods of engagement that the Council intends to rely upon to cooperate with partners on strategic cross boundary issues relating to transport matters. The Council intends to rely on its Duty to Cooperate Framework to monitor success and to highlight issues which still require cooperation at each key stage of Plan preparation.
- Runnymede will continue to drive forward the A320 feasibility study with its partners. A key action will be appointing a project lead from one of the authorities to ensure that the project remains on track and to coordinate all parties involved.
  - Runnymede will continue to seek the support of Surrey County Council during the preparation of its amended SHAR and engage Highways England at key stages in the process (email will be the initial form of contact but this will be supplemented by telephone calls and meetings as necessary) with the aim of resolving objections to Runnymede's strategic highway modelling work.

## 6. Ongoing cooperation

*How will the strategic issues be managed on an ongoing basis? What are the mechanisms/structures being used to do this? How will this be monitored?*

In relation to the required strategic highway modelling work, Runnymede Borough Council continues to work with Surrey County Council and Highways England to address the concerns raised by Highways England on the Council's regulation 18 TIA. The position with the Runnymede TIA, and the points raised by Highways England have been an ongoing area for cooperation over the period covered by this statement. Meetings, emails and conference calls have been held to try and positively resolve the issues raised. This will continue through the remainder of Plan preparation with the hope of achieving a positive resolution. The Council aims to agree a statement of Common Ground with Highways England and Surrey County Council on matters related to the Council's strategic highway modelling work in readiness for the Examination in Public.

## Chapter 10: Flooding

### 1. Strategic Planning issue

#### *Define the issue*

Runnymede is a top ten local authority for flood risk in England. The potential impacts of all types of flooding must be assessed and their impact on delivering growth in the Borough quantified as part of the evidence gathering prior to the formulation of the Council's Local Plan. A sustainable strategy must then be developed which balances flood risk against the need to promote sustainable growth through the Local Plan.

### 2. Evidence base

#### *What is the evidence used to develop the LP's strategic policies?*

- Runnymede draft Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, April 2016
- Runnymede draft strategic sequential test, June 2016.

### 3. Strategic Partners

#### *List of bodies engaged with*

All those listed in the Council's 2015 Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework in the 'Flooding' section.

### 4. Relevant actions carried out since last DtC update statement was published in July 2016 in pursuit of achieving outcomes outlined in the DtC Scoping Framework (October 2015)

#### *How have you worked collaboratively with your partners?*

#### *What actions did you take to manage the strategic issue?*

*Was there any joint evidence developed e.g. SHMA? Who was involved? Include timescales for the evidence in an annex to demonstrate how and when key decisions were made (appendix 2).*

**Action:** Phone call with officer at the Environment Agency to discuss the Council's Local Plan evidence (Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Strategic Sequential Test in particular). This conference call was arranged following the receipt of the Environment Agency's comments on the Strategic Sequential Test draft work which was sent to the EA for comment on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2016, and which the EA provided comments on the 11<sup>th</sup> August 2016, and which can be viewed in appendix 8.

**Partners:** Environment Agency

**Outcome:** A number of key action points were agreed between the Environment Agency and Council officers in terms of matters that the Council needs to ensure are addressed before both the Council were agreed before the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Strategic Sequential Test are finalised. However, in their letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> August 2016 the Environment Agency stated that they were, '*pleased that you are preparing your evidence of the flood risk sequential test in an appropriate manner*'. The EA also provided advice in terms of content that the Council may wish to include in the Local Plan in relation to any allocations proposed. The minutes from this telephone call can be viewed in appendix 9.

**Date:** 26<sup>th</sup> September 2016

**Action:** Runnymede officers sent the Environment Agency an email updating them on the Council's progress with the Local Plan and requesting a meeting in mid March 2017 to discuss the Council's policy development work on the natural environment and flooding. A copy of the correspondence trail between the Council and the Environment Agency over this period can be viewed in appendix 10.

**Partners:** Environment Agency

**Outcome:** As an outcome of this engagement, a meeting was held with the Environment Agency in March 2017 (see entry below) where various aspects of the Council's evidence and policy development work were discussed.

**Date:** 7<sup>th</sup> February 2017

<p><b>Action:</b> Runnymede officers sent the Environment Agency the following for comment: -a revised draft of its Strategic Sequential Test methodology for comment (this revised methodology seeks to address the comments made by the Environment Agency on the original methodology and draft strategic sequential test work which the Environment Agency commented on in August 2016), -a number of queries relating to the draft SFRA, -an early draft of the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan Flood Risk Management policy</p> <p><b>Partners:</b> Environment Agency</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Meeting held with the Environment Agency on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2017. At this meeting the requirements for a water cycle study were discussed as well as the draft wording for the Council's Flood Risk Management policy. The Council agreed at this meeting that it would explore carrying out a Water Cycle Study to underpin its Local Plan. The Environment Agency made a number of comments at this meeting on the draft Flood Risk Management policy wording which the Council agreed to consider in redrafting this policy. It was agreed that written comments would be sent to the Council on its Strategic Sequential Test and also in response to the queries raised in regard to the SFRA (however no written response has been received at the time of writing). Ultimately, the outcome being aimed for is that the Council and the Environment Agency can work together to agree the Council's Strategic Sequential Test methodology, SFRA content and Local plan policy content.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> February/March 2017</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Officers from Runnymede attended an Environment Agency workshop on 14th March 2017 to review and discuss the draft outputs from the Lower Thames re-modelling project.</p> <p><b>Partners:</b> Environment Agency and other Local Authority partners.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The Council made a number of comments on the draft modelling which the EA confirmed they would consider prior to the final modelling being issued. Runnymede has agreed that it will delay the publication of its SFRA and Strategic Sequential Test so that this updated modelling (which also models the new climate change allowances) can be taken into account, providing that the modelling is received by mid June 2017. The Environment Agency confirmed that this should be possible.</p> <p><b>Date:</b> 14th March 2017</p>



**Action:** Officers at Runnymede Borough Council continue to positively engage with the Environment Agency, Surrey County Council and other partner local authorities to bring forward the delivery of the River Thames Scheme (RTS). A representative from Runnymede sits on the Sponsor Group, the Programme Board, the funding sub group and the Consents and Authorisations Action Group.

**Partners:** The Environment Agency, Surrey County Council, the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, Spelthorne Borough Council, Elmbridge Borough Council, Kingston Borough Council, London Borough of Richmond, and the Flood and Coastal Area Committee.

**Outcome:** Through the work of the partnership the Strategic Outline Business Case for the RTS has been agreed. The Outline Business Case is now being progressed to completion to coincide with the submission of the planning applications for the flood alleviation channel in July 2018. To that end workshops with stakeholders and partners have been held throughout 16/17 and, through their position in the delivery groups, Officers have progressed a Funding Strategy, a Funding Prospectus for investment, an agreed Outline Design and a schedule of consents and authorisations

**Date:** Cooperation ongoing.

### 5. Outcomes from strategic working

*What was the result of the strategic cooperation and how has this influenced the plan (include specific references to relevant policies where possible)? Include any issues that remain unresolved and how the authority plans to manage these. Outline what the implications are of these unresolved matters*

#### Results

-During the IOPA consultation, responses from consultees on the Council's flooding chapter were generally positive although the Environment Agency did raise concern about the Council's preferred approach to the sequential test (issue F3). In this regard, the Council has confirmed in its Additional Sites and Options consultation document that it intends to amend its preferred approach to the sequential test to an alternative approach preferred by the Environment Agency.

-Consultees made a number of detailed comments about matters that the Council should seek to address in its Local Plan flooding policies through the IOPA consultation. Council officers have started some early work on policy drafting in some areas (including in relation to flood risk). This policy drafting work seeks to address points raised by consultees where appropriate.

-Work on the River Thames Scheme over the period covered by this update statement has continued to be positive and the project has moved forward considerably over the period in question.

### **Unresolved issues**

- Officers continue to work positively with the Environment Agency, Surrey County Council and other key partners to address the points raised during consultations on the Council's SFRA and strategic sequential test. However, comments are yet to be received from the Environment Agency on the strategic sequential test or in response to the queries raised by the Council on the draft SFRA which were sent to the Environment Agency in early 2017.
- A water cycle study has not yet been commissioned by the Council although the Council agrees that at a minimum a scoping exercise should be carried out.
- Wording for the Council's Flood Risk Management policy not yet agreed.
- updated modelling to underpin the RTS not received at the time of writing. This updated modelling should be reflected if possible in both the strategic sequential test and the SFRA.

### **Actions moving forward**

Actions that need to be addressed by the Council moving forward will be:

- The Council will need to chase a response from the Environment Agency on its draft strategic sequential test methodology and SFRA queries during the course of May 2017 to allow this work to be completed over summer 2017 and agreed with key consultees prior to consultation on the pre submission Local Plan in autumn 2017.
- Officers, during the development of the Council's Local Plan flooding policy/policies aim to address the points raised by partners in response to the Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document. This will involve considering the points made by partners on suggested policy content for the flooding policies in the Borough Local Plan and incorporating text where considered appropriate.
- The Council will advertise a tender for its Water Cycle Study by mid-June 2017 with the anticipation of securing a supplier to carry out the necessary works.

### **6. Ongoing cooperation**

*How will the strategic issues be managed on an ongoing basis? What are the mechanisms/structures being used to do this? How will this be monitored?*

In line with the commitment set out in the Council's October 2015 Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework, during the finalisation of the Council's evidence base and drafting of the local plan policies relating to flooding, the Council will continue discussions on the points raised in the IOPA and ASO consultation responses from DtC partners. Partners will be consulted on emerging draft Plan policies, and on any additional evidence as appropriate with the aim of agreeing final proposed policy wording for the Borough Local Plan.

All partners listed in the October 2015 Scoping Framework in the flooding chapter will be consulted via email in summer 2017 on the Council's draft flooding policy/policies. The Council will offer to meet with partners if partners would find this helpful. A preliminary meeting with the Environment Agency has already been held in March 2017 which allowed for discussion on the Council's early policy development work.

Further discussions with partners will be carried out if unresolved issues remain.

## Chapter 11: Infrastructure

### 1. Strategic Planning issue

#### *Define the issue*

The key issue in respect of infrastructure is whether or not any further capacity is required to support development proposed in the Local Plan, and if so, where that infrastructure should be within or outside the Borough.

### 2. Evidence base

#### *What is the evidence used to develop the LP's strategic policies?*

- Runnymede Infrastructure Delivery Plan, February 2013
- Runnymede Infrastructure Needs Assessment, May 2017

At the time of writing an updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is being prepared by the Council to underpin the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan although this work is not completed at the time of writing.

### 3. Strategic Partners

#### *List of bodies engaged with (details of each, make up and constitution etc, to be listed in appendix 3)*

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

### 4. Relevant actions carried out since last DtC update statement was published in July 2016 in pursuit of achieving outcomes outlined in the DtC Scoping Framework (October 2015)

#### *How have you worked collaboratively with your partners?*

#### *What actions did you take to manage the strategic issue?*

#### *Was there any joint evidence developed e.g. SHMA? Who was involved? Include timescales for the evidence in an annex to demonstrate how and when key decisions were made (appendix 2).*

**Action:** Email sent to DtC partners to inform them that Runnymede are starting work on an Infrastructure Needs Assessment and seeking views on whether the range of infrastructure to be assessed is appropriate and whether any additional typologies need to be considered.

**Partners:** See list of relevant partners in the Council's Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework 2015

**Outcome:** Several email responses returned with only one requesting clarification on 6<sup>th</sup> Form Colleges and Parkland. Reply confirmed these infrastructure typologies will be considered in the INA. No other infrastructure typologies identified for assessment through DtC engagement.

**Date:** October 2016

*Although the following does not strictly fall under the Duty to Cooperate, officers have been engaging co-operatively with Sport England during the preparation of the Plan and the actions and outcomes from this co-operative working are as follows:*

**Action:** Sport England was contacted via email by planning officers in the process of summarising and responding to representations made during the IOPA consultation. A meeting was held between a representative from Sport England and from the Planning Policy and Strategy team to discuss the Sport England representation and agree a plan moving forward (see appendix 11). Although Sport England are not a body that is subject to the duty to cooperate, planning officers feel that engagement with them is important throughout the Local Plan process and is highlighted in the Runnymede Borough Council Duty to Cooperate Scoping Report.

**Partners:** Sport England

**Outcome:** The officer response to Sport England's representation was completed and the Council had a clearer idea of what was expected from them moving forwards in terms of the preparation of the evidence base (particularly related to the production of a playing pitch strategy).

**Date:** December 2016

**Action:** Meeting with representative from North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group, Ashford & St Peter's Hospital Trust, Surrey & Borders Partnership to discuss population projections and growth scenarios arising from the Local Plan 2015-2035 and how this will translate into health infrastructure needs moving forwards as well as impact to local highways serving St Peter's Hospital site.

**Partners:** North West Surrey CCG, Ashford & St Peter's Hospital Trust (ASPH), Surrey & Borders Partnership (SABP), Surrey County Council

**Outcome:** Agreed to send housing trajectory data as compiled for the Runnymede Infrastructure Needs Assessment to the CCG to enable analysis of housing growth scenarios and need for future resources. Also agreed to further meeting with SCC & CCG/ASPH regarding transport issues. CCG agreed to send on Health Infrastructure Plan when published in April 2017 for consideration of projects in the RBC Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).

**Date:** February 2017

*Although the following does not strictly fall under the Duty to Cooperate, officers have been engaging co-operatively with Sport England during the preparation of the Plan and the actions and outcomes from this co-operative working are as follows:*

**Action:** Email correspondence between a representative from Sport England and an officer from the Planning Policy and Strategy team to query whether a longer timetable for the playing pitch strategy would be supported by Sport England with regard to the Local Plan timetable.

**Partners:** Sport England

**Outcome:** It was suggested that Sport England and the Planning Policy and Strategy team could work together to agree some appropriate wording to ensure that the draft local plan policies would be in line with NPPF paragraph 74 and Sport England's planning policy objectives. It was also suggested to agree appropriate wording with reference to the playing pitch strategy's development and a commitment to use the strategy to inform any decisions or draft policies. An officer from the Planning Policy and Strategy team suggested having a conversation or meeting after the May-June 2017 consultation to discuss the wording for draft policies.

**Date:** April 2017

## 5. Outcomes from strategic working

*What was the result of the strategic cooperation and how has this influenced the plan (include specific references to relevant policies where possible)? Include any issues that remain unresolved and how the authority plans to manage these. Outline what the implications are of these unresolved matters*

### Results

- Agreed with relevant DtC partners that the range of typologies to be assessed in the Infrastructure Needs Assessment are appropriate following clarification of the education and Green Infrastructure typologies.
- Agreed with the CCG to hold further meetings regarding health infrastructure needs and possible congestion issues on the A320 around the St Peter's Hospital site once the Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) has been prepared by Surrey County Council's Transport Modelling Team.

### Unresolved issues

There are no unresolved issues at this time.

### Action plan moving forwards

- Complete playing pitch strategy and engage with Sport England at appropriate milestones to ensure that the evidence meets their requirements.
- Consult with partners and infrastructure providers on the draft Infrastructure Needs Assessment and feed their comments into the report before finalising (as appropriate)
- Commence production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Work collaboratively with partners during this work to ensure accuracy in terms of costings and likely timely of infrastructure delivery.

## **6. Ongoing cooperation**

*How will the strategic issues be managed on an ongoing basis? What are the mechanisms/structures being used to do this? How will this be monitored?*

In line with the commitment set out in the Council's October 2015 Duty to Cooperate Scoping Framework, during the finalisation of the Council's evidence base and drafting of the local plan policies relating to infrastructure, the Council will continue discussions on the points raised in the IOPA and ASO consultation responses from DtC partners. Partners will be consulted on emerging draft Plan policies, and on any additional evidence as appropriate with the aim of agreeing final proposed policy wording for the Borough Local Plan.

## **Chapter 12: other strategic matters**

### **Heritage**

Since the July 2016 DtC update statement was published, Runnymede Borough Council has made contact with Surrey County Council and had some early discussions with them around the potential content and format of the heritage policies in the Local Plan. This discussions took place in March 2017 and discussions are continuing at the time of writing.

### **Waste and minerals**

Following the Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches consultation in the latter part of 2016, Runnymede sent Surrey County Council a number of minerals assessments which had been submitted by site promoters during the course of the consultation to ask for their comments. These consultee comments will feed into the Council's ongoing site assessment work which will underpin the 2035 Local Plan.

In addition, since the July 2016 DtC update statement was published, Runnymede approached Surrey County Council in February 2017 during the preparation of its 2017 SLAA to ask for guidance on the suitability of sites for development from a waste and minerals perspective. Comments received from the minerals & waste team, which will feed in to the SLAA site assessments.



# Appendix 1

**West Surrey Local Plan Group**

**Room 355 County Hall**

**Thursday 13 October 2016**

**Meeting Notes**

**Present:** Geoff Dawes, Spelthorne; Tanya Mankoo Flatt, Guildford; Katelyn Symington, SCC Minerals and Waste Planning; Ernest Amoako, Woking; Jane Peberdy, Runnymede; Kath Harrison, Spatial Planning Team.

**Apologies:** Helen Murch, Surrey Heath; Matthew Ellis, Waverley

**1. PWG hub demo**

- 1.1 All to accept invites to join and let Katelyn know if there are any problems with IT. Practice will make perfect.

**2. Duty to Cooperate Issues**

- 2.1 In the context of the Waste Plan: engagement required with key partners at the outset before plan making commences. Process needs to be robust. PWG is not formally a duty to cooperate mechanism but it is a useful forum for sharing information and discussing strategic issues. There is potential for key issues to be identified as specific agenda items and followed up by more detailed discussion possibly with groups of authorities which could be aligned to LSS spatial areas. Specific issues will require further individual liaison.
- 2.2 Initial methodologies for forecasting housing growth considered. The Issues and Options Report uses the “planned housing” data for Surrey from the Surrey infrastructure Study, Jan 2015, as context. This study uses different data sources for various LAs, including adopted and draft Regulation 18 Local Plans. Noted 3 SC using different methodology as it needs to align with other counties.
- 2.3 Proposed method is using two different growth rates based on data available from DCLG<sup>1</sup>. Group discussed using data published by DCLG in housings table vs OANs from SHMAs. The first ensures a consistent format. However, the latter can be considered a worst case scenario – a sound approach for planning waste. Agenda item to be presented by Katelyn at the next PWG on the Duty to Cooperate and proposed methodology for household waste arisings.

### **3. Actions/updates/issues arising from previous meeting:**

G&T update: Guildford updating TAA to account for new definition of travellers.  
Commissioning consultants Millfield to do interviews in the New Year.

### **4. LSS Progress Information Share**

- 4.1 At SPOA the draft LSS was presented by Mark Behrendt, (of Elmbridge and PWG Chair). Ernest reported that it was considered that more time was required to consider in more detail. Issues were raised about language needing to reflect the local context and the functional requirement needing to be clearly related to the Duty to Cooperate. The need for SPOA to engage with CEOs and Leaders was pointed out. SPOA reps would feed individual responses to Sue Janota by the end of October.

### **5. Airports expansion and related Heathrow access issues**

- 5.1 Announcement on airport expansion expected on 18 Oct. A free vote anticipated for parliament a week later. The Heathrow Strategic Planning Group will be holding a summit event on 10 November for council leaders, portfolio holders and other key stakeholders. There will be a workshop on the Arup report re the southern access study on 8 November. The County Council will be holding a members seminar on the morning of 28 November and will be inviting all Borough and District Leaders and CEOs. Gatwick and Heathrow will give presentations and take questions. Arup will also report on the southern access.

### **6. Self-build register**

- 6.1 Guildford Legal team have suggested that proof should be provided that those who register need to prove that they meet the requirements rather than just self-declaring that they do. Spelthorne and Runnymede require self-declaration. Considered that the proof requirement would seem to be disproportionate given that registration does not imply any offer of land to be made.
- 6.2 New Regulations issued 12 October 2016. Local connection requirement may be imposed. Also, local authorities may impose a fee. Considered this might be because of individuals applying to register with more than one authority. All included question as to whether registered elsewhere.

### **8. Local updates**

- 8.1 Guildford: Burpham NDP has been adopted and a PINS appeal Inspector had been supportive. Effingham NDP Reg 16 consultation is imminent. East and West Horsleys also being prepared. CIL is progressing slowly. Addendum to SHMA and ELNAS (Guildford only) to consider impact of BREXIT. TAA being revised as mentioned above.
- 8.2 Woking: one adopted NDP Hook Heath. Pyrford going to 20 October meeting of council to seek approval to submit the Plan to referendum . West Byfleet about to go out to Reg 16 Consultation. DM DPD to exec today (13 October). It then go to Council on 20 October to seek authority to adopt. Site Allocations DPD to Council on 20 Oct to seek authority for Reg 19 consultation. Private members briefing to take place on Monday (17 October). Woking has a post NPPF adopted Core Strategy that does not meet OAN of 517. The Core Strategy make provision for the delivery of an annual housing requirement of 292 dwellings per annum. CIL 106 officer is monitoring CIL.

- 8.3 Runnymede: Thorpe NDP has been designated and at the evidence gathering stage with inception meeting to be held next week (19<sup>th</sup> October). CIL viability work to be undertaken later in the year. LDS will be revised going to committee 15 November. John at Garden Villages event today in Cambridgeshire. G&T -doing a refresh, but not against the new definition. Being carried out by the Housing department. The Council has held open meetings which were well attended and are awaiting feedback from them. TIA work continuing.
- 8.4 SCC M&W SEA and SA scoping circulated yesterday. Publishing a summary of responses to the Issues & Options Consultation in early 2017. Nearly 200 responses so far. Planning apprentice has been working successfully at Runnymede – model for the way forward. Katelyn arranging young planners meetings. All invited to consider hosting/presenting events.
- 8.5 Spelthorne: freehold of BP Sunbury site purchased and leased back to BP to provide income for the Council. Monday 10 October - consultations started on FEA, GB Methodology and SEA/SA scoping. Next week “call for sites” consultation to run till January. LDS to be revised once more staff – not yet recruiting. Issues and options to be produced later next year. A duty to cooperate meeting on Green Belt methodology meeting to be set up soon.
9. Review of PWG Minutes
- 9.1 Older people – Matt Lamburn will be engaging with districts on land for provision of affordable extra care homes
- 9.2 SNCIs – John should be engaging with boroughs and districts on boroughs and districts SNCI policies.
- 10. Issues for next Planning Working Group**
- 10.1 Item on Waste Plan housing forecasts - Katelyn to lead
- 10.2 John Edwards to feedback on outcome of discussions with biodiversity groups re SNCI policy discussions.
- 11. AOB**
- 11.1 KH to find out more from Becky Smith (now at Tandridge) about the table sent from the Leader at Tandridge which doesn't entirely align with others.
- 12. Next Meeting**
- 12.1 To be held at Waverley in December/January. Date to be discussed with Waverley and confirmed.

# Appendix 2

## Georgina Pacey

---

**From:** Wai-Po Poon <Wai-Po.Poon@woking.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 11 October 2016 16:39  
**To:** Georgina Pacey  
**Cc:** Ernest Amoako  
**Subject:** RE: Economic matters-summary of current position

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Georgina

It was nice to meet you too.

Whilst the Council acknowledges some links with Runnymede, Woking is of the view that it is within a different FEA. This is set out in 'The West Surrey Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA)' paper published by Guildford in August 2016. The paper sets out that Woking, Guildford and Waverley make a logical FEMA, where the extent of the FEMA was agreed by all three authorities.

The Council confirmed its position to Richard Ford at the meeting held on 6 October, where it was confirmed that we are unable to meet any of Runnymede's unmet need. Ernest has also previously confirmed the Council's position in writing. Nevertheless, as it was assured to Richard previously, if there are any other cross boundary issues the Council is happy to engage with Runnymede on these.

Kind regards

Wai-Po

**Wai-Po Poon | Planning Policy Officer | Planning Services**

---

Woking Borough Council, Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking, Surrey, GU21 6YL

**Phone:** 01483 743727 | **Fax:** 01483 756842 | **Web:** [www.woking.gov.uk](http://www.woking.gov.uk)

For general enquiries, please call Woking Borough Council's Contact Centre on 01483 755855

 [Follow @wokingcouncil](https://twitter.com/wokingcouncil)

---

**From:** Georgina Pacey [mailto:Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk]

**Sent:** 05 October 2016 09:58

**To:** Wai-Po Poon

**Cc:** Ernest Amoako; Richard Ford

**Subject:** Economic matters-summary of current position

Dear Wai Po

It was nice to see you on Friday and I am glad that things are going well at Woking.

As discussed, I thought it would be useful to get in touch so that I could update you on where we are with our employment work and to hopefully agree a position between us/way forward for future work.

## Functional economic area

I note in your email from July (shown below) that your evidence points to Woking being in a functional economic area with Waverley and Guildford. Our own FEA analysis from June

2015 (<https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=12930&p=0>) draws the following conclusions:

*9.2 Overall, given the strength of transport links in and out of Runnymede, the above findings show that the Borough is most likely to sit on the edges of two different FEAs. The northern part of the Borough, in particular the Thorpe and Egham areas are considered to sit within a wider FEA which focusses on Heathrow airport at its centre. The boroughs that Runnymede has the strongest relationships with in this Heathrow centred FEA are Spelthorne, Hounslow and Hillingdon. It is these three authorities that it is recommended that Runnymede engages with as it progresses its economic work. Some links with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead have also been found although overall this authority is considered to have stronger links elsewhere and be located in a different FEA to Runnymede. The same can be said for Bracknell Forest.*

*9.3 The southern parts of the borough, in particular the Addlestone and Chertsey areas are considered to sit on the edge of a South West London/M3/A3 corridor market. Again the extent of this wider FEA is considered to cover a substantial geographical area stretching to Reigate to the south, Croydon to the east and Guildford to the south west. Whilst these areas undoubtedly have some links to Runnymede due to the existing transport network, this report has not identified that Runnymede benefits from any strong links with these authorities. The analysis carried out indicates that in this wider FEA, Runnymede has the strongest links with Woking and Elmbridge and as such it is these authorities that it is also recommended that Runnymede engages with as it progresses its economic work.*

It is for these reasons that I contacted you back in July to see if there was any appetite to produce a joint ELR. (As an update on this, after asking its FEA partners whether there was any interest in producing a draft ELR, Runnymede proceeded alone as there was no appetite for such a joint study at that time).

As I am sure you are aware Runnymede is a small Borough with 3 small town centres, none of which form a dominant centre. Given the proximity of the much larger centres of Staines upon Thames and Woking in two adjoining authority areas, there is a notable flow of people from Runnymede to the boroughs of Woking and Spelthorne for employment, retail and cultural facilities.

Our evidence identifies that Runnymede has the strongest links with Spelthorne for both housing and employment work and as such we continue to engage proactively with Spelthorne as we prepare our local plan. We are also seeking more engagement with Elmbridge given the findings of our own FEA analysis and the findings of the Enterprise M3 Commercial Property Market studies of 2013 and 2016 which groups the Boroughs of Spelthorne, Runnymede and Elmbridge in the Upper M3 commercial market area. We engage with Hounslow regularly through the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group and we are meeting with Hillingdon on Friday to discuss cross boundary matters including those related to the economy.

In regard to engagement with Woking on economic matters, from speaking to you on Friday, my understanding is that Woking continues to progress its economic work with its partners identified in the LEP commercial property market study of 2013 which identified at this time that Woking had the strongest links with Guildford and the central and eastern part of Waverley. Whilst the 2016 commercial property market study produced by the LEP now concludes that Guildford and Woking are located in two separate commercial property market areas, I note that in August 2016 Woking, Waverley and Guildford published a FEMA analysis to support the links between these 3 authorities. The report acknowledges however the complexity of cross boundary issues across the region and highlights links between Woking and Runnymede.

Given the links that our own evidence has identified with Woking, and the secondary links highlighted between Woking and Runnymede in the Woking, Waverley and Guildford FEMA analysis, I would propose to keep you informed of any key actions which emerge from any meetings/discussions which are held under the duty to cooperate with our other FEA partners identified above and I hope you will agree that this is a sensible course of action.

This is the course of action that we have followed to date, and in this regard I am aware of email exchanges between Richard Ford from Runnymede and Ernest Amoako and Douglas Spinks from your own authority relating to cross boundary issues including economic matters. We have also consulted Woking on both our FEA analysis and ELR.

### **Unmet needs**

Runnymede's 2016 ELR identifies a significant unmet need for B8 floorspace in the Borough (between approx. 106,000 and 139,000sqm between 2015 and 2035). Through the production of its evidence to date (in particular the Council's draft Site Selection Methodology and Assessment, June 2016

<https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=15447&p=0>) the Council has been unable to identify any suitable and available sites to help meet these identified B8 needs. I am currently trying to arrange a meeting with Spelthorne and Elmbridge where we discuss cross boundary economic matters including any supply and demand imbalances and I can update you on their position on this matter in due course if this would be helpful?

In regard to Woking's position, as I understand it Ernest confirmed to Richard via email on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2016 that Woking was unable to assist Runnymede with meeting its unmet B8 needs, and more recently the LEP 2016 Commercial Property Market Study notes that Woking has a major shortage of vacant space and land suitable for industrial development. Your June 2015 employment topic paper highlights your difficulties in meeting your own B8 needs. Obviously however if your position changes, Runnymede would like to be kept informed, and if our position changes we would do the same.

### **On going work**

In terms of engagement moving forwards in relation to employment matters, Runnymede will continue to:

- consult you on any evidence produced which relates to the economy;
- consult you at key stages of the Local Plan including during the development of policies for the Local Plan;
- keep you informed on any key outputs from any discussions with the other Local Authorities that we have our strongest functional links with for economic matters (Hounslow, Hillingdon, Spelthorne and Elmbridge);
- seek to agree a common position between our authorities in relation to cross boundary economic matters once Runnymede is closer to submitting its Local Plan to the SoS to support Runnymede at EiP. In this regard, Richard is meeting with Ernest tomorrow to discuss the possibility of an MoU and what such an MoU should cover.

I hope that this information is helpful and look forward to hearing any comments that you may have.

Kind regards

Georgina

**Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council**



Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at [www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone)

Please Think Before You Print This

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

\*\*\*\*\*

This transmission is intended for the named addressee only.

It may contain sensitive material and be marked as CONFIDENTIAL and accordingly must not be disclosed to anyone other than the named addressee, unless authorisation is granted by the sender.

If you are not the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), you may not copy, use or disclose it to anyone else.

If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately. All Public Services Network(PSN) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

\*\*\*\*\*.

# Appendix 3

## Georgina Pacey

---

**From:** Georgina Pacey  
**Sent:** 13 January 2017 11:38  
**Cc:** Richard Ford  
**Subject:** Consultation on the Runnymede Green Belt Review Part 2 methodology  
**Attachments:** Sketch Methodology ISSUE 13 01 17 (commercial redacted).pdf; Green Belt Review Part 2-buffers.pdf

**Categories:** Egress Switch: Unprotected

**Tracking:**

**Recipient**

**Delivery**

Richard Ford

Delivered: 13/01/2017 11:38

planningpolicy@elbridge.gov.uk

LDF@epsom-ewell.gov.uk

planning.policy@molevalley.gov.uk

LDF@reigate-banstead.gov.uk

planning.policy@rbwm.gov.uk

planning.policy@spelthorne.gov.uk

planning.policy@surreyheath.gov.uk

localplan@guildford.gov.uk

LocalPlan@tandridge.gov.uk

planning.policy@woking.gov.uk

planningpolicy@waverley.gov.uk

Localplan@hillingdon.gov.uk

development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

ldf@hounslow.gov.uk

\_Planning Policy (PlanningPolicy@slough.gov.uk)

planning.consultations@surreycc.gov.uk

Darren.richards@london.gov.uk

John Devonshire

Delivered: 13/01/2017 11:38

Jane Peberdy

Delivered: 13/01/2017 11:38

Dear Sir/Madam

### Consultation on the Runnymede Green Belt Review Part 2 methodology

Runnymede Borough Council commissioned Arup in 2014 to carry out a strategic, borough wide Green Belt Review. The Arup Green Belt Review (GBR) considered the performance of all Green Belt land in Runnymede. To assist with the analysis, the Borough's Green Belt was divided into 41 parcels (known as General Areas) and the performance of each parcel was assessed against 3 of the 5 Green Belt purposes, followed by a refinement of the parcels through the consideration of constraints to development, followed by a further consideration of refined land parcels against Green Belt purposes.

This process resulted in a number of resultant land parcels remaining which formed areas of search which the Council could consider for release from the Green Belt if it was found that such an approach was necessary and justified as part of its wider Local Plan spatial strategy through the demonstration of exceptional circumstances.

Following the publication of this work in December 2014, a number of interested parties submitted comments to the Council on the methodology and conclusions drawn in the GBR. In a number of cases, this was also supported by 'counter' reviews. Following on from this, during the Council's Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches (IOPA) consultation (reg 18) in July and August 2016, a number of representations made detailed comments on the GBR.

All detailed comments/representations made on the GBR since its publication were sent to Arup in September 2016 for analysis. Following their analysis, Arup concluded that the methodology used in the GBR was robust and that the conclusions drawn in this 2014 work could continue to be relied upon. However they noted that a number of the representations/counter reviews sent to them expressed concern that the Green Belt parcels considered in the 2014 work were too large in some cases. It was argued that if smaller parcels had been considered different conclusions would have been drawn in terms of how a site performs against Green Belt purposes.

Arup accepted this point and recommended to the Council that a more finely grained review could be undertaken to understand the performance of smaller parcels against Green Belt purposes and to better understand their context in the performance of the Green Belt as a whole. The intention is that this additional phase of work will build on and complement the 2014 GBR and also complement other aspects of the Council's evidence base (for example the Site Selection Methodology and Assessment).

Runnymede Borough Council has recently commissioned Arup to carry out this additional piece of work (to be known as the Green Belt Review Part 2). The methodology that Arup has produced for this study can be found attached with this email. Also attached is a map showing the buffer zones around the Borough's urban settlements where further assessment will take place (please note that whilst some of the buffers extend into neighbouring Local Authority areas, it is only Green Belt land in Runnymede that will be assessed as part of this commission).

Should you have any comments to make on the methodology being employed by Arup, the areas for further review or on any general comments that you wish to make, please can you send these to [planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk) by **5pm on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> January**.

In the meantime, please feel free to contact me with any queries that you may have. Runnymede Borough Council is very grateful for your cooperation and we look forward to hearing your views in due course.

Yours faithfully

**Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council**

[georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk) | 01932 425248 | [www.runnymede.gov.uk](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk)

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at [www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone)

Please Think Before You Print This

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



## Georgina Pacey

---

**From:** tcampbell@hillington.gov.uk on behalf of Local Plan <localplan@hillington.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 18 January 2017 13:59  
**To:** Georgina Pacey  
**Cc:** James Gleave  
**Subject:** Re: Consultation on the Runnymede Green Belt Review Part 2 methodology

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Georgina,

### **Consultation on the Runnymede Green Belt Review Part 2 Methodology**

Thank you for inviting the London Borough of Hillingdon to comment on the above.

I am pleased to advise that we have no comments to make.

Regards,

Tom Campbell

Planning Policy Team  
London Borough of Hillingdon

[www.hillingdon.gov.uk](http://www.hillingdon.gov.uk)

On 13 January 2017 at 11:38, Georgina Pacey <[Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk)> wrote:

Dear Sir/Madam

### **Consultation on the Runnymede Green Belt Review Part 2 methodology**

Runnymede Borough Council commissioned Arup in 2014 to carry out a strategic, borough wide Green Belt Review. The Arup Green Belt Review (GBR) considered the performance of all Green Belt land in Runnymede. To assist with the analysis, the Borough's Green Belt was divided into 41 parcels (known as General Areas) and the performance of each parcel was assessed against 3 of the 5 Green Belt purposes, followed by a refinement of the parcels through the consideration of constraints to development, followed by a further consideration of refined land parcels against Green Belt purposes.

This process resulted in a number of resultant land parcels remaining which formed areas of search which the Council could consider for release from the Green Belt if it was found that such an approach was necessary and justified as part of its wider Local Plan spatial strategy through the demonstration of exceptional circumstances.

Following the publication of this work in December 2014, a number of interested parties submitted comments to the Council on the methodology and conclusions drawn in the GBR. In a number of cases, this was also supported by 'counter' reviews. Following on from this, during the Council's Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches (IOPA) consultation (reg 18) in July and August 2016, a number of representations made detailed comments on the GBR.

All detailed comments/representations made on the GBR since its publication were sent to Arup in September 2016 for analysis. Following their analysis, Arup concluded that the methodology used in the GBR was robust and that the conclusions drawn in this 2014 work could continue to be relied upon. However they noted that a number of the representations/counter reviews sent to them expressed concern that the Green Belt parcels considered in the 2014 work were too large in some cases. It was argued that if smaller parcels had been considered different conclusions would have been drawn in terms of how a site performs against Green Belt purposes.

Arup accepted this point and recommended to the Council that a more finely grained review could be undertaken to understand the performance of smaller parcels against Green Belt purposes and to better understand their context in the performance of the Green Belt as a whole. The intention is that this additional phase of work will build on and complement the 2014 GBR and also complement other aspects of the Council's evidence base (for example the Site Selection Methodology and Assessment).

Runnymede Borough Council has recently commissioned Arup to carry out this additional piece of work (to be known as the Green Belt Review Part 2). The methodology that Arup has produced for this study can be found attached with this email. Also attached is a map showing the buffer zones around the Borough's urban settlements where further assessment will take place (please note that whilst some of the buffers extend into neighbouring Local Authority areas, it is only Green Belt land in Runnymede that will be assessed as part of this commission).

Should you have any comments to make on the methodology being employed by Arup, the areas for further review or on any general comments that you wish to make, please can you send these to [planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk) by **5pm on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> January**.

In the meantime, please feel free to contact me with any queries that you may have. Runnymede Borough Council is very grateful for your cooperation and we look forward to hearing your views in due course.

Yours faithfully

**Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council**

**[georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk) | 01932 425248 | [www.runnymede.gov.uk](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk)**

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at [www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone)

Please Think Before You Print This

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

Hillingdon Council routinely monitors the content of emails sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures. The contents of this message are for the attention and use of the intended addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient or addressee, or the person responsible for sending the message you may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use it or any part of it in any way. To do so may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake please advise the sender immediately. Where opinions are expressed they are not necessarily those of the London Borough of Hillingdon. Service by email is not accepted unless by prior agreement.



## Georgina Pacey

---

**From:** Miles, Deborah <Deborah.Miles@molevalley.gov.uk> on behalf of Local Plans <Local.Plans@molevalley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 23 January 2017 09:48  
**To:** Planning Policy  
**Subject:** Consultation on the Runnymede Green Belt Review Part 2 methodology

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Thank you for keeping us informed with the progress of your draft Local Plan. Mole Valley would have no comments to make in this instance.

Regards,

Deborah Miles  
Planning Policy Officer  
Mole Valley District Council  
01306 879275  
[www.molevalley.gov.uk](http://www.molevalley.gov.uk)

---

This email was scanned by our anti-virus solution.



Have you tried [www.molevalley.gov.uk](http://www.molevalley.gov.uk)? Our easy to use, accessible website allows you to access our services at any time. You can look at planning applications, pay bills online or find out more about where you live using the My Mole Valley feature.

Please note that calls to the Council may be recorded and monitored for training purposes. The computer system may also be monitored and recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, the E-mail and any files have been transmitted to you in error and any copying, distribution or other use of the information contained in them is strictly prohibited.

## Georgina Pacey

---

**From:** Jennie Falconer <Jennie.Falconer@waverley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 17 January 2017 09:35  
**To:** Planning Policy  
**Subject:** Consultation on the Runnymede Green Belt Review Part 2 methodology

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Thank you for consulting Waverley on this document. We have no comments to make at this stage.

Kind regards,

**Jennie Falconer**

Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy Team  
Waverley Borough Council  
Direct line: 01483 523294  
Working Tuesday - Friday (8.30 a.m - 5.00 p.m)

If I am not available and you need assistance before my return, please contact Annie Reid on 01483 523280 or at [localplan@waverley.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@waverley.gov.uk)  
[www.waverley.gov.uk](http://www.waverley.gov.uk)

This email, and any files attached to it, is confidential and solely for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed.

The opinions expressed in this email are not necessarily those of Waverley Borough Council.

The Council is not responsible for any changes made to the message after it has been sent. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or the person responsible for delivering it to them you may not copy it, forward it or otherwise use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful.

Please visit our website at <http://www.waverley.gov.uk>

# Appendix 4

## Notes from meeting with RBC and NE 070716

Present: RF, CB, Marc Turner, Amy Steel

### IOPA

-Generally happy with the contents of the NE IOPA chapter. A few comments will be made through the consultation process. The preferred terminology is to be 'Maintain, protect and enhance'.

-would request the 'pyramid' of site protection set out in policy-International sites, national sites, local sites.

-NE advised that Slough BC has a good biodiversity policy in their LP. **Action point to look at policy wording of the Slough LP policy. Post meeting: policy saved in Z drive.**

-NE requires that RBC has a TBHSPA policy included within the Plan that effectively covers the policy of SEP NRM6.

### Local Plan

-Query raised by the Council about whether NE would be satisfied with the Council not having SANGs for the 20 years of the Plan period, but the policy making a commitment to do a review prior to the capacity running out (at approx. 10-15 yrs). NE require SANGs to be identified for the entire Plan period, although the specific locations are not required, just general areas (although wouldn't necessarily need agreement from developers). The numbers would need to add up as a situation arose in another LPA area where the Council had allocated land for development and was started to be built-out without the appropriate mitigation in place. **[post-meeting chat with IM, who said this approach was unrealistic as the end of the Plan has so much uncertainty. Action: GP said that Surrey Heath had a solution to this issue. CB to talk to JD] Post meeting note: CB has spoken with JD, who directed to the SH CS Inspector report. Query has been raised with NE, who have stated they would still wish to see the full Plan supply in the LP.**

### HRA/SEA

-NE advised that other protected sites, such as the RAMSAR and Windsor Great Forest would have no recreational disturbance in combination and would be fine with the HRA screening this out, in particular the WGF as it is more resilient.

-Hydrology- both quantity and quality should be considered, particularly quality.

-Air pollution-new roads within 200m of a protected site or where 1000 trips would be generated need consideration. NE would want to see TIA. If there is an increase in pollution of less than 1%, this is acceptable. More than 1% may be acceptable but would need more thought.

## **Chertsey Meads as candidate SANGs.**

-Chertsey Meads agreed in 2013 could be a SANG. NE agreed that the principle and capacity were still acceptable, although the capacity may be able to be increased, dependent on the model used. **[Action: check the model that was used. If not Bracknell model, the capacity may be increased a little]** *Post-meeting note: confirmed that Bracknell model was used.*

-NE advised that the Long-term management Plan of Chertsey Meads would need to be drawn up and sent to NE, although this may not be necessary prior to examination. **[Action, explore how the long-term management plan is put in place].** *Post meeting note, Leisure have produced a management plan and this has been passed to NE for comment as suitable for SANG management.*

## **Residential development within 5-7 km of the SPA**

-the qu was asked specifically asked in relation to proposed RLP allocation at Thorpe.

NE advised that if the development is over 50 dwellings, some mitigation would be likely.

Advised that the developer as part of any planning application could look at the 2012 SPA study and identify the number of visitors to the SPA come from the Thorpe area. If this was only 25% of the entire number of visitors to the SPA, then only 25% of the new residents would need to be mitigated for. This would equate in effect to a standard of 2ha provision per 1000 population required, rather than 8 ha per 1000 within the 5km zone. Of paramount importance is the circular walk must be 2.5 km.

Mention of the approach in 5-7 km could be included in the TBHSPA policy.

## **Other business**

### **Brexit implications**

-NE advised the LPA to carry on what we're doing until any changes in Legislation may be made. It is likely this would take a number of years to unravel all the international and national legislation

### **Funding of SAMM**

-As starter homes are exempt from paying S106, how will SAMM be funded?

-NE stated that for permitted development, Habitats Regs trump S106, so PD is required to pay S106. NE recommended that the Council seek legal advice on if the same might apply to starter homes

**[Action: Ask Legal team advice on this matter]** *awaiting comment from legal*

### **Which habitats/species are protected in Runnymede?**

-NE advised that the Surrey Local Record centre or SWT (Ken Ankorn) will be able to advise where to look to identify the protected habitats/species that are present in Runnymede. **[Action contact Ken Ankorn] awaiting comment from SWT**

### **Existing SANGs**

-The SAMM warden has visited the SANGs in Runnymede as part of the annual survey (first in Oct and then further visits in April). Although in general the SANGs are good, there are some issues identified and the S106 funding should be used to improve certain aspects of the SANGs. **[Action: NE will send the comments to planning officers, who will forward to Peter Winfield for consideration]. Action complete.**

# Appendix 5

## **Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership Board**

**Date of Meeting:** 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016 at 10am

**Venue:** Council Chamber Woking Borough Council

### **Agenda Part 1**

1. Apologies
2. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising
- 3 SMM update
- 4 Eutrophication of soils- funding of trial project on TBH SPA
- 5 Financial Report
- 6 ANY other Business
- 7 Date of Next Meeting



# Appendix 6

**Meeting to discuss the Runnymede TIA, Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> July 2016, Highways England offices,  
Guildford**

To be attended by officers from Runnymede Borough Council, Surrey County Council and Highways England.

**Agenda items**

1. Introductions
2. Discussion of the Runnymede TIA and the points specifically raised by Highways England, including:
  - Suitability of the model being relied upon.
  - Provision of an evening peak hour assessment in the TIA.
  - The suitability of the use of average peak hours over a 3 hour period, and possible alternatives
  - Comments on NTM adjusted growth in TEMPRO
  - Additional information required in section 2.5.4 on the Runnymede roundabout
  - Comments on trip rates and TRICS
3. How HE can assist with the Runnymede TIA, i.e. by indicating what the existing position is in terms of capacity on their network/links and how they expect SRN improvements set out in their delivery plan – including the widening to 5 lanes on the M25 between Chertsey and the M40 - to affect future capacity and the interaction with Local Plan proposals.
4. Timetable moving forward for the Runnymede Local Plan and TIA work
5. AOB

## **Notes of meeting with Highways England and Surrey County Council to discuss the Runnymede TIA**

**Meeting held at Highways England offices at Bridge House, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford**

**Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> July at 10am**

### **Attendees:**

Heather Archer (HA)-Highways England (HE)

Stephen Gee-WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff

Sue Janota (SJ)-Surrey County Council

William Bryans (WB)-Surrey County Council

Georgina Pacey (GP)-Runnymede Borough Council

John Devonshire (GP)- Runnymede Borough Council

**Item 1: Introductions.** GP asked that the group went around the table and introduced themselves

**Item 2: Discussion of the Runnymede TIA and the points raised by Highways England in their email dated 16th June 2016.**

WB started by saying that he felt that it was important that HE ensured consistency when they were providing comments on TIAs. In a different area of the County Mouchel is the technical advisor to HE and seem happy with the approach taken by SCC but in the area that Runnymede is located within, where WSP Brinckerhoff is the technical advisor, different points have been raised. HA said that she would take this comment back to her team. Acknowledgement that consistency is important. *[post meeting note: subsequent meetings have been held between SCC and HE and on the basis of these meetings, HE consider that this issue has been resolved].*

GP suggested that the paragraphs in HA's email were gone through in order.

- The first point discussed was the suitability of the model being relied upon. HE has raised concerns about the suitability of the model given that age of the underlying data. Should Runnymede wish to use such a model further justification should be provided and/or refinements made to the model to ensure that HE can have sufficient confidence that its forecasts adequately cover likely future traffic flow impacts.

SG said that whilst he appreciated that the model had been relied upon previously, data relied upon should be from the last 6years. WB confirmed that at the current time, this was the only model available. He stated that the model is being updated but this new model will not be available for use until the early part of 2017, so Runnymede will not be able to rely on this new model. Agreed between all parties that Runnymede should only rely on one model and not change the model it uses midway through the plan preparation process. WB advised that observed data underpins the model, the current reference year being 2009. SG said that if SCC could introduce some extra test into the next iteration of the Runnymede TIA to

explain the history of the model, the level of updates that have occurred and the age of the information being relied upon, this may help to alleviate the concerns raised.

- HE has advised that given the heavy congestion experienced on the M25 and M3 through Runnymede and outside throughout most afternoons and evenings, it is imperative that an evening peak hour assessment is also provided in the TIA. JD said that he didn't recall ever seeing a PM peak in a TIA in any of the previous Local Authorities that he had worked at. SG added that the busiest section of the SRN runs through Runnymede and as such he felt it important that a PM peak was provided, especially as this second peak could show different issues and pinch points on the network from the AM peak. WB confirmed that it is possible to include a PM peak but this would double the amount of forecasting work and analysis required. Could add approximately 3 weeks on to the production of the TIA. Furthermore, as there isn't a validated PM model at the moment, extra time would be needed to produce this and factor to 2014 (this would be on top of the 3 weeks extra needed for the extra forecasting and analysis work). GP said she would discuss this matter further with her line manager and would let SCC how RBC wished to proceed.
- HE has stated that the model relies on the average peak hours over a 3 hour period. HE is concerned that this is likely to underestimate the actual peak hour situation. It is recommended/suggested that the analysis is undertaken for the busiest peak hour for the AM and PM.. HE wants to know the worst case situation rather than an average of 3 hours. WB advised that it was not possible to assess just the peak hour in the current model. The new model will be able to do this but this will not be ready in time for Runnymede to use. Peak hour is different on the LRN and SRN. If a LRN peak hour is used then flows on the SRN are lower as traffic is stuck in a queue. The only way of overcoming this is to use a dynamic model, but SCC wouldn't take this approach to a strategic TIA. WB said that as one option the number of hours that the average is taken over could be reduced to 2. In addition, a statistical analysis could be carried out and inserted into the document to show the difference between the average hour peak and the peak. SG said that this would be helpful as an initial starting point.
- HE has stated that section 2.1 outlines that the 2014 reference year has been created from the 2009 base using a growth rate derived from 64 observed DfT counts within Surrey. However, details of the count locations and which growth rate has been used does not appear to be set out. The information relied upon could underestimate traffic flow in 2014, especially for the AM peak hour. This depends on where the 64 DfT counts are taken and therefore how representative they are. WB said that further information could be provided in the next iteration of the TIA to confirm which of the counts were in Runnymede and these could also be plotted. If it is found that an insufficient number of the counts are in Runnymede, SCC would want to move back to TEMPRO. In addition WB said that the County could use an updated modelling programme: currently using OmniTRANS 6.0 but could move to OmniTRANS 6.1 (includes the block back function and could provide significantly different results and may better reflect the operation of the SRN) although this could add several weeks of delay onto the next stage of the TIA process as the model would need to be re-validated. SG to speak with his colleagues and feedback on whether use of OmniTRANS 6.1 would be preferable to HE. *[post meeting note: WB has found that whilst OmniTRANS 6.1 includes this facility, it is optional and for it to work the software suppliers need to make*

*coding changes to files only they can access. If this facility were to be used, then the model(s) would need re-calibrating and validating].*

- HE has stated that section 2.5.4 highlights that a calibration factor of 0.5 has been applied to the A30 Egham By-pass approach to Runnymede roundabout in the base model. Additional information should be provided to detail the effect of this adjustment. WB confirmed why a calibration factor had been applied and confirmed that this information could easily be added into the next iteration of the TIA.
- Negative trip data was briefly discussed. HE want to make sure that where negative trips are reported that sites are actually in the existing use that they are stated to be in to ensure that the impact of new development on the network is not underestimated. WB confirmed that this required Runnymede to ensure that the data being given to SCC was accurate. GP assured HE and SCC that the Runnymede data that the TIA is based upon will continue to be as reliable as possible and based on officers' most up to date knowledge of sites.
- HE has commented that analysis of the trips in the document with TRICS suggests that the residential trip rates used are likely to underestimate trips for the AM peak hour. Based on the information on number of units and associated trips, this suggests a trip rate of approximately 0.35 per unit in the AM peak hour. This is considered low for the AM peak hour, as the TRICS average for mixed housing developments in Surrey is 0.44 in the AM peak. WB confirmed that the TRICS values used go beyond Surrey to obtain a bigger sample by location type which is considered to be a more robust approach. SCC is happy to provide more information to HE to justify how the trip rate has been arrived at, although WB would first obtain the views of colleagues in SCC's Transport Development Planning team.
- JD suggested that it could be helpful for all three parties to produce a statement of common ground further down in the line in the process as this could be helpful at the EIP. All parties agreed that this could be helpful and explored at a later date.
- GP asked if there were any further points that any party wished to discuss. SG asked how the growth aspirations of other neighbouring/nearby Local Authorities had been factored into the Runnymede TIA. HE were not necessarily asking for additional scenarios to be tested but asked for further clarification on what the base model includes to assess cumulative impacts on the SRN from across the County. WB confirmed that essentially TEMPRO was relied upon, and that further information to provide clarification on this point could be provided in the next iteration of the report.

**Item 3: How HE can assist with the Runnymede TIA, i.e. by indicating what the existing position is in terms of capacity on their network/links and how they expect SRN improvements set out in their delivery plan – including the widening to 5 lanes on the M25 between Chertsey and the M40 - to affect future capacity and the interaction with Local Plan proposals.** HA confirmed that the technical team at HE is run from Birmingham. Until schemes are confirmed they should not be included in any TIA modelling.

**Item 4: Timetable moving forward for the Runnymede Local Plan and TIA work.** GP gave a brief update on the Runnymede Local Plan timetable moving forward. It was confirmed that the Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches consultation had commenced today for a 6 week period. Both SCC and HE had been posted a letter and DVD today which provided more information about the consultation. GP advised that the next round of consultation on the

Local Plan was anticipated to commence on the 14<sup>th</sup> December. GP confirmed that the timetable was ambitious as the Government had made it clear that a number of Local Authorities including Runnymede needed to have a Local Plan in place by early 2017. As such the Council was aiming to submit its Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate in March 2017 to meet the Government's deadline. GP, SJ and WB agreed that a further meeting was required to discuss the Council's timetable in more detail to allow the TIA work for the draft plan to be properly timetabled in the County's work stream. GP to contact SJ and WB with some suggested dates for this meeting.

**Item 5: AOB.** SG confirmed that WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff's contract ends with HE on 2<sup>nd</sup> September. Atkins will be the technical advisor for Runnymede from this date.

# Appendix 7

## Georgina Pacey

---

**From:** William Bryans EI <william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 21 October 2016 16:44  
**To:** Heather Archer  
**Cc:** Georgina Pacey; Sue Janota EI; Kath Harrison EI  
**Subject:** Runnymede Local Plan

Dear Heather,

I am just following up with some points that were raised at our meeting in July discussing the highway assessment of Runnymede's draft Local Plan and, in particular, the modelling work undertaken.

### 2-hour average peak hour

It was suggested that using a 2 hour average peak hour for the period 07:00-09:00 would be preferable to the current 3 hour average peak hour. While we agree with this, having investigated the possibility, we are unable to do this within Runnymede's required timescale. This is because the data for the hour 07:00-08:00 is not in the model. Therefore we would need to extract this data for all count sites used in the county model and process the data so that it is in the correct format to upload into the model. Once this has been done, the whole model will need re-calibrating and re-validating and then the local area of Runnymede re-checked. It is the data element that is so time consuming and making this unviable.

### Single peak hour

Currently we are seeing if we have the time to convert the model to a single peak hour. It would for the 08:00-09:00 hour as this data is already in the model. It means re-calibrating and re-validating the whole model, and then undertaking a check for the Runnymede local area. We are progressing this at the moment while Runnymede Borough Council prepare their planning data for the forthcoming assessment. However, if it should prove to turn out to require much more time than we think it will take, then we may have to revert to the original 3 hour average peak model. But it should also be noted that we will only have time to do this for the AM period at the moment rather than for both the AM and PM periods.

### Model software

We have already converted the Runnymede model for use with the latest OmniTRANS software (version 6.1.16). At the same time, we are in discussions with the software providers, DAT.Mobility, to add in the capability of simulating merges on the motorway network. If this is possible, then this needs to be done before we progress too far with re-calibrating and re-validating the model to the AM peak hour.

### Model update

The updated Surrey County Model should be delivered to us later this Autumn. However, when we receive it the model will still require calibrating and validating to the Runnymede area. Given our resources and work programme for the first part of next year, it would mean putting back the Runnymede assessment until later in 2017. This is not acceptable to Runnymede as the Council needs to meet DCLG requirements.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss further any of the points raised above.

With my regards,  
William.



William Bryans BA MSc CILT  
Transport Studies  
Highways & Transport, Surrey County Council  
020 8541 7222  
07968 832464  
[william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk)

\* \* \* \* \*

This email and any attachments with it are intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege.  
If you have received this email in error please notify the sender or [postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk)  
The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council's position. Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.

Visit the Surrey County Council website -  
<http://www.surreycc.gov.uk>

\* \* \* \* \*

## Georgina Pacey

---

**From:** William Bryans EI <william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 18 November 2016 13:51  
**To:** Georgina Pacey  
**Subject:** Fw: Runnymede Local Plan

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Georgina,

Here's the email from Heather Archer, received yesterday evening.

I will be in touch after I've met with Elmbridge and HE on Tuesday afternoon.

With my regards,  
William.

William Bryans BA MSc CILT  
Transport Studies  
Highways & Transport, Surrey County Council  
020 8541 7222  
07968 832464  
[william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:william.bryans@surreycc.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Archer, Heather <[Heather.Archer@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:Heather.Archer@highwaysengland.co.uk)>  
**Sent:** 17 November 2016 17:50  
**To:** William Bryans EI  
**Subject:** Runnymede Local Plan

Dear William

Thank you for your email of 21 October concerning the modelling work in relation to Runnymede Local Plan. I apologise for the delay in replying.

In response to your point you made in your email concerning 2-hour average peak hour and single peak hour, our assessment requirement is we advise you to look at a single peak hour as this will examine the worst case scenario on the network. Modelling any other scenario will under-represent peak conditions, in particular queues and delays. We require assessments of both morning and evening peak hours. If SINTRAM is to be used it will need to adequately represent existing conditions on the network and will need to include recent observed origin destination data in line with WebTAG Unit M3.1 guidance.

In the absence of a properly validated assignment model for both morning and evening peak hours, a manual assignment process and detailed junction modelling plus merge/diverge assessments using DMRB 22/06 might be sufficient. This would normally require current or recent observed data factored to future year.

Highways England would not insist on the use of specific software to assess merges or diverges on the strategic road network.

Heather

**Heather Archer, Spatial Planning Manager**

Highways England | 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Bridge House | Walnut Tree Close | Guildford | GU1 4LZ

+44 (0) 300 470 1019



Web: <http://www.highwaysengland.co.uk>



Highways England Company Limited | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ | Registered in England and Wales No. 9346363

*This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.*

**Highways England Company Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 |National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF | <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/highways-england> | [info@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:info@highwaysengland.co.uk)**

*Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ*

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

\* \* \* \* \*

This email and any attachments with it are intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege.

If you have received this email in error please notify the sender or [postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk)

The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council's position. Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.

Visit the Surrey County Council website - <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk>

\* \* \* \* \*

# Appendix 8

## Georgina Pacey

---

**From:** Planning-Farnham <Planning-Farnham@environment-agency.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 11 August 2016 16:24  
**To:** Georgina Pacey  
**Subject:** Sequential Testing of Sites Consultation  
**Attachments:** 160811 EA response - RBC Sequential Testing of Sites.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Georgina,  
Please find attached our response to the Runnymede Borough Council Strategic Sequential Testing of Sites.

Should you have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,  
Oliver

**Oliver Rathmill**  
**Sustainable Places | Planning Advisor**  
Environment Agency | South East | Thames

Our **climate change allowances** for planning were updated on 19 February 2016. The guidance is accessible here: [Flood risk assessment: Climate change allowances](#)

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else.

We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it.  
We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.  
Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

Ms Georgina Pacey  
Runnymede Borough Council  
Policy & Planning Department  
Civic Offices Station Road  
Addlestone  
Surrey  
KT15 2AH

**Our ref:** WA/2012/112747/SF-  
03/IS1-L01  
**Your ref:**  
**Date:** 11 August 2016

Dear Ms Pacey

### **Strategic Sequential Testing of Sites**

Thank you for contacting us on this matter. We have reviewed the following documents:

- Strategic Sequential Test, covering letter (June 2016)
- FINAL strategic sequential test
- 2016 interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) site assessments

It is vital that you have a robust, update, relevant and proportionate evidence base that will inform your local plan. Without this your local plan may not be deemed sound. From the limited information provided, we are pleased that you are preparing your evidence of the flood risk sequential test in an appropriate manner. We acknowledge that this is not a completed evidence set and that you are continuing to undertake further work. Nevertheless, we wish to provide the following comments for your consideration at this early stage.

#### **General Advice**

It is essential that you provide satisfactory evidence to the Planning Inspector reflecting your local circumstances. With regards to flood risk, generally local plan evidence bases comprise of several components including Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA - level 1), sequential testing of sites, a SFRA (level 2) (where appropriate), amongst other documentation.

All development sites (residential, employment, or otherwise) are subject to the flood risk sequential test. Within your submission you must clearly demonstrate how any promoted site has passed the flood risk sequential test.

Although your evidence base should be proportional, we wish to emphasise that you should provide sufficient information to illustrate your/the council's 'thought process' or 'reasoning' to us and the Inspector, especially regarding the flood risk sequential test. This will provide clarity and reassurance to us that you have considered all the relevant

Cont/d..



options adequately.

For example, we strongly recommend that you provide a copy of your flood risk sequential test methodology as part of your local plan evidence base submission. If required, we would welcome the opportunity to review and comment on it.

Furthermore, although you have provided us with a strategic sequential test for 145 sites and an accompanying covering letter, we would expect to see further clarification and additional evidence in any local plan submission. Specifically,

- 'discounting of sites' - We note that the 2016 interim SLAA covered a total of 264 sites. We recommend that you provide a flood risk overview of all sites considered in the strategic sequential testing of site within one table and that you include your justification for discounting certain sites located in more preferential location (in terms of flood risk). This table would not necessarily have to be as detailed as the current sequential testing of sites table you have submitted to us for review. However, it should identify what sites you will investigate in more detail – these sites would be included in the table you have submitted to us.
- While all sources of flooding have been considered it is not clear whether, and to what extent, the Council is giving weight to surface water and groundwater flooding when allocating sites
- The colour coding of sites, and accompanying explanation, is not clear. Please can you clarify this.
- Ranking of sites – we suggest that a column for the overall ranking of sites in terms of preference is added to the table.
- It is unclear whether the final Strategic Sequential Test document has considered climate change using the new climate exchange allowances. Perhaps your flood risk sequential test methodology provides further clarification on this matter.
- Sites with existing planning applications – while we recognize the role of such sites for consideration of your housing numbers it is not necessary to include these on the sequential testing of sites as this was deemed passed when planning permission was granted.

The strategic sequential test has been applied to 145 sites. 85 of the 145 are located in Flood Zone 1. 16 sites of 145 are located either wholly in Flood Zone 2, or have a mix of land in flood zones 1 and 2. Sites in flood zones 1 or 2 are being considered in the council's housing allocation. We note the exception to this rule is where planning permission has already been granted for a site in Flood Zone 3a or 3b. We understand there are constraints to providing all allocations within Flood Zone 1. Therefore sites in Flood Zone 2 are also being considered.

We welcome the overall strategic sequential approach to the allocation of sites. We are also pleased to see that all sources of flooding have been included in the strategic sequential test of sites. However, we would like to review your original list of sites and the reasons for discounting those that are perhaps located in more preferential location (in terms of flood risk).

### Site specific observations

While many of the sites within the sequential testing of sites match the details given in the site assessment documents on your website, we have noted a number are not consistent:

Site number	Issue
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site assessment constraints note that none of the site is in Flood Zones 3a or 3b but your spreadsheet shows 1% and 2% of the site is in these flood zones</li> </ul>
257	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site assessment constraints note that none of the site is in Flood Zone 2 but your spreadsheet shows 1% of the site is in this flood zone</li> </ul>
103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site assessment constraints note that none of the site is in Flood Zone 2 but your spreadsheet shows 25% of the site is in this flood zone</li> </ul>
251	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our detailed modelling indicates that this site is mostly within Flood Zone 1, not Flood Zone 2. A small section of the site lies within the 1 in 100 year plus 20% allowance flood plain. A small section of the site lies within Flood zone 3. The rest of the site is sited within Flood Zone 2.</li> </ul>
32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our detailed modelling indicates that this site is within Flood Zone 1, not Flood Zone 2. The site is shown to be outside of the 1 in 100 year plus 20% allowance flood plain. The site is shown to be partly in Flood Zone 1 and partly in Flood Zone 2.</li> </ul>
194	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our detailed modelling indicates that this site is entirely within Flood Zone 1. Site is within flood zone 2</li> </ul>
190	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our detailed modelling indicates that the 1% plus a 20% allowance will possibly impact on the north and east of this site.</li> </ul>
157	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site appears to contain 168 High Street, Egham, which has been put forward as site 194</li> <li>Our detailed modelling indicates that this site is entirely within Flood Zone 1. Site is within Flood Zone 2.</li> </ul>
237	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site recommendations regarding the application of the Flood Risk Sequential and Exception Tests for this proposed Traveller Site appear to be incorrectly carried out. <b>Please can you review this?</b></li> </ul>
38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site address is given as Thorpe Park Farm, Staines Road, Chertsey, however, the site appears to lie on Coldharbour Lane, Thorpe</li> </ul>
175	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The detailed modelling indicates 1% CC extent over much of the site However, the 1% extent is less than suggested in the SLAA Sequential Test</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site constraints note on the site assessment note indicates that it contains FZ2</li> </ul>

### Additional comments

We would like to take this opportunity to inform you we are presently re-modelling the River Thames, the River Wey and Chertsey Bourne. We also plan to model the Addlestone Bourne. We note from the Local Development Scheme (April 2016) that the Council is planning to submit the Local Plan to the Secretary of State in March 2017 and the Examination will after this date in 2017. We are aware that new flood data could impact the Council's evidence base and potential Soundness of the plan. We would be happy to meet with you to discuss this further.



### Climate Change Allowances

Following our comments above please find enclosed a copy of our Climate Change Guidance note.

### **Final comments**

Once again, thank you for contacting us. Our comments are based on our available records and the information submitted to us. Please quote our reference number, letter subject and letter date in any future correspondence.

We would like to work with you further on your Local Plan to ensure that all of the potential issues are satisfactorily addressed and to enable Runnymede Borough Council to have a robust, effective local plan which is reflective of national planning policy and your local evidence base.

If you have any queries please feel free to contact me.

Yours sincerely

**Mr Oliver Rathmill**  
**Sustainable Places | Planning Advisor**

Direct dial 0208 4747 682

E-mail [planning-farnham@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:planning-farnham@environment-agency.gov.uk)

# Appendix 9

## Georgina Pacey

---

**From:** Georgina Pacey  
**Sent:** 04 October 2016 10:41  
**To:** Rathmill, Oliver (Oliver.Rathmill@environment-agency.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** minutes following our conference call

Dear Oliver

Thank you for speaking with me about Runnymede's flooding evidence on Monday 26<sup>th</sup> September. I took some notes during the course of our phone call which I thought it would be helpful to send over so we have a record of key points agreed. Please can you review and let me know if you think that I have missed anything important.

**-Whether Runnymede needs to produce a stage 2 SFRA.** It was agreed that Runnymede would need to produce a stage 2 SFRA if any of the proposed allocations in the Local Plan would contain any land in flood zones 2 or 3. GP felt it was likely therefore that a stage 2 element would be required. In terms of the format of this document it was agreed that as Runnymede's stage 1 SFRA already contains detailed information on applying the exception test, that the stage 2 assessment could be limited to provide detailed site specific write ups for each of the sites with any land in flood zones 2 or 3, and that this alone should be sufficient. It was agreed that in identifying the sites which would be included in the stage 2 assessment, it was only the fluvial flood zones which were the determining factor although other sources of flooding would also need to be considered (albeit it in less detail) in those sites which were agreed to require a stage 2 assessment. The impact of the RTS would also need to be considered in the write ups.

**-Publication of the stage 1 SFRA-OR** asked if this was going to be published now that formal consultation with DfC partners had been completed. GP advised that this was dependent on when the DfC modelling was due to be released. If this was to happen in the coming weeks then RBC would probably hold off publication. However assuming that it is still the EA's intention to only release the new RTS modelling in the early part of next year, then RBC would go ahead and publish the stage 1 SFRA imminently. **ACTION:** OR to confirm whether timescale of letting LPAs see the new modelling in late 2016 and then publishing in the early part of 2017 was still the current timetable.

**-Automatic pass of the sequential test-way forward-** GP said that she felt that Runnymede may move away from a specified policy approach as suggested in F3/01 (p146) of the IOPA document although on a practical level, whether or not Runnymede is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply/ sufficient land for traveller pitches/sufficient land to meet B8 needs in flood zones 1 (or 1 and 2) at any given time will in reality play a significant role in whether Runnymede would allow a pass of the sequential test on a site by site basis. **Post meeting note/action:** GP to come up with some new suggested wording on this for the stage 1 SFRA and run past the EA for checking.

**-Strategic sequential test-** Agreed that Runnymede would wait to redraft this until it had sight of the amended climate change allowances which would be released with the RTS modelling. However in the interim, GP would work on drafting the strategic sequential test methodology and would send to the EA to agree.

-In regard to the colour coding of sites, it was agreed that the current use of colour coding was confusing. It was agreed that some form of colour coding would remain for the fluvial flood zones to help with the ordering but that this same colour coding system would not be used for other types of flood risk as the comments about other types of flood risk was aiming to give a factual summary and was less influential in determining the position of the site in the sequential test ranking. GP would confirm in the methodology what each of the colours used meant so it was clear to the reader.

-GP asked whether it was preferable to rank sites on the basis of the % of a site in each flood zone rather than the area of site in each flood zone. OR advised that in the sequential tests that he had reviewed, people tended to rank by %.

-OR suggested that the sites should be ordered from worst to best.

-GP queried OR references to more detailed modelling. She confirmed that for her draft sequential test she had referred to the quarterly releases of flood data by the EA as shown on the Flood Map for Planning and not more detailed modelling. OR advised that more detailed modelling should be looked at for sites with areas in flood zones 2 and 3 as the flooding map for planning was only indicative of when a planning application was required. **However if GP was going to wait for the RTS modelling to be released, as this modelling would replace all existing modelling, this may be able to be relied upon in isolation.**

**-Content required in the draft and submission Local Plan.** GP advised that the format of the Local Plan document was not yet decided although she envisaged that it would have a chapter relating to site allocations. In this chapter, for each allocation OR felt that a summary was needed to confirm to the reader how each allocated site had passed the sequential test. The underlying evidence base should also be referred to.

**-Future meetings:** GP advised OR that officers were currently reviewing the Local Plan timetable and she would let OR know over the coming weeks whether any amendments were to be made. GP was keen to arrange a meeting with the EA to discuss their Local Plan representation although this would be arranged when the timetabling work had been completed and would in all likelihood not be until later November/December 2016.

Do let me know if you think I have missed anything or if any changes are required. I am also not sure about the sentence in red so if you could let me know if what I have written here is correct, that would be great.

Kind regards

Georgina

**Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council**

**[georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk) | 01932 425248 | [www.runnymede.gov.uk](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk)**

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at [www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone)

Please Think Before You Print This

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

# Appendix 10

## Georgina Pacey

---

**From:** \_THM, Planning <Planning\_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 16 March 2017 11:09  
**To:** Georgina Pacey  
**Cc:** Cheryl Brunton  
**Subject:** RE: Update on Runnymede Local Plan

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Hi Georgina and Cheryl,  
Next Thursday afternoon is great. I have a room booked between 2-4pm.

In attendance from the EA will be myself, Neil Landricombe and Natalie Hyde from Partnership and Strategic Overview (flood risk); John Willmott-French (River Thames Scheme), Emma Langford from Integrated Environment Planning (water cycle study and water quality).

I agree with the following points of discussion and suggest the following running order:

- Water cycle study
- Our redrafted strategic sequential test methodology
- draft Local Plan flooding policy (and advice on the windfall sites policy)
- last round of queries on the SFRA (as set out in my email dated 28<sup>th</sup> February 2017)

Unfortunately, my colleague Francesca Taylor in Fisheries, Biodiversity and Geomorphology, is unable to attend. However, I may be able to answer some queries regarding the natural environment and would be happy to pass any of these onto her for comments at a later date. In addition, Emma will be able to offer comments regarding water quality.

I have asked colleagues to review the draft flooding policy in preparation for next week and will pass any comments I receive before Thursday for you to look at.

I look forward to meeting you again next week. If you have any questions beforehand please get in touch.

Kind regards  
Oliver

**Oliver Rathmill**  
**Sustainable Places | Planning Advisor**  
Environment Agency | South East | Thames

Our **climate change allowances** for planning were updated on 19 February 2016. The guidance is accessible here: [Flood risk assessment: Climate change allowances](#)

✉ Environment Agency, 4th Floor, Kings Meadow House, Kings Meadow Road, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 8DQ  
☎ 0208 4747 682  
📧 [planning\\_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk)



## ARE YOU AT RISK FROM FLOODING? Check your flood risk today



**From:** Georgina Pacey [mailto:Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk]

**Sent:** 13 March 2017 13:47

**To:** \_THM, Planning <Planning\_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk>; Rathmill, Oliver <Oliver.Rathmill@environment-agency.gov.uk>

**Cc:** Cheryl Brunton <cheryl.brunton@runnymede.gov.uk>

**Subject:** RE: Update on Runnymede Local Plan

Hi Oliver.

I could make next Thursday in the afternoon if this is any good? Just let me know what time suits you and your colleagues best. Cheryl will need to come back to me in terms of whether she can attend the meeting as she has other commitments but can we go ahead anyway and if Cheryl can make it then that is a bonus.

In terms of what we will be discussing, can I assume that you and your colleagues will be in a position to discuss the following:

- Our redrafted strategic sequential test methodology
- Water cycle study
- draft Local Plan flooding policy (and advice on the windfall sites policy)
- last round of queries on the SFRA (as set out in my email dated 28<sup>th</sup> February 2017)
- natural environment queries from us (if Cheryl is able to attend)

I note your comments regarding the updated lower Thames modelling and I am attending a workshop tomorrow where the outputs from the modelling will be discussed which I am sure will be helpful. Providing that there are no more delays to the release of the modelling, I can wait for it before finalising the SFRA, although if there are further delays, I will have to go ahead and publish it, with a commitment to updating when the modelling is released. This is because we have to have our Local Plan evidence and policies completed by the end of June 2017 to enable everything to go through the SA process prior to our draft plan consultation in the Autumn. Corporately, any delay to the Local Plan process is not acceptable.

I look forward to meeting with you and your colleagues next week.

Kind regards

Georgina

**Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council**

**[georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk) | 01932 425248 | [www.runnymede.gov.uk](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk)**

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at [www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone)

## Please Think Before You Print This

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

---

**From:** \_THM, Planning [[mailto:Planning\\_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk)]  
**Sent:** 13 March 2017 12:57  
**To:** Georgina Pacey  
**Cc:** Cheryl Brunton  
**Subject:** RE: Update on Runnymede Local Plan

Dear Georgina and Cheryl,

Thank you for this my apologies for the delay in getting in touch with you regarding dates. I have set out below our preferred date and time and additional relevant comments that I have had back from various colleagues.

### Meeting Date and Location

It would be great if you can come to us at our office in Reading as I believe that a face to face meeting with some of my colleagues would be very beneficial at this time. Our office is at [Kings Meadow House](#) and is only a few minutes walk from the Reading railway station. Car parking on site is available but often limited, there is a car park opposite, and another just further down the road at Tesco.

Unfortunately, I can only arrange the attendance of most of my colleagues for Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> March

### Thames Model

These are the comments that I have had back regarding the new River Thames model from our flood risk team:

The River Thames model will include new allowances. According to our latest programme, all model runs will be completed by May 2017. We will then undertake a review of the model prior to sign off.

As the SFRA will be used as an evidence base to support emerging policies in the Local Plan and site allocations, the SFRA should refer to the new climate change allowances that were published in February 2016 and the SFRA should also be updated where new modelling has been completed. If the document is published before the Thames model is available then we would wish to see the SFRA updated once the new model is available.

### Infrastructure and Water Cycle Study (WCS)

The comments you have provided regarding this topic have raised some concerns for us regarding your evidence base for your Local Plan that indicates further work is required to resolve them, if this is not in place it may lead to the Inspector finding you Plan unsound. I have asked a member of our technical team who works on this issue to be present at the meeting to explain more but I have provided some of their initial comments below and attached our guidance on WCS.

It is a concern that Runnymede BC do not deem it necessary to conduct an assessment of the potential impact that growth up to 2031 may have on the effluent-receiving waters. From a water quality perspective, if growth is to cause a deterioration in the water framework directive (WFD) status of the receiving waters, this would be unacceptable and a breach of this directive. At this current stage, there has been no evidence provided by the local authority to reassure us that growth is within the environmental capacity of the receiving rivers. It is the Inspector who will determine whether



the local plan is sound at the examination stage. One of the key tests is whether the plan is based on a robust and credible evidence base. Therefore at the very least a phase 1 Water Cycle Study assessment will need to be undertaken by the authority if they are to ensure their local plan is sound (see my previous email).

There appears to have been some confusion in the difference between environmental capacity and infrastructure capacity. Infrastructure capacity does not necessarily precede or inform the environmental capacity of the receiving waters. Regardless of whether a sewage treatment works is able to accommodate the increased effluent loads from growth, and able to maintain its current treatment standards, this does not tell us if the receiving waters can accommodate the increased effluent volume without causing a deterioration in WFD status. It is the responsibility of the local authority to ensure that planned growth does not lead to a detriment in WFD status.

Runnymede are correct in suggesting that a WCS will involve engagement with partners, namely the relevant sewage undertaker, the environment agency, and neighbouring local authorities. They mention geographic extent: we are primarily interested in the water bodies that receive effluent from proposed growth within the local authority boundary. However communication needs to occur with neighbouring authorities in cases where effluent from growth is due to be sent to STWS within neighbouring authorities or vice versa (cross boundary considerations). I imagine this ties in with the duty to comply/co-operate.

I hope the above comments are of use and that you are able to make the indicated date. If you have any further questions please get in touch.

Regards  
Oliver

**Oliver Rathmill**  
**Sustainable Places | Planning Advisor**  
Environment Agency | South East | Thames

Our **climate change allowances** for planning were updated on 19 February 2016. The guidance is accessible here: [Flood risk assessment: Climate change allowances](#)

✉ Environment Agency, 4th Floor, Kings Meadow House, Kings Meadow Road, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 8DQ  
☎ 0208 4747 682  
📧 [planning\\_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk)



**ARE YOU AT RISK FROM FLOODING?**  
Check your flood risk today



---

**From:** Georgina Pacey [<mailto:Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk>]  
**Sent:** 16 February 2017 12:39  
**To:** \_THM, Planning <[Planning\\_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk)>

Cc: Cheryl Brunton <[cheryl.brunton@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:cheryl.brunton@runnymede.gov.uk)>; Rathmill, Oliver <[Oliver.Rathmill@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Oliver.Rathmill@environment-agency.gov.uk)>

Subject: RE: Update on Runnymede Local Plan

Dear Oliver

Thank you for your email dated 9<sup>th</sup> February. Cheryl and I look forward to hearing from you in due course when you have a better idea of possible dates/times that you could meet with us. Our preference would be a meeting at the RBC offices if possible but we would be happy to come to your offices if this is easier for you in terms of ensuring that the relevant people from the EA can attend. In the alternative we are happy just to receive written comments from the EA on any policies that we draft and then arrange a conference call to iron out any points if this would be easier?

In terms of what Cheryl and I would be hoping to get out of any meeting/correspondence with the EA, we would hope to be able to get an idea of whether the draft policy wording that we will have sent you (this is looking more like mid March now) is acceptable to the EA, and identify any areas that the EA has any difficulties with or objection to. The ultimate aim is that we agree the policy wording for the natural environment and flooding policies with the EA as far as is possible in advance of our reg 19 consultation in the Autumn.

I am also hoping to discuss with you the revised strategic sequential test methodology that I have been working on and which I have attached with this email. I am looking to discuss/receive written comments on the draft methodology and understand any changes that the EA think need to be made before Runnymede and the EA can reach agreement on its contents. Once the methodology is agreed I will publish it on the website and hope to be able to start the Strategic Sequential Test process by the end of April if at all possible. I appreciate that this will be in advance of the EA publishing the updated modelling to reflect the new climate change allowances but given that the release of this modelling has been delayed (see comments in the para below on this) we can't really afford to wait too much longer to ensure that we have everything ready in time for our reg 19 consultation.

In regard to the strategic sequential test methodology, you will note from the attached methodology that it is the Council's intention to publish the final SFRA in March. This is because since your email of 9<sup>th</sup> February I have been told by my colleague Ian Maguire, who is working on the RTS scheme, that the revised modelling is now not expected until the summer. Given this delay, we have decided that it is sensible to finalise the SFRA now, rather than waiting another 6 months. The final published version will incorporate the comments and suggestions received by the EA during the consultation we carried out with DtC partners on the draft document (EA comments received on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2016). We acknowledge that both the SFRA and SST may need revising when the new climate change modelling is released in Summer.

I have tried to address all of the points you have made in your letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> August 2016 and during our call on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2016 in the revised SST methodology. Something that has been deleted entirely is the colour coding of sites which I agree is confusing. As such, this is not mentioned at all in the methodology. I hope that the revised approach is satisfactory to you as it deviates from what we tentatively agreed on 26<sup>th</sup> September to retain some form of colour coding for sites, but this is something that I have given significantly more thought to in the redrafted methodology in terms of how sites are ranked.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Kind regards

Georgina

**Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council**

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at [www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone)

Please Think Before You Print This

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

---

**From:** \_THM, Planning [[mailto:Planning\\_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk)]  
**Sent:** 09 February 2017 17:34  
**To:** Georgina Pacey  
**Cc:** Cheryl Brunton  
**Subject:** RE: Update on Runnymede Local Plan

Dear Georgina and Cheryl

Happy new year to you too. All is well here, thanks.

Many thanks for getting in touch with this update on your progress. It is very helpful and I have forwarded this to our relevant technical experts for their information and to prepare them for your draft policies and possible meeting dates.

I am happy to meet with you to discuss the relevant Local Plan policies and I have offered this out to our expert teams too. However, at this stage they may require seeing the draft policies and a bit more focused agenda for the meeting before they commit to joining us, as the discussion may not be so relevant to their particular remit. I hope to get back to you with a bit more clarity on dates and times soon but would appreciate your thoughts on what you wish to get out of the meeting and which topics you wish to focus on? Also, are you proposing to hold the meeting at your offices, or would you like to meet at ours?

I have also asked for an update on the latest modelling and hope to get back to you soon.

Finally, please note our new email address. The previous [planning-farnham](mailto:planning-farnham@environment-agency.gov.uk) and [planning-wallingford](mailto:planning-wallingford@environment-agency.gov.uk) addresses both still work but will be closing in the future. So please update your records to [planning\\_thm@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:planning_thm@environment-agency.gov.uk)

Kind regards  
Oliver

**Oliver Rathmill**  
**Sustainable Places | Planning Advisor**  
Environment Agency | South East | Thames

Our **climate change allowances** for planning were updated on 19 February 2016. The guidance is accessible here: [Flood risk assessment: Climate change allowances](#)

✉ Environment Agency, 4th Floor, Kings Meadow House, Kings Meadow Road, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 8DQ



**ARE YOU AT RISK FROM FLOODING?**  
Check your flood risk today



---

**From:** Georgina Pacey [<mailto:Georgina.Pacey@runnymede.gov.uk>]  
**Sent:** 07 February 2017 12:06  
**To:** Rathmill, Oliver <[Oliver.Rathmill@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Oliver.Rathmill@environment-agency.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Cheryl Brunton <[cheryl.brunton@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:cheryl.brunton@runnymede.gov.uk)>; Planning-Farnham <[Planning-Farnham@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Planning-Farnham@environment-agency.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Update on Runnymede Local Plan

Dear Oliver

Happy New Year, I hope that all is well at the Environment Agency. I am conscious that I have not spoken to you since before Christmas and thought it was a good time to update you on where we are with our new Local Plan. As you know, we went out to public consultation on our reg 18 document in July and August last year. All of the representations received have now been summarised and responded to. These summaries and responses can be viewed here: <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/6385/Planning-Committee-Agendas-2017> . The reps are in number order. The ID number given to the Environment Agency is 604 and the EA rep summary and response from the Council can be viewed in 'Planning Representations 5' (which can be viewed here: <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16186&p=0> ).

A summary of the number of representations received to our natural environment and flooding chapters, and an overview of the main points raised can be provided as follows (as reported to Members):

### **Chapter 8: Natural Environment**

No. of reps received which made comments on this chapter: **34**

Main issues raised:

3 different issues. Between 4 and 8 representors commented on each of those issues. 1) The majority supported the Preferred Approach for Protecting Sites with others neutral; none thought any of the other Approaches to be suitable. 2) There was support in principle for protecting the TBHSPA issue, but representors suggested that larger developments should bring forward bespoke SANG, and SANG could also be funded by section 106 agreements on top of CIL. 3) There was 80% support for the Landscape issue Preferred Approach.

One representation emphasised that the Plan should refer to the necessity of maintaining/enhancing/preserving the natural environment, with an emphasis on priority habitats, in order to minimise impacts on biodiversity as required by the NPPF (para. 117).

The Environment Agency, in their representation, also encouraged an approach of a further policy to provide the 'hook' for a Green Infrastructure Strategy (to include blue infrastructure).

While these are not material changes, officers are recommending that these matters are reviewed with the Working Group, to examine whether the changes should be made for the next stage of the Plan.

## **Chapter 12: Flooding**

No. of reps received which made comments on this chapter: **33**

Main issues raised:

7 different issues. Between 11 and 15 representors commented on each of those issues. In no case did the support for the Council's Preferred Approach fall below 83%.

The exception is in relation to Issue F3 which relates to how the Council will approach the sequential test in the Borough over the Plan period. 13 representations considered this issue. The preferred approach suggests that where the Council has evidence that there are insufficient sites in the Borough to meet certain identified needs (for example, housing needs) in flood zones 1, then an automatic pass of the sequential test could be given for developments proposed in flood zone 2, and where the Council's evidence demonstrates that there are insufficient sites available in flood zones 1 and 2 to meet identified needs, then an automatic pass of the sequential test would be given for proposals in flood zone 3a. 3 of the representors who commented on issue F3 did not agree with the Council's preferred approach including the Environment Agency who is a statutory consultee. As such, while 10 representations support the preferred approach officers and the Working Group will reconsider this policy approach during the policy development work which will occur this year.

Issue F4 Cumulative Impact of Minor Development. One objector asks Council to remove PD rights in flood zone 3b before adopting preferred approach (an approach not suggested in IOPA). Again, this will be explored with the Working Group prior to the regulation 19 consultation on the Local Plan later this year.

My colleague Cheryl Brunton (who leads on matters related to the natural environment) and I (who leads on matters related to flooding) are looking to address the points raised by the EA in the drafting of the relevant Local Plan policies. We are hoping to have some draft policy wording available for comment by the end of February to pass to the EA and then wondered if we could arrange a meeting with you and any relevant colleagues in mid March to discuss? We were thinking perhaps during the w/c 13<sup>th</sup> March or 20<sup>th</sup> March if that suits? Cheryl and I currently are currently free on the following dates and times:

Monday 13<sup>th</sup> March-PM only  
Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> March-all day  
Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> March-all day  
Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> March-all day  
Friday 17<sup>th</sup> March-not free  
Monday 20<sup>th</sup> March- all day  
Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> March-PM only  
Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> March-any time from 11am  
Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> March-PM only  
Friday 24<sup>th</sup> March-any time

At this meeting we also hope to be able to give you an update on where we are with the latest Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and strategic sequential test that will accompany this work.

I also hope to be able to update you on where we are with our SFRA. As you know this is drafted and published on the website. The EA and Surrey County Council are broadly satisfied with its contents. We made the decision not to finalise the document until we have the latest modelling that will accompany the work on the River Thames Scheme and which I understand will include information relating to the latest climate change allowances? Are you able to provide confirmation in this regard and also advise when we can expect to receive this modelling. I thought we were meant to receive in January but I have heard nothing. As I am sure you can understand, I am keen to publish the SFRA in final form but it seems logical to me having given the matter some thought to wait until the expected modelling is published. Any advice that you can provide in this regard would be much appreciated.

I hope that this information is helpful and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Kind regards

Georgina

**Georgina Pacey | Assistant Planning Policy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council**

**[georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:georgina.pacey@runnymede.gov.uk) | 01932 425248 | [www.runnymede.gov.uk](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk)**

Runnymede is transforming Addlestone-find out more at [www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk/addlestone)

Please Think Before You Print This

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

This message has been scanned and no issues discovered.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else.

We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it.

We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

This message has been scanned and no issues discovered.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else.

We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it.

We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

This message has been scanned and no issues discovered.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else.

We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it.

We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

# Appendix 11



Meeting with Owen Neal, Sport England, on 13/12/2016 regarding Playing Pitches Strategy and Sport England's response to the Runnymede Borough Council Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches consultation


Attendees

RBC Community Development – Suzi Bowen

RBC Planning Policy – Anna Murray

Sport England Planning Manager – Owen Neal

- Meeting began with an overview of why and how the Playing Pitch Strategy was being produced by Runnymede Borough Council. Representations were made by both Owen Neal (ON) and Richard Fordham (RF) from Sport England during the Council's Local Plan Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches (IOPA) consultation relating to the need for an up to date Playing Pitch Strategy and an up to date built sports facilities strategy in order for a robust and up to date evidence base. Anna Murray (AM) had called a meeting with the Council's Community Development team and Sport England to discuss key points raised in Sport England's representation and also to agree how Runnymede could positively respond to the comments made by Sport England.
- ON and Suzi Bowen (SB) discussed the structure, content and any other matters concerning the Playing Pitches Strategy. ON advised SB on what he believed was important in the strategy and the process of undertaking it. It was agreed that a Stage A steering group meeting would be set up with National Governing Bodies for sport and other interested parties from the Council in the New Year.
- ON asked AM how the estimated completion of the Playing Pitches Strategy would fit in with the Local Plan timetable. AM clarified that the emerging Local Plan had been delayed and the team would not be submitting for examination until Christmas 2017 therefore the estimated completion month of June should provide sufficient time for the Planning Policy and Strategy team to consider the recommendations made in the development of their Local Plan policies.
- ON and AM discussed Sport England's representations that had been made during the IOPA consultation. ON clarified that Active Design are a set of design principles developed by Sport England in partnership with Public Health England. The aim is to support local authorities in planning for healthy and active communities. AM asked whether there were any best practice examples of local standards. ON clarified that Sport England do not support a standards-based approach to the provision of indoor or outdoor sports facilities.
- SB said that she would forward a draft Playing Pitch Strategy that was put together by her line manager last year to ON for comments to be made. ON said that he would be happy to help with any guidance or queries regarding the Playing Pitch Strategy and would put us in contact with his colleague Warren Tucker who would be able to assist on the built sports facilities strategy.



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](mailto:planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk)

[www.runnymede.gov.uk](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk)

2017

