

# Runnymede 2035

## Meeting the Duty to Co-operate



October 2015

*This page has been left intentionally blank*

## Contents

Chapter	Chapter heading	Page
1	Introduction	2
2	This Duty to Co-Operate Statement	7
3	Consultation on the draft Scoping Framework	8
4	Overview of strategic matters to be addressed in this statement	9
5	Housing	15
6	Gypsies and Travellers	21
7	Economic Development	25
8	Green Belt	30
9	Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA	35
10	Transport	39
11	Flooding	43
12	Infrastructure: Education; Health; Utilities; Community and Culture; Open Space and Recreation	46
13	Other strategic matters not listed in chapters 5-12	50
	Appendix 1-representations made during the consultation period and Officer responses	52

## 1.0 Introduction

### The Duty to Co-Operate

1.1 The Duty to Co-operate (DtC) is a requirement of the Localism Act 2011. Its aim is to ensure that local planning authorities engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis, so that strategic, cross boundary matters are dealt with effectively in individual Local Plans. Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) describes strategic matters as follows:

*“(a) sustainable development or use of land that has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas, including (in particular) sustainable development or use of land for or in connection with infrastructure that is strategic and has or would have significant impact on at least two planning areas; and*

*(b) sustainable development or use of land in a two-tier area if the development or use (i) is a county matter, (ii) has or would have a significant impact on a county matter”.*

1.2 Both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (2014) make reference to the DtC.

1.3 Paragraph 178 of the NPPF states that public bodies have a duty to co-operate on planning issues that overlap administrative boundaries, particularly those relating to strategic priorities. These are defined at para 156 of the NPPF as follows:

- Homes and jobs needed in the area;
- Provision of commercial, retail and leisure development;
- Provision of infrastructure for transport , telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management and the provision of minerals and energy;
- Provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and,
- Climate change mitigation and adaption, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.

1.4 The PPG states that local planning authorities should make every effort to secure necessary co-operation on strategic cross boundary matters before submitting a Local Plan for examination. It is also explained that activities falling within the Duty include those that prepare the way for, or support, the preparation of Local Plan documents, and can relate to any stage of the Local Plan process.

## Runnymede

1.5 Runnymede Borough Council is preparing a single Local Plan that will guide development in the Borough up to 2035. The major milestones of the Local Plan adoption timetable are as set out below.

- Completion of evidence gathering, identification of issues, preparation of Issues and Options document;
- Public Participation on the Issues and Options and SA Report;
- Publish Draft Submission Local Plan;
- Submission of Local Plan, SA report and Policies Map; and
- Adoption of Local Plan.

1.6 In preparing the Local Plan, the Council has a legal duty to co-operate with certain prescribed bodies where relevant. These are defined in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012<sup>1</sup> and are as follows:

- Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Mayor of London
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Homes and Communities Agency
- each clinical commissioning group established under s.14D of the NHS Service Act 2006
- NHS Commissioning Board (known as NHS England for operational purposes since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013)
- Office of Rail Regulation (now Office of Rail and Road)
- Transport for London
- Each Integrated Transport Authority
- Each highway authority within the meaning of section 1 of the Highways Act 1980
- *Marine Management Organisation (not relevant).*

1.7 Additionally, the Council is required to co-operate with the Local Enterprise Partnership (for Runnymede, this is the Enterprise M3 LEP) and the Local Nature Partnership (Surrey LNP).

1.8 In practice, co-operation should produce effective and deliverable policies on strategic cross boundary matters. Runnymede has been advised<sup>2</sup> that effective co-

---

<sup>1</sup> As amended by The National Treatment Agency (Abolition) and the Health and Social Care Act 2012 (Consequential, Transitional and Saving Provisions) Order 2013

<sup>2</sup> Runnymede Borough Council Inspector's Conclusion Letter 29<sup>th</sup> April 2014

operation is likely to require sustained joint working and there should be clear outcomes, one way or another. To achieve this a robust framework or methodology within which co-operation can be progressed and monitored, in respect of frequency but also bodies to be involved, issues to be addressed and outcomes to be anticipated, is essential. The Council must demonstrate co-operation, co-ordination and continuous engagement to satisfy the duty placed upon it.

- 1.9 In particular, it has been highlighted that there are six key elements of co-operation that Runnymede Borough Council will need to demonstrate in respect of engagement with any identified relevant body. Key lessons in respect of each of these elements have been set out in Examination Inspectors' letters, as follows:

Whether engagement has been **constructive**.

- Show how a concerted effort to address the issues around strategic priorities has been made;
- Records of meetings must show how the likelihood of effective co-operation has been improved or how the matter has been progressed in any significant way;
- Any discussions or issues that challenge the Council's existing (predetermined) strategy should not be precluded; and
- Work cannot be undertaken following submission of a Local Plan to make it legally compliant.

Whether engagement has been **active**.

- Demonstrate that the Council has been sufficiently active in trying to garner co-operation; and,
- Record actions taken related to progressing the strategic issues.

Whether engagement has been **ongoing**.

- Demonstrate that co-operation started with "initial thinking" (NPPF para 181) and provide evidence.

Whether engagement has been **collaborative**.

- Appropriate mechanisms to be put in place to engender co-operation, e.g. Joint Committees established specifically to address strategic planning issues; proposed joint planning policies; and signed Memoranda of Understanding; and,
- Have clear objectives concerning what the Council is seeking to achieve through co-operation.

Whether engagement has been **diligent**.

- Demonstrate that an in-depth analysis of the strategic issues facing the local planning authorities in the wider area has been undertaken;
- Prepare a robust assessment of how those issues should be addressed.

Whether engagement has been of **mutual benefit** (the broad outcomes).

- Even if it is not possible to achieve a high level of mutual benefit, then at least demonstrate that it has been sought, e.g. jointly commissioned documents proposed.

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

- 1.10 As part of the overarching framework to facilitate co-operation, following a meeting in March 2014 attended by the Leaders, Planning Chairman/Portfolio holders, Chief Executives and Heads of Planning from all of the Surrey Districts and Boroughs and the County Council, a resolution was reached to move forward with a joint partnership and document known as the Local Strategic Statement (LSS), to allow County wide priorities and opportunities to be identified as a way to assist in meeting this duty to co-operate. That resolution led to the production of a draft Memorandum of Understanding for a LSS, a draft Terms of Reference for the SSPIP (consisting of the Leaders of the Surrey Councils) and a paper describing the scope, goals and timetables for the LSS itself.
- 1.11 The Memorandum of Understanding was signed by Runnymede Borough Council's Leader in July 2014, and eight other Surrey Boroughs and Districts have since signed, or resolved to sign the Memorandum to reinforce the framework for Co-operation within Surrey.
- 1.12 The first part of the LSS work is the completion of a consistent and compatible evidence base at the early stages of the Local Plan making work in the County. In summary, the LSS has 4 key strands:
  - The production of collaborative evidence on housing, through the completion of up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs) across the County with, as far as possible, compatible methodologies. The collaborative evidence will be used to form a combined document stitching together the individual SHMAs from the resultant Housing Market Areas (HMAs), and benchmarking any differences in methodology or assumptions to ensure as much consistency as possible is achieved;
  - The production of collaborative evidence on Green Belt, through the completion of up to date Green Belt Reviews across the County with, as far as possible, compatible methodologies. The collaborative evidence will be used to form a combined document stitching together the individual Green Belt Reviews, and benchmarking any differences in methodology to ensure as much consistency as possible is achieved;

- Marrying the above collaborative evidence with the collaborative evidence which already exists across the County on economic needs, taken from existing work done by the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) in their Strategic Economic Plans and Surrey Futures in their own plans; and
- The production of a collaborative Surrey Infrastructure Study (SIS) (previously the Surrey Infrastructure Plan), commissioned from AECOM and using published Infrastructure Delivery Plans (IDPs), the most up to date information on housing and economic forecasting and primary data gathered from partners and statutory undertakers for infrastructure in the area.

1.13 The key outcome of this strand of co-operation will be a document setting out common priorities on strategic matters which can be used in local plans and associated examinations across the County.

1.14 This work, while making a significant contribution to the quality and outcome of plan making in the county of Surrey, is not a substitute for the broader co-operation needed to deliver strategic outcomes. In particular, more focussed, outcome driven work with key partners on key issues will be necessary, as well as further work with other partners and bodies outside of the County boundary, including other neighbouring authorities and those within London.



## **2.0 This Duty to Co-operate Statement**

- 2.1 Government guidance recommends that, to assist compliance with the Duty, local planning authorities 'scope' the strategic matters of the Local Plan document at the commencement of the preparation process. This involves taking account of the geographical extent of each specific strategic matter, e.g. the housing market area, and identifying the prescribed and other bodies that need to be engaged with in respect of it.
- 2.2 The Borough Council has drawn up this Duty to Co-operate Statement to set out how it intends to fulfil its obligations relating to the Duty in preparing its new Local Plan.
- 2.3 The Statement is intended to form a constituent part of the background evidence to the Local Plan and will fulfil several significant roles. In particular, it:
  - should ensure that all of the strategic issues affecting the Borough and the wider area are identified at the earliest stage of plan preparation;
  - sets out the framework for appropriate engagement with other authorities and bodies;
  - should permit consultation with those authorities and bodies that may highlight other issues, bodies or mechanisms that have not been identified for engagement to date by the Borough Council.
- 2.4 The Statement is divided into a series of assessments, one for each strategic issue. This approach should assist in ensuring that the Statement framework is clear to all parties who have an interest in co-operating with Runnymede on relevant cross boundary issues.
- 2.5 The Council will continue to update the Statement to reflect ongoing co-operation throughout the plan preparation process. The Council is maintaining a database of Duty to Co-operate correspondence, meetings, and other communications, and the outcomes arising from these. Subsequent versions of the Statement will demonstrate how the Borough Council has engaged with other organisations and the outcomes of that engagement, including their effect upon the development of the Runnymede Local Plan. Also requiring to be considered will be the matter of how ongoing collaborative working arrangements can be established.
- 2.6 The ways in which the Council has sought to meet the Duty to Co-operate throughout Plan preparation will be set out in a written statement supporting the Local Plan when it is submitted to the Secretary of State.

### **3.0 Consultation on the draft Scoping Framework**

- 3.1 Consultation on the draft Scoping Statement was carried out between 10<sup>th</sup> April and 11<sup>th</sup> May 2015.
- 3.2 The Council requested that respondents to this consultation addressed the following questions:
- 1) Have all relevant cross boundary strategic matters been identified?
  - 2) Have all the required prescribed bodies, local authorities and consultees been identified?
  - 3) Has the Council identified the most appropriate processes and mechanisms to encourage effective involvement in the development of the Local Plan?
  - 4) Do you have any other comments on the Council's proposals for engaging with prescribed bodies, local authorities and consultees?
- 3.3 The comments received during this consultation and the officer responses to them can be viewed in Appendix 1 of this document.

#### 4.0 Overview of strategic matters to be addressed in this statement

4.1 At Table 1 below, the Council has identified the strategic issues that need to be addressed with each Duty to Co-operate body as part of preparing the Local Plan. The table also identifies those parts of the Duty to Co-operate framework relevant to each of the identified organisations.

4.2 The table identifies that duty to cooperate partners have been split into the following categories:

**Core Local Authority partners:** The Local Authority partners considered to have the strongest links with Runnymede for a particular strategic issue.

**Secondary Local Authority partners:** The Local Authority partners that have notable links with Runnymede for a particular strategic issue.

**Other potential Local Authority partners:** The Local Authority partners that may have some links with Runnymede in relation to a particular strategic issue, although the strength of these links is more limited.

**Interested Local Authorities:** Local Authorities who have expressed an interest in being kept informed about the Council’s progress with a particular strategic issue although Runnymede considers that it is unlikely that the Local Authority in question would be a partner for future engagement under the Duty to Cooperate.

**Duty to co-operate partners:** Partner bodies/agencies (other than Local Authorities), who the Council would seek to engage with under the Duty to Cooperate in relation to certain strategic issues.

**Table 1: Identified ‘Duty to Co-operate’ Issues of Relevance and Co-operation Partners**

Strategic Issue	Duty to Co-operate Body
Housing	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b> Spelthorne Borough Council (as part of the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA)</p> <p><b>Secondary Local Authority partners</b> Elmbridge Borough Council London Borough of Hounslow Woking Borough Council</p> <p><b>Other potential Local Authority partners</b> Bracknell Forest Borough Council Epsom and Ewell Borough Council</p>

Strategic Issue	Duty to Co-operate Body
	<p>           Guildford Borough Council            Hart District Council            London Borough of Hillingdon            London Borough of Richmond upon Thames            Mole Valley District Council            Reigate and Banstead Borough Council            Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames            Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead            Rushmoor Borough Council            Slough Borough Council            South Bucks District Council            Surrey Heath Borough Council            Tandridge District Council            Waverley Borough Council            Other HMAs – dependent on need.         </p> <p> <b>Duty to cooperate consultees</b>            Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership            Greater London Authority (GLA)            Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)            Network Rail            Surrey County Council (including the Adult Social Care and Public Health teams)            Transport for London         </p>
<b>Gypsies and Travellers</b>	<p> <b>Core Local Authority partners</b>            Elmbridge Borough Council            Epsom and Ewell Borough Council            Guildford Borough Council            Mole Valley District Council            Reigate and Banstead Borough Council            Spelthorne Borough Council            Surrey Heath Borough Council            Tandridge District Council            Waverley Borough Council            Woking Borough Council         </p> <p> <b>Other potential Local Authority partners</b>            Bracknell Forest Borough Council            London Borough of Hillingdon            London Borough of Hounslow            Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead         </p>

Strategic Issue	Duty to Co-operate Body
	<p><b>Interested Local Authorities</b> Slough Borough Council</p> <p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b> Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership Friends, Families and Travellers Greater London Authority (GLA) Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Network Rail Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain Surrey County Council</p>
<p><b>Economic Development</b></p>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b> Elmbridge Borough Council London Borough of Hillingdon London Borough of Hounslow Spelthorne Borough Council Woking Borough Council</p> <p><b>Secondary Local Authority partners</b> Bracknell Forest Borough Council Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Surrey Heath Borough Council</p> <p><b>Interested Local Authorities</b> Slough Borough Council</p> <p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b> Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership Greater London Authority (GLA) Heathrow Airport Holdings Network Rail Surrey County Council Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership Transport for London</p>

Strategic Issue	Duty to Co-operate Body
<p><b>Green Belt</b></p>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b>  Elmbridge Borough Council  Epsom and Ewell Borough Council  Guildford Borough Council  Mole Valley District Council  Reigate and Banstead Borough Council  Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  Spelthorne Borough Council  Surrey Heath Borough Council  Tandridge District Council  Waverley Borough Council  Woking Borough Council</p> <p><b>Secondary Local Authority partners</b>  Bracknell Forest Borough Council  London Borough of Hounslow  London Borough of Hillingdon</p> <p><b>Other interested Local Authorities</b>  Slough Borough Council</p> <p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b>  Greater London Authority (GLA)  Surrey County Council</p>
<p><b>Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA</b></p>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b>  Bracknell Forest Borough Council  Elmbridge Borough Council  Guildford Borough Council  Hampshire County Council  Hart District Council  Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  Rushmoor Borough Council  Surrey Heath Borough Council  Waverley Borough Council  Woking Borough Council  Wokingham Borough Council  Spelthorne Borough Council</p> <p><b>Interested Local Authorities</b>  Slough Borough Council</p>

Strategic Issue	Duty to Co-operate Body
	<p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b>  Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership  Environment Agency  Greater London Authority (GLA)  Natural England  Surrey County Council  Surrey Nature Partnership  Transport for London</p>
<p><b>Transport</b></p>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b>  Elmbridge Borough Council  Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  Spelthorne Borough Council  Surrey Heath Borough Council  Woking Borough Council</p> <p><b>Secondary Local Authority partners</b>  London Borough of Hillingdon  London Borough of Hounslow  Slough Borough Council</p> <p><b>Other interested Local Authority partners</b>  Mole Valley District Council  Slough Borough Council</p> <p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b>  Civil Aviation Authority  Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership  Greater London Authority (GLA)  Heathrow Airport Holdings  Highways England  Network Rail  Office of Rail and Road  Surrey County Council  Transport for London</p>
<p><b>Flooding</b></p>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b>  Elmbridge Borough Council  London Borough of Richmond upon Thames  Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames  Spelthorne Borough Council</p>

Strategic Issue	Duty to Co-operate Body
	<p>Woking Borough Council</p> <p><b>Secondary Local Authority partners</b>  Surrey Heath Borough Council  South Bucks District Council  Slough Borough Council</p> <p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b>  Environment Agency  Greater London Authority (GLA)  Surrey County Council  Surrey Nature Partnership</p>
<p><b>Infrastructure: Education;  Health; Utilities;  Community and Culture;  Open Space and  Recreation</b></p>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b>  Elmbridge Borough Council  Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  Spelthorne Borough Council  Surrey Heath Borough Council  Woking Borough Council</p> <p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b>  Affinity Water  Ashford and St Peters NHS Trust  British Gas  Enterprise M3 LEP  Environment Agency  Network Rail  NHS England  North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group  Royal Holloway University of London  Southern Electric  Southern Gas Networks  Sport England  Strode's College  Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust  Surrey County Council  Surrey Nature Partnership  Telecoms operators  Thames Water  Windsor, Ascot and Maidenhead Clinical  Commissioning Group</p>



## 5.0 Housing

### 5.1 The Issue and the Need for Involvement

<p><b>The Issue</b></p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>The Outcome</b></p>	<p>The intended outcomes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The production of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), to supersede the SHMA produced in 2009;</li> <li>-The production of a Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) during the early stages of plan preparation (and then where necessary during the lifetime of the Plan) to identify the land in Runnymede that is available and suitable for different types of development, including housing;</li> <li>-Alongside Spelthorne BC, to meet the objectively assessed needs (OAN) for housing within the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA;</li> <li>-If, on completion of the relevant evidence it becomes clear that either Runnymede or Spelthorne is not able to meet their agreed proportion of the OAN within their Local Authority area, they would first need to explore, through cross boundary working, if the other could accommodate any unmet need. If the two Authorities cannot meet the OAN between them, this HMA grouping would need to approach neighbouring authorities, starting with those that fall within other HMAs that have the strongest links with the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA to see if they could help meet any unmet needs. These authorities have been identified as Elmbridge, Hounslow and Woking Boroughs;</li> <li>-If the full OAN cannot be met in the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA, the implications of this will need to be clearly understood; and,</li> <li>- To deliver a sustainable housing strategy that will deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive mixed communities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who is involved</b></p>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b> Spelthorne Borough Council (as part of the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA)</p> <p><b>Secondary Local Authority partners</b> Elmbridge Borough Council London Borough of Hounslow</p>

	<p>Woking Borough Council</p> <p><b>Other potential Local Authority partners</b></p> <p>Bracknell Forest Borough Council  Epsom and Ewell Borough Council  Guildford Borough Council  Hart District Council  London Borough of Hillingdon  Mole Valley District Council  Reigate and Banstead Borough Council  Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames  Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  Rushmoor Borough Council  Slough Borough Council  South Bucks District Council  Surrey Heath Borough Council  Tandridge District Council  Waverley Borough Council  Other HMAs – dependent on need.</p> <p><b>Duty to cooperate consultees</b></p> <p>Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership  Greater London Authority (GLA)  Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)  Network Rail  Surrey County Council (including the Adult Social Care and Public Health teams)  Transport for London</p>
<p><b>Methods for Engagement</b></p>	<p>-meetings/discussions with relevant local authorities and bodies during the preparation of the evidence (SLAA and SHMA in particular) including engagement through the SHMA Joint Member Liaison Group (Steering Group);</p> <p>-request comments from local authorities and relevant bodies on the SHMA and SLAA methodologies and the draft evidence;</p> <p>- meetings/discussions/correspondence (verbal and email) with relevant authorities/ bodies at officer level, and at Member level if necessary and when appropriate as strategy and policies are being developed (including through the SHMA Joint Member Liaison Group);</p> <p>-Opportunity for written comments to be made on proposed evidence, allocations and policies during the public consultation stages of the Local Plan;</p> <p>-Stakeholder events as appropriate; and,</p> <p>-Engagement through the Surrey Local Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership (SSPIP) and engagement</p>

	<p>through joint working groups arising from the SSPIP or other co-operative work with other partners.</p> <p>Please note that the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (December 2014) sets out how the Council intends to engage with the community throughout the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>
--	---

## 5.2 The Stages for Involvement

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
<p><b>Initial Thinking</b></p> <p><b>Now and To Date</b></p>	<p>a) Ongoing discussions relating to the content of the joint SHMA with Spelthorne Borough Council.</p> <p>b) Formation of SHMA Joint Member Liaison Group with Spelthorne Borough Council and agreement of Terms of Reference (December 2014).</p> <p>c) SHMA Stage 1 Report: Duty to Co-operate stakeholder event held in August 2014 with relevant authorities and bodies to discuss methodology and proposed HMA grouping.</p> <p>d) Planning Stakeholder Meeting, presenting findings of the draft SHMA work to members and key officers Runnymede BC. Invitation extended to officers and key members at Spelthorne BC in view of partnership in SHMA (December 2014).</p>	<p>a) Progression of a joint SHMA and identification of the OAN for the HMA.</p> <p>b) Member Liaison Group, governed by its Terms of Reference to provide a joint forum under the duty to co-operate for exploring how the objectively assessed need for housing in Runnymede-Spelthorne Housing Market Area (HMA) could be delivered.</p> <p>c) To help establish whether SHMA methodology is sound and whether the emerging conclusions on the HMA geography are accepted.</p> <p>d) To make Members and key officers aware of the SHMA methodology being followed and the key emerging findings and to provide an opportunity for Members and officers to ask questions.</p> <p>e) To seek views on whether it is agreed that the draft report follows national policy and guidance and whether the conclusions are supported.</p> <p>f) To establish a consistent approach to assessing land supply across the</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
	<p>e) SHMA Stage 2 Report: DtC stakeholder consultation event(s) with local authorities and other relevant bodies on draft report in May/June 2015.</p> <p>f) Agreement of joint SLAA methodology with Spelthorne Borough Council (August 2015), at the SHMA Joint Member Liaison Group.</p> <p>g) SLAA: Consultation on the methodology with relevant authorities and bodies in Sept 2015.</p> <p>h) Continuing work to produce collaborative evidence on housing across the County as part of the LSS.</p>	<p>HMA.</p> <p>g) To seek views on whether it is agreed that the SLAA methodology is compliant with national policy and guidance.</p> <p>h) To understand the level of housing need and housing land supply across the County.</p>
<p><b>Preparation of the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Spring 2014-Autumn 2015</b></p>	<p>a) Completion of a NPPF compliant SHMA with Spelthorne Borough Council (anticipated October 2015).</p> <p>b) Continuing to produce collaborative evidence of housing need through the SSPIP as part of the LSS.</p> <p>c) Discussions on the Borough's housing land supply, potential maximum housing number and potential spatial options with Spelthorne Borough in particular following the completion of Runnymede's 2015 SLAA.</p>	<p>a) To identify the OAHN that exists across the HMA.</p> <p>b) Creation of a common picture across Surrey in relation to housing needs. Additional working with other bodies and partners beyond the Surrey County boundary may also be required.</p> <p>c) Seek agreement with Spelthorne on the amount of land available in Runnymede Borough to meet housing needs following completion of the SLAA in Runnymede.</p> <p>d) In particular to reach agreement with Spelthorne in terms of how much of the identified OAN for the HMA can be met in Runnymede (Spelthorne is</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
	<p>d) Discussions with Spelthorne BC to agree an approach to meeting the OAN.</p> <p>e) Emerging Issues and Options to be circulated and discussed with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies.</p>	<p>at a different stage of Plan preparation and has a different timetable moving forwards meaning that discussions relating to Spelthorne's land supply capacity will have to follow at a later date).</p> <p>d) Ultimately in the event that the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA is not able to meet all of its OAN, Member Liaison Group will engage with neighbouring HMAs to establish whether unmet need can be met outside of the HMA.</p> <p>e) Confirmation that the Issues and Options are consistent with any agreed strategic approach.</p>
<p><b>Consultation on the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Autumn 2015/ Winter 2015/16</b></p>	<p>a) Seeking comments on Issues and Options and the supporting evidence base.</p> <p>b) If, on the basis of the evidence produced to date it is concluded that there is likely to be a shortfall across the HMA in meeting the OAN, Runnymede will, with Spelthorne, (through the Member Liaison Group) continue to discuss with other relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies in adjoining HMAs.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede to discuss the Issues and Options with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies during the consultation as necessary.</p> <p>a) The consultation will provide the opportunity for feedback from Duty to Co-operate bodies on the proposed Issues and Options.</p> <p>b) To ensure that any unmet need from the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA is met in adjoining/nearby areas.</p>
<p><b>Preparation of the Pre-Submission Plan</b></p> <p><b>Summer/Autumn 2016</b></p>	<p>a) Discussions on the representations made, and emerging draft Plan policies, and on any additional evidence with relevant Local Authorities and/or other bodies if appropriate.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede will discuss the Issues and Options representations with the Duty to Co-operate bodies and seek to agree a way forward so that all parties can agree that the Plan is sound.</p> <p>a) Seek to agree final proposed policy wordings related to the issue of</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
	b) Use of the SSPIP and other collaborative working arrangements as appropriate.	housing. b) To ensure effective and collaborative working where possible with relevant Authorities.
<b>Publication of the Pre-Submission Plan</b> <b>Winter 2016/17</b>	a) To facilitate comments to be made to the Examination Inspector as necessary	a) Production of Statements of Common Ground and/or Memorandums of Understanding where appropriate to support joint outcomes

## 6.0 Gypsies and Travellers

### 6.1 The Issue and the Need for Involvement

<b>The Issue</b>	<p>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 Green Belt and flooding constraints.</p>
<b>The Outcome</b>	<p>The intended outcomes are:          -The production of a Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA), to supersede the North Surrey GTAA produced in 2007; and,          -That the identified need for Runnymede will be met within the Borough boundary.</p>
<b>Who is involved</b>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b>          Elmbridge Borough Council          Epsom and Ewell Borough Council          Guildford Borough Council          Mole Valley District Council          Reigate and Banstead Borough Council          Spelthorne Borough Council          Surrey Heath Borough Council          Tandridge District Council          Waverley Borough Council          Woking Borough Council</p> <p><b>Other potential Local Authority partners</b>          Bracknell Forest Borough Council          London Borough of Hillingdon          London Borough of Hounslow          Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead</p> <p><b>Interested Local Authorities</b>          Slough Borough Council</p> <p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b>          Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership          Friends, Families and Travellers          Greater London Authority (GLA)          Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)          Network Rail          Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain          Surrey County Council</p>
<b>Methods for Engagement</b>	<p>- meetings/discussions with relevant local authorities and</p>

	<p>bodies during the preparation of a Surrey-wide TAA methodology;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- meetings/discussions with relevant local authorities and bodies during the preparation of the TAA;</li> <li>- request comments from local authorities and relevant bodies on draft TAA;</li> <li>- meetings/discussions/correspondence (verbal and email) with relevant authorities/ bodies at officer level, and at Member level as appropriate as strategy and policies are being developed;</li> <li>- Opportunity for written comments on proposed evidence, allocations and policies during the public consultation stages of the Local Plan; and,</li> <li>- meet with the Surrey Officers Gypsy and Travellers Group to discuss issues arising in relation to travellers as appropriate.</li> </ul> <p>Please note that the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (December 2014) sets out how the Council intends to engage with the community throughout the preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to setting up a Member Liaison Group if a need for further joint working at Member level with other authorities is identified.</p>
--	---

## 6.2 The Stages for Involvement

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
<p><b>Initial Thinking</b></p> <p><b>Now and To Date</b></p>	<p>a) Runnymede TAA published September 2014.</p> <p>b) Discussions relating to any relevant proposed or emerging evidence base from other Local Authorities.</p>	<p>a) Identification of the level of need for traveller pitches in Runnymede Borough.</p> <p>b) Clarification as to whether there are any cross boundary strategic issues in relation to planning for the needs of Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>b) The identification of whether there is a need for any joint evidence base. This is considered unlikely however as the County’s Boroughs and Districts worked together to devise a Countywide Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) methodology, which, with some minor modifications</p>



Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
		to take account of particular local circumstances, has been used across the County by the individual Authorities.
<p><b>Preparation of the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Spring 2014-Autumn 2015</b></p>	<p>a) Emerging Issues and Options to be circulated and discussed with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies.</p> <p>b) Production of collaborative evidence through the LSS.</p> <p>c) Discussions with neighbouring authorities, if relevant, to determine whether they are able to assist in meeting any of Runnymede's unmet need for permanent pitches/plots or, if Runnymede has spare capacity, whether any other Surrey boroughs need assistance meeting their unmet need for pitches.</p> <p>d) Discussions with neighbouring authorities to seek to identify any potential locations for transit sites.</p>	<p>a) Confirmation that the issues and options are consistent with any agreed strategic approach.</p> <p>b) The collaborative evidence being gathered by the SSPIP on Green Belt, the economy, housing needs and infrastructure is likely to be relevant when considering the strategy for travellers.</p> <p>c) To ensure that any unmet needs for traveller pitches are met within the County.</p> <p>d) To ensure that any identified need for transit sites is met in the most suitable locations across the County.</p>
<p><b>Consultation on the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Autumn 2015/ Winter 2015/16</b></p>	<p>a) Seeking comments on Issues and Options and the supporting evidence base.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede to discuss the Issues and Options with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies during the consultation as necessary.</p> <p>a) The consultation will provide the opportunity for feedback from Duty to Co-operate bodies on the proposed Issues and Options.</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
<p><b>Preparation of the Pre-Submission Plan</b></p> <p><b>Summer/Autumn 2016</b></p>	<p>a) Discussions on the representations made, and emerging draft Plan policies, and on any additional evidence with relevant Local Authorities and/or other bodies if appropriate.</p> <p>b) Use of the SSPIP and other collaborative working arrangements as appropriate.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede will discuss the Issues and Options representations with the Duty to Co-operate bodies and seek to agree a way forward so that all parties can agree that the Plan is deliverable and sound.</p> <p>a) Seek to agree final proposed policy wordings related to the issue of Gypsies and Travellers</p> <p>b) To ensure effective and collaborative working where possible with relevant Authorities.</p>
<p><b>Publication of the Pre-Submission Plan</b></p> <p><b>Winter 2016/17</b></p>	<p>a) To facilitate comments to be made to the Examination Inspector as necessary.</p>	<p>a) Production of Statements of Common Ground and/or Memorandums of Understanding where appropriate to support joint outcomes.</p>

## 7.0 Economic Development

### 7.1 The Issue and the Need for Involvement

<p><b>The Issue</b></p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>The Outcome</b></p>	<p>The Key outcomes being aimed for are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The production of a Functional Economic Area analysis which identifies the boroughs/districts that Runnymede has the strongest functional links with for economic purposes;</li> <li>-The production of an Employment Land Review that updates the study published in 2010;</li> <li>-The production of a Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) during the early stages of plan preparation (and then where necessary during the lifetime of the Plan) to identify the land in Runnymede that is available and suitable for different types of development, including economic uses;</li> <li>-The production of a Town and Local Centres Study, to supersede the study published in 2009;</li> <li>-The creation of a policy framework that supports the needs of the economies of the Borough and the needs of the wider FEA; and,</li> <li>-Ensuring the delivery of retail and other uses in town centres to meet the needs of the Borough, having regard to the position of Runnymede’s towns in the established retail hierarchy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who is involved</b></p>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b>          Elmbridge Borough Council          London Borough of Hillingdon          London Borough of Hounslow          Spelthorne Borough Council          Woking Borough Council</p> <p><b>Secondary Local Authority partners</b>          Bracknell Forest Borough Council          Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead          Surrey Heath Borough Council</p> <p><b>Interested Local Authorities</b>          Slough Borough Council</p>

	<p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b>  Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership  Greater London Authority (GLA)  Heathrow Airport Holdings  Network Rail  Surrey County Council  Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership  Transport for London</p>
<p><b>Methods for Engagement</b></p>	<p>-meetings/discussions with relevant local authorities and bodies during the preparation of the evidence (FEA, ELR, SLAA and Town and Local Centres Study in particular);  -request comments from local authorities and relevant bodies on draft evidence (including on the methodologies to be used where appropriate);  - meetings/discussions/correspondence (verbal and email) with the relevant authorities/bodies at officer level, and at Member level as appropriate as strategy and policies are being developed;  -Opportunity for written comments on proposed evidence, allocations and policies during the public consultation stages of the local plan; and,  -Engagement through the Surrey Local Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership (SSPIP) and engagement through joint working groups arising from the SSPIP or other co-operative work with other partners..</p> <p>Please note that the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (December 2014) sets out how the Council intends to engage with the community throughout the preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to setting up a Member Liaison Group if a need for further joint working at Member level with other authorities is identified.</p>

## 7.2 The Stages for Involvement

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
<p><b>Initial Thinking</b>  <b>Now and To Date</b></p>	<p>a) FEA Report: consultation on methodology for defining FEA and draft conclusions with relevant local authorities/bodies</p>	<p>a) To help establish whether FEA methodology is sound and whether the emerging conclusions on the FEA geography are accepted.</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
	<p>(March/April 2015).</p> <p>b) FEA analysis published in final form (June 2015).</p> <p>c) Surrey Hotel Futures Study published (June 2015).</p> <p>d) ELR: approach other FEA Authorities to establish appetite for producing a joint ELR (July 2015) (no appetite expressed for procuring a joint ELR).</p> <p>e) Town and Local Centres Study: Stakeholder consultation with neighbouring Local Authorities carried out during preparation of study (August 2015).</p> <p>f) Agreement of joint SLAA methodology with Spelthorne Borough Council (August 2015), at the SHMA Joint Member Liaison Group.</p> <p>g) Relevant Local Authorities and other bodies consulted on draft Town and Local Centres Study report (Sept 2015).</p> <p>h) Officers from Runnymede attended the first meeting of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Working Group (September 2015).</p> <p>i) Continuing work to</p>	<p>b) The identification of the boroughs/districts that Runnymede has the strongest links with for the purpose of economic matters.</p> <p>c) Provision of an analysis of the future opportunities and requirements for hotel development across Surrey to inform the future plans and policies of Surrey County Council and its District and Borough Councils.</p> <p>d) The identification of whether it would be desirable/necessary to produce a joint ELR, or any other economic evidence.</p> <p>e) Identification of any cross boundary issues that the Council's consultants need to address in the report.</p> <p>f) To establish a consistent approach to assessing land supply across the two local authority areas.</p> <p>g) To seek views on whether it is agreed that the draft report follows national policy and guidance and whether the conclusions are supported.</p> <p>h) That the Local Authorities most impacted by Heathrow, and Heathrow Airport Ltd work together to consider and understand the sub regional impact of the airport so that all parties can better plan, mitigate and manage the impacts and maximise the potential benefits for local communities, stakeholders and businesses.</p> <p>i) To understand the economic needs across the County.</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
	produce collaborative evidence on economic needs across the County as part of the LSS.	
<p><b>Preparation of the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Spring 2014-Autumn 2015</b></p>	<p>a) Consultation with relevant Local Authorities and other bodies on draft ELR.</p> <p>b) Completion of ELR and Town and Local Centres Study.</p> <p>c) Discussions on the Borough's land supply and spatial options with relevant Local Authorities and other bodies following the completion of the SLAA, and discussions around any issues relating to unmet needs.</p> <p>d) Emerging Issues and Options to be circulated and discussed with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies.</p> <p>e) Continuing to produce collaborative evidence of housing need through the SSPIP as part of the LSS.</p>	<p>a) Identification of any cross boundary issues that the Council needs to address in the report.</p> <p>b) To identify the level of need for employment, retail and leisure floor space in the Borough over the Plan period.</p> <p>c) To seek agreement with the relevant Local Authorities and other bodies on the amount of land available in Runnymede Borough to meet employment needs following completion of the SLAA in Runnymede (in conjunction with the emerging housing strategy work) and how this fits in with what other FEA Authorities are proposing. The outcome should be that the identified needs of the FEA are met across the relevant Local Authority areas.</p> <p>d) Confirmation that the Issues and Options are consistent with any agreed strategic approach.</p> <p>e) Creation of a common picture across Surrey in relation to economic needs. Additional working with other bodies and partners beyond the Surrey County boundary may also be required.</p>
<p><b>Consultation on the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Autumn 2015/ Winter 2015/16</b></p>	<p>a) Seeking comments on Issues and Options and the supporting evidence base.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede to discuss the Issues and Options with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies during the consultation as necessary.</p> <p>a) The consultation will provide the</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
		opportunity for feedback from Duty to Co-operate bodies on the proposed Issues and Options.
<b>Preparation of the Pre-Submission Plan</b>  <b>Summer/Autumn 2016</b>	a) Discussions on the representations made, and emerging draft Plan policies, and on any additional evidence with relevant Local Authorities and/or other bodies if appropriate.  b) Use of the SSPIP and other collaborative working arrangements as appropriate.	a) Runnymede will discuss the Issues and Options representations with the Duty to Co-operate bodies and seek to agree a way forward so that all parties can agree that the Plan is deliverable and sound.  a) Seek to agree final proposed policy wording related to the issue of the economy.  b) To ensure effective and collaborative working where possible with relevant Authorities.
<b>Publication of the Pre-Submission Plan</b>  <b>Winter 2016/17</b>	a) To facilitate comments to be made to the Examination Inspector as necessary.	a) Production of Statements of Common Ground and/or Memorandums of Understanding where appropriate to support joint outcomes.

## 8.0 Green Belt

### 8.1 The Issue and the Need for Involvement

<p><b>The Issue</b></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>The Outcome</b></p>	<p>The key outcomes anticipated are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Completion of a Borough wide Green Belt Review which will assess how well the Borough’s Green Belt performs against the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The land has also been assessed against technical constraints. Overall the study seeks to identify any land which performs weakly against the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, isn’t constrained in other ways and which could therefore potentially be returned to the Urban Area to help meet identified development needs over the Plan period;</li> <li>-Completion of a technical review of the Green Belt boundary in the Borough in order to consider, and if necessary make any minor amendments required to make the boundary more logical and/or defensible; and,</li> <li>-To meet identified needs for housing, employment, retail etc. This may necessitate alteration to the Borough’s Green Belt boundary to increase the amount of developable urban land.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who is involved</b></p>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elmbridge Borough Council</li> <li>Guildford Borough Council</li> <li>Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead</li> <li>Spelthorne Borough Council</li> <li>Surrey Heath Borough Council</li> <li>Waverley Borough Council</li> <li>Woking Borough Council</li> </ul>



	<p><b>Secondary Local Authority partners</b>  Bracknell Forest Borough Council  Epsom and Ewell Borough Council  London Borough of Hounslow  Mole Valley District Council  Reigate and Banstead Borough Council  Tandridge District Council</p> <p><b>Interested Local Authorities</b>  Slough Borough Council</p> <p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b>  Greater London Authority (GLA)  Surrey County Council</p>
<b>Methods for Engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-meetings/discussions with relevant local authorities and bodies during the preparation of the Arup Green Belt Review;</li> <li>-request comments from relevant local authorities and relevant bodies on draft evidence (including on methodologies to be employed where appropriate);</li> <li>- meetings/discussions/correspondence (verbal and email) with neighbouring authorities/relevant bodies at officer level, and at Member level if necessary as appropriate as strategy and policies are being developed;</li> <li>-Opportunity for written comments on proposed evidence, allocations and policies during the public consultation stages of the Local Plan; and,</li> <li>-Engagement through the Surrey Local Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership (SSPIP) and engagement through joint working groups arising from the SSPIP or other co-operative work with other partners..</li> </ul> <p>Please note that the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (December 2014) sets out how the Council intends to engage with the community throughout the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>

## 8.2 The Stages for Involvement

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
<b>Initial Thinking</b>  <b>Now and To Date</b>	a) Green Belt Review: Workshop with relevant local authorities facilitated	a) Identification of any cross boundary strategic issues and to help establish whether Green Belt Review

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
	<p>by consultants to review methodology employed and possible cross boundary issues (August 2014).</p> <p>b) Green Belt Review: presentation given by consultants at the Surrey PWG meeting to discuss the methodology employed and possible cross boundary issues (September 2014).</p> <p>c) Planning stakeholder meeting: presenting findings of Green Belt Review to members and key officers of Runnymede BC (December 2014).</p> <p>d) Publication of Arup Green Belt Review (December 2014).</p> <p>e) Publication of the Council's Technical Review of the Green Belt Boundary Methodology (Feb 2015) and commencement of project.</p> <p>f) Continuing work to produce collaborative evidence on the conclusions emerging from Green Belt Reviews undertaken across the County as part of the LSS.</p>	<p>methodology is sound.</p> <p>b) Identification of any cross boundary strategic issues and to help establish whether Green Belt Review methodology is sound.</p> <p>c) Provided an overview to Members and key officers on the methodology followed and the key findings of the project. Provided attendees with an opportunity to ask questions about the work.</p> <p>d) Confirmed Arup's recommendations for parcels of Green Belt land in Runnymede borough that perform weakly against the purposes of including land within the Green Belt and which the Council could consider returning to the Urban Area through the Local Plan process.</p> <p>e) This work, will propose minor amendments to the Green Belt boundary as appropriate to make it more logical and/or defensible.</p> <p>f) To understand the areas which could potentially be released from the Green Belt across the County in the coming years.</p>
<p><b>Preparation of the Issues and Options</b> <b>Spring 2014-Autumn</b></p>	<p>a) Completion and publication of the technical review of the Green Belt boundary.</p>	<p>a) To identify where Officers consider the Green Belt boundary should be amended to ensure it is logical and defensible for the Plan period and</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
<b>2015</b>	<p>b) Continuing to produce collaborative evidence relating to Green Belt Reviews through the SSPIP as part of the LSS.</p> <p>c) Discussions on the Borough's housing land supply, proposed housing number and spatial options with the relevant Local Authorities and bodies.</p> <p>d) Emerging Issues and Options to be circulated and discussed with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies to seek consensus.</p>	<p>beyond.</p> <p>b) Creation of a common picture across Surrey in relation to the Green Belt Review work being undertaken. Additional working with other bodies and partners beyond the Surrey County boundary may also be required.</p> <p>c) Seek agreement with the relevant Local Authorities and other bodies on 1) the amount of land available in Runnymede Borough to meet development needs following completion of the SLAA and Green Belt Review, 2) the spatial options to meet identified needs that are available to the Council.</p> <p>d) Confirmation that the Issues and Options are consistent with any agreed strategic approach.</p>
<p><b>Consultation on the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Autumn 2015/ Winter 2015/16</b></p>	<p>a) Seeking comments on issues and options and the supporting evidence base</p>	<p>a) Runnymede to discuss the Issues and Options with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies during the consultation</p> <p>a) The consultation will provide the opportunity for feedback from Duty to Co-operate bodies on the proposed Issues and Options</p>
<p><b>Preparation of the Pre-Submission Plan</b></p> <p><b>Summer/Autumn 2016</b></p>	<p>a) Discussions on the representations made, and emerging draft Plan policies, and on any additional evidence if appropriate.</p> <p>b) Use of the SSPIP and other collaborative working arrangements as appropriate.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede will discuss the Issues and Options representations with the Duty to Co-operate bodies and seek to agree a way forward so that all parties can agree that the Plan is deliverable and sound.</p> <p>a) Seek to agree final proposed policy wordings related to the issue of the Green Belt.</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
		b) To ensure effective and collaborative working where possible with relevant Authorities.
<b>Publication of the Pre-Submission Plan Winter 2016/17</b>	a) To facilitate comments to be made to the Examination Inspector as necessary.	a) Production of Statements of Common Ground and/or Memorandums of Understanding where appropriate to support joint outcomes.

## 9.0 Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA

### 9.1 The Issue and the Need for Involvement

<b>The Issue</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>In respect of biodiversity, the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) is located beyond the western boundary of the Borough and comprises areas of heathland protected by international and national legislation as a natural habitat for three particular species of ground nesting birds. A key issue is that new housing development is judged to have a likely significant effect on the birds that have made the SPA their habitat, and a consistent package of mitigation measures for the delivery of new housing has to be in place across the 11 affected authorities in order to ensure that new housing in the 400m-5km zone of influence can continue to be permitted over the Plan period. It should be noted that currently agreed measures are in place by way of saved South East Plan Policy NRM6 and the TBHSPA Delivery Framework.</p> <p>The issue relating to TBHSPA is whether there are sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces (SANGS) available to mitigate the level of development required through the Local Plan, given the OAHN across the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA.</p> <p>The Borough also contains a variety of sites of biodiversity and nature conservation importance including Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Ramsar sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), Local Nature Reserves (LNR) and Ancient Woodlands. The Borough's river systems and waterways also have an especially important role to play in nature conservation by providing natural habitat linkages via multi habitat wildlife corridors.</p> <p>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. Therefore, if appropriate mitigation is not put in place</p>
------------------	--

	<p>or new development is permitted which adversely affects protected sites, they could become threatened.</p> <p>In addition, all of the Borough's nine surface waterbodies are failing to achieve the Water Framework Directive's required ecological status.</p>
<b>The Outcome</b>	<p>The intended outcomes are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-enable the continued protection of the TBHSPA whilst continuing to allow the delivery of new homes in the 400m-5km zone of influence. This will be achieved through the delivery of appropriate mitigation measures, to be agreed through the well-established TBHSPA Joint Strategic Planning Board meetings, and TBHSPA Officer Working Group;</li> <li>-avoid further habitat fragmentation, to restore functional habitat connectivity and to enhance existing sites of biodiversity and nature conservation importance where possible; and,</li> <li>-implement strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change as appropriate.</li> </ul>
<b>Who is involved</b>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b>  Bracknell Forest Borough Council  Elmbridge Borough Council  Guildford Borough Council  Hampshire County Council  Hart District Council  Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  Rushmoor Borough Council  Surrey Heath Borough Council  Waverley Borough Council  Woking Borough Council  Wokingham Borough Council  Spelthorne Borough Council</p> <p><b>Interested Local Authorities</b>  Slough Borough Council</p> <p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b>  Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership  Environment Agency  Greater London Authority (GLA)  Natural England  Surrey County Council  Surrey Nature Partnership  Transport for London</p>
<b>Methods for Engagement</b>	-Discussions on the TBHSPA will take place at Member level

	<p>through the TBHSPA Joint Strategic Planning Board meetings, and at officer level through the TBHSPA Officer Working Group and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) Group meetings;</p> <p>-for biodiversity issues, it is envisaged that officer discussions will take place through meetings and correspondence with the relevant Local Authorities and other bodies;</p> <p>- meetings/discussions/correspondence (verbal and email) with neighbouring authorities/relevant bodies at officer level, and at Member level if necessary (and when appropriate) as strategy and policies are being developed; and,</p> <p>-Opportunity for written comments on proposed evidence, allocations and policies during the public consultation stages of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Please note that the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (December 2014) sets out how the Council intends to engage with the community throughout the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>
--	---

## 9.2 The Stages for Involvement

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
<b>Initial Thinking</b>  <b>Now and To Date</b>	a) Surrey Wildlife Trust in association with a number of bodies, including Runnymede BC organised a workshop in December 2014 in relation to <i>Green Space, Physical Activity, Mental Health and Well Being</i> .	a) A report is due to be published after taking account of the relevant stakeholder’s comments
<b>Preparation of the Issues and Options</b>  <b>Spring 2014- Autumn 2015</b>	a) Arrange meetings with relevant bodies such as Natural England, Environment Agency and the Surrey Nature Partnership to discuss the proposed scope of the Local Plan in relation to this subject matter, and the outcomes of the <i>Green Space, Physical Activity, Mental Health and Well Being report</i> .  b) Identify whether the availability of mitigation	a) Agreement on the key issues that need to be considered and potential Local Plan content required in relation to this topic area.  b) Seek to identify possible solutions in conjunction with Duty to co-operate bodies.  c) To ensure that there is sufficient SANGS capacity to support proposed housing growth over the Plan period and to achieve agreement to the delivery/use of any cross boundary

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
	<p>measures for the THBSPA may be a potential constraint to future housing delivery.</p> <p>c) The identification of any existing and future SANGS capacity.</p> <p>d) Explore any opportunities for use of surplus SANGS capacity.</p> <p>e) Emerging Issues and Options to be circulated and discussed with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies to seek consensus.</p>	<p>SANGS.</p> <p>d) To ensure that surplus SANGS are put to an appropriate and beneficial alternative use.</p> <p>e) Confirmation that the Issues and Options are consistent with the agreed strategic approach.</p>
<p><b>Consultation on the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Autumn 2015/ Winter 2015/16</b></p>	<p>a) Seeking comments on Issues and Options and the supporting evidence base.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede to discuss the Issues and Options with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies during the consultation as necessary.</p> <p>a) The consultation will provide the opportunity for feedback from Duty to Co-operate bodies on the proposed Issues and Options.</p>
<p><b>Preparation of the Pre-Submission Plan</b></p> <p><b>Summer/Autumn 2016</b></p>	<p>a) Discussions on the representations made, and emerging draft Plan policies, and on any additional evidence with relevant Local Authorities and/or other bodies if appropriate.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede will discuss the Issues and Options representations with the Duty to Co-operate bodies and seek to agree a way forward so that all parties can agree that the Plan is deliverable and sound.</p> <p>a) Seek to agree final proposed policy wording related to the TBHSPA with relevant Local Authorities and bodies.</p>
<p><b>Publication of the Pre-Submission Plan</b></p> <p><b>Winter 2016/17</b></p>	<p>a) To permit comments to be made to the Examination Inspector as necessary.</p>	<p>a) Production of Statements of Common Ground and/or Memorandums of Understanding where appropriate to support joint outcomes.</p>



## 10.0 Transport

### 10.1 The Issue and the Need for Involvement

<p><b>The Issue</b></p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>The Outcome</b></p>	<p>The intended outcomes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The development of a Transport Impact Assessment and Infrastructure Needs Study;</li> <li>-That the Local Plan will be capable of sustainable delivery, without unacceptable adverse impact on the Strategic Road Network (managed by Highways England) or the Local Road Network (managed by Surrey County Council);</li> <li>-To review opportunities for transport improvements in the wider area that could be beneficial for Runnymede, and to support such opportunities where the positive impacts would on balance outweigh any negative impacts; and,</li> <li>-To encourage more sustainable modes of transport and initiatives through the Local Plan to seek a modal shift to alternative modes of transport and reducing the need to travel.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who is involved</b></p>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b>          Elmbridge Borough Council          Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead          Spelthorne Borough Council          Surrey Heath Borough Council          Woking Borough Council</p> <p><b>Secondary Local Authority partners</b>          London Borough of Hillingdon          London Borough of Hounslow</p> <p><b>Interested Local Authorities</b>          Mole Valley District Council          Slough Borough Council</p>

	<p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b>  Civil Aviation Authority  Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership  Greater London Authority (GLA)  Heathrow Airport Holdings  Highways England  Network Rail  Office of Rail and Road  Surrey County Council  Transport for London</p>
<b>Methods for Engagement</b>	<p>-meetings/discussions with relevant local authorities and bodies during the preparation of the evidence;  -meetings/discussions/correspondence (verbal and email) with neighbouring authorities/relevant bodies at officer level, and at Member level if necessary as appropriate as strategy and policies are being developed;  -Opportunity for written comments to be made on proposed evidence, allocations and policies during the public consultation stages of the Local Plan; and,  -Engagement through the Surrey Local Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership (SSPIP) and engagement through joint working groups arising from the SSPIP or other co-operative work with other partners.</p> <p>Please note that the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (December 2014) sets out how the Council intends to engage with the community throughout the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>

## 10.2 The Stages for Involvement

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
<p><b>Initial Thinking</b>   <b>Now and To Date</b></p>	<p>a) Discussions with other Surrey Boroughs/Districts and Surrey County Council relating to production of a joint infrastructure study across the County (which would consider transport infrastructure) (2014).   b) Surrey County Council</p>	<p>a) Consensus that it would be helpful to produce a joint evidence base (2014).   b) Production of a robust evidence base, setting out the county’s infrastructure requirements in the context of planned growth and estimated likely costs and funding gaps.</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
	<p>appointed AECOM to produce a Surrey wide Infrastructure Study (April 2015).</p> <p>c) Officers at Runnymede provided SCC and AECOM with the information requested to feed into the Surrey Infrastructure Study (April/May 2015).</p> <p>d) Surrey Infrastructure Study circulated in draft form for comment (August 2015).</p> <p>e) Officers from Runnymede attended the first meeting of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Working Group (September 2015).</p>	<p>c) To ensure that the report is accurate and locally relevant for Runnymede.</p> <p>d) Comments made as necessary to ensure study is accurate in regard to information about Runnymede.</p> <p>e) That the Local Authorities most impacted by Heathrow, and Heathrow Airport Ltd work together to consider and understand the sub regional impact of the airport so that all parties can better plan, mitigate and manage the impacts and maximise the potential benefits for local communities, stakeholders and businesses.</p>
<p><b>Preparation of the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Spring 2014-Autumn 2015</b></p>	<p>a) Completion of any preliminary transport assessment work with SCC to support Issues and Options consultation.</p> <p>b) Completion of collaborative evidence on infrastructure needs through the Surrey Infrastructure Study.</p> <p>c) Emerging Issues and Options to be circulated and discussed with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies to seek consensus.</p>	<p>a) To ensure that the potential impact of any allocations being considered on the transport network is quantified and understood.</p> <p>b) Production of a robust evidence base, setting out the County's infrastructure requirements in the context of planned growth and estimated likely costs and funding gaps.</p> <p>c) Confirmation that the Issues and Options are consistent with any agreed strategic approach.</p>
<p><b>Consultation on the Issues and Options</b></p>	<p>a) Seeking comments on Issues and Options and the</p>	<p>a) Runnymede to discuss the Issues and Options with relevant Duty to Co-</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
<b>Autumn 2015/ Winter 2015/16</b>	supporting evidence base.	<p>operate bodies during the consultation as necessary.</p> <p>a) The consultation will provide the opportunity for feedback from Duty to Co-operate bodies on the proposed Issues and Options.</p>
<b>Preparation of the Pre-Submission Plan  Summer/Autumn 2016</b>	a) Discussions on the representations made, and emerging draft Plan policies, and on any additional evidence with relevant Local Authorities and/or other bodies if appropriate.	<p>a) Runnymede will discuss the Issues and Options representations with the Duty to Co-operate bodies and seek to agree a way forward so that all parties can agree that the Plan is deliverable and sound.</p> <p>a) Seek to agree final proposed policy wordings related to transport.</p>
<b>Publication of the Pre-Submission Plan  Winter 2016/17</b>	a) To facilitate comments to be made to the Examination Inspector as necessary.	Production of Statements of Common Ground and/or Memorandums of Understanding where appropriate to support joint outcomes.

## 11.0 Flooding

### 11.1 The Issue and the Need for Involvement

<b>The Issue</b>	Runnymede is a top ten local authority for flood risk in England <sup>3</sup> . 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.
<b>The Outcome</b>	The intended outcomes are: -The production of a NPPF compliant SFRA to replace that produced in 2009; -To produce robust flood risk policies based on sound local evidence which seek to reduce flood risk in the Borough overall, factoring in the impacts of climate change; and, -To steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding wherever possible during the Plan period and ensuring that if development is concluded to be justified as necessary in areas of higher risk, that such developments will be safe for their lifetime, taking into account the vulnerability of their users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and where possible, reducing flood risk overall.
<b>Who is involved</b>	<b>Core Local Authority partners</b> Elmbridge Borough Council London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Spelthorne Borough Council Woking Borough Council  <b>Secondary Local Authority partners</b> Surrey Heath Borough Council South Bucks District Council Slough Borough Council  <b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b> Environment Agency Greater London Authority (GLA) Surrey County Council Surrey Nature Partnership

<sup>3</sup> Flooding in England: A national assessment of flood risk (2009)  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/292928/geho0609bqds-e-e.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/292928/geho0609bqds-e-e.pdf)

<b>Methods for Engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-meetings/discussions with Surrey County Council and the Environment Agency (and other relevant bodies) during the preparation of the SFRA;</li> <li>-request comments from relevant Local Authorities and other bodies on draft SFRA;</li> <li>- Meetings/discussions/correspondence (including verbal and email) with relevant authorities/bodies at officer level, and at Member level if necessary as appropriate as strategy and policies are being developed;</li> <li>-Opportunity for written comments on proposed evidence, allocations and policies during the public consultation stages of the Local Plan;</li> <li>-Through officer meetings such as the Lower Thames Planning Officers Group (LTPOG) meeting;</li> <li>-Through the River Thames Scheme Programme Board; and</li> <li>-Through the River Thames Scheme Sponsoring Group.</li> </ul> <p>Please note that the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (December 2014) sets out how the Council intends to engage with the community throughout the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>
-------------------------------	---

## 11.2 The Stages for Involvement

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
<b>Initial Thinking</b>  <b>Now and To Date</b>	a) Work continues on the production of the 2015 SFRA (level 1 assessment) following data requests to a number of relevant bodies and consultees (e.g. Surrey County Council, Environment Agency, Thames Water etc).	a) Production of an NPPF compliant SFRA which has been produced following collaborative working with key Local Authorities and other relevant bodies.
<b>Preparation of the Issues and Options</b>  <b>Spring 2014-Autumn 2015</b>	a) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment: complete in draft form and request comments on study from all relevant prescribed bodies and all authorities in Lower Thames area.  b) publish SFRA (level 1	a) To seek views on whether it is agreed that the draft report follows national policy and guidance and whether the conclusions are supported.  b) That the document will robustly identify the flood risks from all sources that exist in Runnymede

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
	<p>assessment) in final form.</p> <p>c) complete level 2 assessment for SFRA if it is found that the Council needs to develop in flood zones 2 and 3 over the Plan period.</p> <p>d) Emerging Issues and Options to be circulated and discussed with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies to seek consensus.</p>	<p>Borough and factor in the potential impacts of climate change. The document will contain sufficient detail to allow the sequential test to be applied.</p> <p>c) That all proposed land use allocations have been subject to the strategic sequential test and that the document provides sufficient advice to allow the exception test to be applied.</p> <p>d) Confirmation that the Issues and Options are consistent with any agreed strategic approach.</p>
<p><b>Consultation on the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Autumn 2015/ Winter 2015/16</b></p>	<p>a) Seeking comments on Issues and Options and the supporting evidence base.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede to discuss the Issues and Options with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies during the consultation as necessary.</p> <p>a) The consultation will provide the opportunity for feedback from Duty to Co-operate bodies on the proposed Issues and Options.</p>
<p><b>Preparation of the Pre-Submission Plan</b></p> <p><b>Summer/Autumn 2016</b></p>	<p>a) Discussions on the representations made, and emerging draft Plan policies, and on any additional evidence with relevant Local Authorities and/or other bodies if appropriate.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede will discuss the Issues and Options representations with the Duty to Co-operate bodies and seek to agree a way forward so that all parties can agree that the Plan is deliverable and sound.</p> <p>a) Seek to agree final proposed policy wording related to the issue of flooding.</p>
<p><b>Publication of the Pre-Submission Plan</b></p> <p><b>Winter 2016/17</b></p>	<p>a) To facilitate comments to be made to the Examination Inspector as necessary.</p>	<p>a) Production of Statements of Common Ground and/or Memorandums of Understanding where appropriate to support joint outcomes.</p>

## 12.0 Infrastructure: Education; Health; Utilities; Community and Culture; Open Space and Recreation

### 12.1 The Issue and the Need for Involvement

<p><b>The Issue</b></p>	<p>The key issue in respect of each of these elements 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.</p>
<p><b>The Outcome</b></p>	<p>The intended outcomes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-To understand through the preparation of evidence whether any infrastructure improvements/additional capacity is required to support development proposed in the Local Plan;</li> <li>-To allow all new and existing development to be supported by the appropriate range and level of infrastructure provision. This will be achieved through the development of an agreed set of infrastructure frameworks;</li> <li>-To produce an Open Spaces Study (OSS) to update the Study produced in 2010;</li> <li>- To meet identified open space needs suggested by evidence collected in the 2015 OSS;</li> <li>-To improve the quality of Runnymede’s open spaces and look to retain open spaces that have not been identified as surplus to requirements in order to meet the needs of the Borough.</li> </ul> <p>It should be noted that a joint assessment of the evidence base to understand opportunities and priorities relating to the provision of infrastructure, forms part of the Local Strategic Statement work, led by Surrey Leaders, with Surrey County Council and Surrey Boroughs and Districts. The likely costs of infrastructure to deliver the requirements of the Runnymede Local Plan will be identified in a Runnymede Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), which will be a more-detailed Plan that should be read in conjunction with the Surrey Infrastructure Study. The IDP will confirm if RBC could adopt a Community Infrastructure Levy in its area.</p>
<p><b>Who is involved</b></p>	<p><b>Core Local Authority partners</b>          Elmbridge Borough Council          Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead          Spelthorne Borough Council          Surrey Heath Borough Council          Woking Borough Council</p> <p><b>Secondary Local Authority partners</b></p>



	<p>Epsom and Ewell Borough Council          Guildford Borough Council          Mole Valley District Council          Reigate and Banstead Borough Council          Tandridge District Council          Waverley Borough Council</p> <p><b>Duty to Cooperate consultees</b>          Affinity Water          Ashford and St Peters NHS Trust          British Gas          Enterprise M3 LEP          Environment Agency          Network Rail          NHS England          North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group          Royal Holloway University of London          Southern Gas Networks          Southern Electric          Sport England          Strode’s College          Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust          Surrey County Council (including in their capacity as the Waste and Minerals Authority for the County)          Surrey Nature Partnership          Telecoms operators          Thames Water          Windsor, Ascot and Maidenhead Clinical Commissioning Group</p>
<p><b>Methods for Engagement</b></p>	<p>-meetings/discussions with relevant bodies/infrastructure providers during the preparation of the evidence;          -request comments from relevant bodies and infrastructure providers on draft evidence;          - Meetings/discussions/correspondence (verbal and email) with relevant authorities/bodies at officer level, and at Member level if as appropriate as strategy and policies are being developed; and,          -Opportunity for written comments on proposed evidence, allocations and policies during the public consultation stages of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Please note that the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (December 2014) sets out how the Council intends to engage with the community throughout the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>

## 12.2 The Stages for Involvement

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
<p><b>Initial Thinking</b></p> <p><b>Now and To Date</b></p>	<p>a) Discussions with other Surrey Boroughs/Districts and Surrey County Council relating to production of a joint infrastructure needs study across the County (2014).</p> <p>b) Surrey County Council appointed AECOM to produce a Surrey-wide Infrastructure Study (April 2015).</p> <p>c) Officers at Runnymede provided SCC and AECOM with the information requested to feed into the Surrey Infrastructure Study (April/May 2015).</p> <p>d) Officers commenced work on the 2015 Runnymede Open Space Study.</p> <p>e) Surrey Infrastructure Plan circulated in draft form for comment (August 2015).</p> <p>f) Officers from Runnymede attended the first meeting of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Working Group (September 2015).</p>	<p>a) Identification that there is a need for a joint evidence base. Agreement reached that Surrey would commission such a study (2014).</p> <p>b) Production of a robust evidence base, setting out the County's infrastructure requirements in the context of planned growth and estimated likely costs and funding gaps.</p> <p>c) To ensure that the report is accurate and locally relevant for Runnymede.</p> <p>d) Production of a robust evidence base that defines the nature and distribution of open space in the Borough.</p> <p>e) Comments made as necessary to ensure study is accurate in regard to information about Runnymede.</p> <p>f) That the Local Authorities most impacted by Heathrow, and Heathrow Airport Ltd work together to consider and understand the sub regional impact of the airport so that all parties can better plan, mitigate and manage the impacts and maximise the potential benefits for local communities, stakeholders and businesses.</p>
<p><b>Preparation of the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Spring 2014-Autumn 2015</b></p>	<p>a) Completion of collaborative evidence of infrastructure needs through the Surrey Infrastructure Study.</p>	<p>a) Production of a robust evidence base, setting out the County's infrastructure requirements in the context of planned growth and estimated likely costs and funding</p>

Stage and Timing	Action	Outcome anticipated/agreed
	<p>b) Completion of the 2015 Open Space Study.</p> <p>c) Emerging Issues and Options to be circulated and discussed with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies to seek consensus.</p>	<p>gaps.</p> <p>b) Production of a robust evidence base that defines the nature and distribution of open space in the Borough.</p> <p>c) Confirmation that the Issues and Options are consistent with any agreed strategic approach.</p>
<p><b>Consultation on the Issues and Options</b></p> <p><b>Autumn 2015/ Winter 2015/16</b></p>	<p>a) Seeking comments on Issues and Options and the supporting evidence base.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede to discuss the Issues and Options with relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies during the consultation as necessary.</p> <p>a) The consultation will provide the opportunity for feedback from Duty to Co-operate bodies on the proposed Issues and Options.</p>
<p><b>Preparation of the Pre-Submission Plan</b></p> <p><b>Summer/Autumn 2016</b></p>	<p>a) Discussions on the representations made, and emerging draft Plan policies, and on any additional evidence with relevant Local Authorities and/or other bodies if appropriate.</p>	<p>a) Runnymede will discuss the Issues and Options representations with the Duty to Co-operate bodies and seek to agree a way forward so that all parties can agree that the Plan is deliverable and sound.</p> <p>a) Seek to agree final proposed policy wording related to the issue of infrastructure provision.</p>
<p><b>Publication of the Pre-Submission Plan</b></p> <p><b>Winter 2016/17</b></p>	<p>a) To permit comments to be made to the Examination Inspector as necessary.</p>	<p>a) Production of Statements of Common Ground and/or Memorandums of Understanding where appropriate to support joint outcomes.</p>

### **13.0 Other strategic matters not listed in chapters 5.0-12.0**

#### **Minerals**

- 13.1 The Council continues to engage with Surrey County Council (SCC) as appropriate on matters relating to minerals development. Currently during the preparation of the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan this engagement has been limited to:
- SCC providing advice to the Council and its consultants during the Green Belt Review project in August 2014;
  - Meeting with officers at SCC on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2014 to find out more about the RESTORE project;
  - Attended public meeting on the RESTORE project on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2015.
- 13.2 It is currently considered that minerals development does not necessitate its own chapter in this Scoping Framework given that officers at Runnymede Borough Council do not envisage at this time that there will be any policies in the Local Plan relating to minerals development. This is on the basis that SCC is the Mineral Planning Policy and Waste Planning Authority for Surrey and has a number of adopted plans and policies that make provision for future mineral extraction across the County, whilst aiming to minimise the impact on local communities and the environment.
- 13.3 Furthermore, as noted elsewhere in this document, the Council is currently producing the evidence base necessary to underpin its Local Plan, however it is not currently proposed that any new or updated evidence relating to the minerals development in Runnymede is required.
- 13.4 Runnymede Borough Council will however continue to monitor the engagement with SCC relating to minerals development over the course of Plan preparation and if at any time it is felt that a bespoke chapter is needed in the Council's DtC documentation on minerals developments, one will be produced.
- 13.5 It is currently envisaged that the main methods of engagement for matters relating to minerals development during Plan preparation will be as follows:
- Meetings/discussions/correspondence (verbal and email) with SCC at officer level, and at Member level if as appropriate as strategy and policies are being developed (including through the Local Plan Member Working Group); and,
  - Opportunity for written comments on proposed evidence, allocations and policies during the public consultation stages of the Local Plan.

## Historic Environment

- 13.6 To date, during the course of the preparation of the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan, there has been little in the way of engagement with SCC and Historic England on matters relating to the historic environment. This is mainly because although the Council is currently producing the evidence base necessary to underpin its Local Plan, it is not considered that any new or updated evidence relating to the historic environment in Runnymede is required before the Issues and Option consultation commences.
- 13.7 As such this DtC Framework does not contain its own chapter relating to the historic environment at the current time. However as the preparation of the Local Plan continues, it is considered that proactive engagement with both of these organisations will be required.
- 13.8 As such, Runnymede Borough Council will continue to monitor the engagement with SCC and Historic England relating to the historic environment as Plan preparation continues and if at any time it is felt that a bespoke chapter is needed in the Council's DtC documentation on the historic environment, one will be produced.
- 13.9 In the absence of a bespoke chapter on the historic environment it is envisaged that the main methods of engagement for matters relating to the historic environment will be as follows:
- Meetings/discussions/correspondence (verbal and email) with relevant bodies at officer level, and at Member level as appropriate as strategy and policies are being developed (including at the Local Plan Member Working Group); and,
  - Opportunity for written comments on proposed evidence, allocations and policies during the public consultation stages of the Local Plan.

## Appendix 1: comments received on draft document and officer responses

Organisation commenting	Summary of comments received	Runnymede Officer response
<p><b>01) Slough Borough Council</b></p>	<p>SBC wishes to be kept informed of progress on Runnymede’s Local Plan and to participate proportionately in respect of the following issues identified in the Scoping Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing, including Gypsies and Travellers</li> <li>• Economic Development</li> <li>• Transport</li> <li>• Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA.</li> </ul> <p>For information (in view of the joint SHMA), SBC’s comments on the Spelthorne DTC Scoping Statement have previously been sent to that Council.</p>	<p>Noted, Runnymede will ensure that Slough is consulted on these matters. Officers have also noted Slough as a ‘secondary Local Authority partner’ for flooding issues given that both Slough and Runnymede attend the Lower Thames Planning Officers Group meetings.</p> <p>The comments that Slough BC has made on Spelthorne’s DTC scope are noted.</p>
<p><b>02) Ashford and St Peters Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust</b></p>	<p>Feel it appropriate that ASPHNHSFT have been included as health providers. The document is fine.</p> <p>The major issue is what happens next and how it is managed to ensure that the health economy responds effectively in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity changes</li> <li>• Land acquisitions and disposals</li> <li>• Funding from planning gain.</li> </ul>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The Council will continue to consult with Ashford and St. Peters Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust on matters relating to infrastructure (including in regard to the Community Infrastructure Levy) as it progresses its Plan to ensure that the relationship between the health economy and planned growth in the Borough are properly considered.</p>

<p><b>03) Surrey Heath Borough Council</b></p>	<p>All relevant cross boundary strategic matters have been identified and all prescribed bodies, local authorities and consultees have been identified.</p> <p>With regard to processes and mechanism – in respect of the preparation of the Issues and Options, the approach of confirming with relevant bodies that the issues and options are consistent with any agreed strategic approach should be applied to all topic areas so that RBC can demonstrate engagement has been active, ongoing and collaborative. Currently this is not applied to all topic areas, e.g. economy and Green Belt. This could be done through meetings or workshops. If this approach is not relevant then the DtC report should state why.</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>Comment noted. The report has been amended to address this point.</p>
<p><b>04) Reigate and Banstead Borough Council</b></p>	<p>Housing – no evidence that RBBC is in same housing market as RBC. Do not consider there are any significant links between our housing market areas. Therefore, consider that there are no cross boundary issues to engage on regarding Housing. However, RBBC does recognise that authorities across Surrey have a duty to engage with the Greater London Authority on this issue.</p> <p>Gypsies and Travellers – RBBC has identified potential cross boundary issues of accommodation</p>	<p>Position noted. RBC agrees that RBC and RBBC are not in the same HMA and the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA supports this. RBC considers that housing is a cross boundary issue that could require discussions with HMA groupings beyond those HMAs immediately bordering the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA area, hence RBBC's inclusion in the 'Who is involved' section of the housing chapter. Furthermore both RBC and RBBC have signed up to the Surrey LSS</p>

	<p>with RBC and other Surrey Authorities. Agree with identification of engagement with RBBC on this issue.</p> <p>Green Belt – no evidence to suggest any strategic cross boundary issues.</p> <p>RBBC agrees that there are no other strategic matters to engage on with RBC.</p>	<p>which seeks to produce a collaborative evidence base with other Authorities across Surrey relating to housing need. In addition, as RBBC identifies, the Surrey Authorities have a duty to engage with the GLA on the issue of housing. In light of these points it is considered prudent that RBC retains RBBC in the ‘who is involved’ box of the housing chapter in the RBC DtC Scoping Framework. However Officers have now split the Local Authorities listed into either ‘core local authority partners’ ‘secondary local authority partners’ and ‘other potential Local Authority partners’ to more clearly identify the Boroughs that Runnymede has the strongest links with. RBBC is in the ‘other potential Local Authority partners’ category.</p> <p>Given that the issue of Green Belt is closely related to the issue of meeting housing needs and is also part of the collaborative evidence that RBC and RBBC are compiling with other Surrey Authorities as part of the LSS, again it is considered prudent that RBBC remains as a consultee under the Duty to Cooperate for Green Belt matters.</p> <p>Other two points noted.</p>
<b>05) Guildford Borough</b>	Housing – Draft West Surrey SHMA (Dec, '14)	Support for approach noted



<p><b>Council</b></p>	<p>identified core HMA as consisting of Guildford, Waverley and Woking. But it does note there are overlaps with surrounding areas and the HMA has strong linkages with Runnymede. Agree that this is a strategic matter that may require future co-operation.</p> <p>Gypsies and Travellers – GBC have published TAA using the Surrey-wide methodology. Traveller needs is a strategic issue but envisage meeting own needs within Guildford Borough.</p> <p>Economic Development – Agree not a cross boundary issue. FEA consists of Woking and Waverley.</p> <p>Green Belt – Whilst this is a strategic issue, GBC considers co-operation will need to occur between adjoining authorities when undertaking any boundary reviews to ensure overall purposes of Green Belt are not harmed.</p> <p>Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA – Agree that SPA is a strategic issue.</p> <p>Transport – Agree that GBC and RBC do not share any notable transport linkages that may require co-</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Given that the issue of Green Belt is closely related to the topic of meeting housing needs and is also part of the collaborative evidence that RBC and GBC are compiling with other Surrey Authorities as part of the LSS, it is considered prudent that GBC remains as a consultee under the Duty to Cooperate for Green Belt matters.</p> <p>Support for approach noted</p> <p>Support for approach noted</p>
-----------------------	---	---

	<p>operation.</p> <p>Flooding – Agree that this is not a shared strategic issue.</p> <p>Infrastructure – Agree that this is not a shared strategic issue.</p>	<p>Support for approach noted</p> <p>Support for approach noted</p>
<b>06) Woking Borough Council</b>	<p>Nothing to add to the issues identified for co-operation. Council looks forward to engaging constructively with RBC to look at details of the relevant issues.</p>	<p>Positive approach to future engagement welcomed.</p>
<b>07) Office of Rail and Road</b>	<p>No comment to make.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<b>08) Wokingham Borough Council</b>	<p>Agrees that biodiversity is likely to be the sole strategic issue between WBC and RBC. Accepted that Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership Board provides an effective mechanism for the authorities to discuss any strategic matters arising from this issue. But depending upon the emerging approach of the plan for Runnymede, the nature of any strategic issues could change and therefore the authority would wish to be kept informed of any future work so that it can keep its position under review.</p>	<p>Content of representation noted. RBC will continue to consult WBC at appropriate stages as it produces its Local Plan</p>

<p><b>09) Waverley Borough Council</b></p>	<p>No comment to make.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>10) Elmbridge Borough Council</b></p>	<p>All relevant cross boundary strategic matters have been successfully identified.</p> <p>EBC agrees with those cross boundary strategic matters that have been identified as requiring co-operation. A similar DtC statement was prepared by EBC and consulted on in 2014. EBC engaged with a number of adjoining London boroughs and where known, other organisations that represent them, including the South London Partnership and West London Alliance. Both the Partnership and Alliance have been identified by EBC as a stakeholder/duty to co-operate body on strategic matters relating to the provision of new homes and Green Belt. Given the joint working taking place between RBC and SBC on the SHMA and Spelthorne's geographical location adjoining London Boroughs who are in the partnerships (Hounslow, Hillingdon and Richmond), it is recommended that the Partnership and Alliance be added to the list of duty to co-operate bodies or are at least consulted to ascertain the level of involvement they consider appropriate.</p> <p>RBC has identified the most appropriate processes and mechanisms, although a flexible approach is</p>	<p>Support for approach noted.</p> <p>Officers thank Elmbridge BC for drawing these two groups to the Council's attention. The South London Partnership and West London Alliance have been contacted and officers are waiting for a response at the time of writing to determine whether these Groups wish to be engaged with Runnymede's policy work relating to housing and the Green Belt. The DtC Scoping Framework will be updated accordingly if these Groups wish to be engaged.</p> <p>Agreed</p>

	<p>required as the form and nature of cooperation may vary depending on the issue. Certain issues may require more focussed and bespoke meetings to take place. Other instances may need the input of senior officers or councillors with appropriate sign off.</p> <p>Supportive of approach RBC has taken in terms of the scope of the consultation paper and seeking to establish the strategic matters that require ongoing and constructive engagement with other local authorities and prescribed bodies whilst preparing the new Local Plan.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
<p><b>11) Spelthorne Borough Council</b></p>	<p>All cross boundary strategic matters have been identified.</p> <p>Table 1 of the Scoping Statement broadly identifies the relevant bodies, local authorities and consultees. Spelthorne would like to be added for Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA.</p> <p>RBC has identified the most appropriate processes and mechanisms to encourage effective engagement, including the Runnymede/Spelthorne Member Liaison Group to discuss housing related matters.</p> <p>Additional points:</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Spelthorne has been added as a consultee for this matter as requested.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>

	<p><u>Issues</u> For all issues identified at the ‘Publication of the pre-submission Plan’ stage, Memorandums of Understanding may also be required, in addition to Statements of Common Ground.</p> <p><u>Housing</u> 4.1 The Outcome. Agreed that should SBC/RBC not meet the housing needs of their HMA then discussion will need to take place with other HMAs and it is reasonable and pragmatic to start with those with the strongest links.</p> <p>4.1 Initial Thinking. In the ‘action’ column it is agreed that discussions between RBC and SBC will need to take place with respect to OAN and that a joint or consistent SLAA methodology be agreed as indicated in the ‘Anticipated Outcomes’ column.</p> <p>4.2 Preparation of Issues and Options. In the ‘Action’ column it states that collaborative evidence of housing need will be produced through the SSIP. This should also indicate that collaborative evidence of housing need will have to be discussed with authorities outside of Surrey as is indicated in para 1.14 of the Scoping Statement.</p> <p>In the ‘Anticipated Outcomes’ column it is agreed that Runnymede and Spelthorne will need to seek an</p>	<p>Agreed. Additional text added as suggested.</p> <p>Support for proposed approach noted.</p> <p>Support for proposed approach noted.</p> <p>Text added to confirm that collaborative working may involve working with other bodies and partners beyond the Surrey County boundary.</p> <p>Support for approach noted.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>agreement of Runnymede’s land supply position and this is likely to occur through the Member Liaison Group. It is also agreed that emerging issues and options should be discussed prior to consultation to ensure that all reasonable options for delivery have been considered at the earliest stage of plan making.</p> <p>4.2 Consultation on the Issues &amp; Options In the ‘Anticipated Outcomes’ column it is agreed that if there is a shortfall of housing across the Runnymede/Spelthorne HMA then the two authorities will have to engage with other relevant Duty to Cooperate partners in terms of whether they can help meet need or if not finding a common approach to the issue. This will need to be agreed through the Member Liaison Group.</p> <p>The first paragraph in this column states that issues and options will be discussed with DTC bodies during consultation. We assume this is a continuation of dialogue indicated at the preparation stage, rather than consultation being the first chance to comment on options?</p> <p><u>Gypsies and Travellers</u> 5.1 Methods of Engagement It is noted that Runnymede does not envisage joint evidence on Gypsies and Travellers. Given that a joint methodology for TAAs has already been agreed between Surrey authorities this position is</p>	<p>Support for suggested approach is noted.</p> <p>Officers can confirm that this is the intended approach.</p> <p>Support for approach noted. Officers at Runnymede agree that if a MLG is required to discuss meeting traveller needs that the membership and wording of the Terms of Reference would need careful consideration.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>reasonable. It is also noted that if joint evidence is required, use of the Member Liaison Group should be made. If this were the case the Terms of Reference for the MLG would need to be widened and agreed by both authorities.</p> <p><u>Green Belt</u> 7.2 Initial Thinking The invitation to Spelthorne officers and members to a workshop presenting the findings of the Runnymede GB review is welcome.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> 10.1 Methods of Engagement This section could helpfully mention the Lower Thames Strategy groups such as the Officers Group, Funding Strategy Project Board and Programme Board.</p> <p><u>Q.4.</u> <u>Housing</u> 4.1 In the 'Outcome' box it states that Runnymede may need to work with Spelthorne to determine whether Spelthorne can accommodate any of the Runnymede's need. This should also state that Runnymede will work with Spelthorne to determine if any of Spelthorne's need could be met in Runnymede. The danger otherwise is that this position somewhat pre-determines a shortfall in Runnymede before any meaningful discussion has</p>	<p>This meeting has already occurred. Future meetings on the Green Belt Review are not timetabled at the current time.</p> <p>A reference to these Groups has been added as suggested.</p> <p>Text has been amended for clarification on this point.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>taken place between the two authorities with respect to housing delivery. The text should therefore be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>4.2 Initial Thinking In the 'Anticipated Outcome' column it states that Spelthorne is to be given early notification of potential shortfall. This again somewhat pre-determines Runnymede's position. The anticipated outcome of joint SHMA work and the member liaison group is to reach agreement with one another in terms of OAN and how this translated into targets for both authorities and beyond if necessary (taking into account our different timetables for plan preparation). This would be a better statement to make than the current approach of early notification.</p> <p>4.2. Preparation of Issues and Options In the 'Anticipated Outcome' column the first paragraph again appears to pre-determine a shortfall in meeting Runnymede's housing needs and reference to this should be removed.</p> <p><u>Gypsies and Travellers</u> 5.2 Initial Thinking As with general housing Runnymede need to reference that they will work with other authorities to see if Runnymede can help their needs in meeting gypsy and Traveller provision.</p>	<p>The text has been amended to address this comment which is now in the 'preparation of Issues and Options' section.</p> <p>The text has been amended in this section to address this point.</p> <p>Text amended to address this point. This point is now addressed under the 'preparation of the Issues and Options' heading</p>
--	--	--



<p><b>12) Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead</b></p>	<p>Recently undertaken own Duty to Cooperate scoping exercise that identified a number of issues as being of relevance to Runnymede. Those issues are the same in RBC scoping statement – issues are appropriate and correct.</p>	<p>Support for approach noted.</p>
<p><b>13) Mole Valley District Council</b></p>	<p>MVDC agrees that RBC has correctly identified the relevant cross boundary strategic matters. Additional comments relate to:</p> <p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>Parts of both Runnymede and MVDC are within the M25 corridor and in both cases there are a large number of built up areas directly adjacent to the motorway.</p> <p>During MVDC’s 2014 consultation on the Housing and Traveller Sites Plan, the Highways Agency (now Highways England) raised concerns about potential housing sites in the Leatherhead Area and their impact on existing congestion problems on the M25 at Junction 9.</p> <p>While recognising that the impact of development on the Strategic Highway Network falls within the remit of Highways England, MVDC would wish to be assured that the impact</p>	<p>Support for approach noted.</p> <p>Officers can advise that as part of the Local Plan process a Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) will be produced which will consider the cumulative traffic impacts of future</p>

	<p>of any strategic housing or employment sites on the congested stretch of the M25 which includes junction 11 (Chertsey) to Junction 9 (Leatherhead) will be fully assessed, taking into account the cumulative impact of forecast growth across the District and Borough boundaries as far as is possible.</p> <p><u>Housing</u></p> <p>MVDC is in the process of preparing a SHMA in partnership with three neighbouring authorities; Elmbridge BC, Epsom and Ewell BC and RB Kingston upon Thames. The SHMA will form part of the evidence base for a new Local Plan for Mole Valley.</p> <p>In this regard, it is noted that Elmbridge Borough is listed as one of those authorities which may be approached, should it not be possible to meet OAN in full within the Runnymede/Spelthorne boundaries. Ongoing discussions as to progress on both SHMAs and the emerging findings would be potentially beneficial, bearing in mind that both MVDC and Runnymede BC have a close functional relationship with the Elmbridge area.</p> <p><u>Gypsies and Travellers</u></p> <p>MVDC has published a TAA dated Nov 2013, using the Surrey methodology referred to in the Scoping Statement.</p>	<p>development as proposed in the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan on the surrounding highway network (both in terms of the impact on the local road network and strategic road network). The Council is of the view that appropriate account would also be taken of any proposals for significant development in other Local Authority areas.</p> <p>Officers agree that ongoing discussions relating to progress on both SHMAs would be beneficial. As such Runnymede, as part of the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA grouping looks forward to proactive engagement with the Kingston and North East Surrey HMA grouping as both groups of Authorities progress their SHMA work.</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Until December 2014 MVDC was preparing a Housing and Traveller Sites Plan – but this was terminated. Proposals for provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites will now be a matter for the new Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Identification of Consultees</u></p> <p>MVDC is not currently listed as a consultee under the heading of Transport. MVDC has an interest in transport issues affecting the section of the M25 corridor from Junction 9 (Leatherhead) to/from Junction 10 (Chertsey). Therefore, MVDC would be grateful to be kept abreast of any emerging proposals that may have wider implications for traffic flow along this section of the motorway network.</p> <p>MVDC agrees that the framework provided by the Surrey Local Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership will provide the appropriate mechanism for ongoing cooperation between MVDC and Runnymede BC on strategic matters. Specific issues where one to one engagement would be appropriate have been highlighted in this consultation response.</p>	<p>Proposed approach noted.</p> <p>Mole Valley has been added to the list of consultees for this matter as requested.</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p><b>14) Surrey County Council (Public Health)</b></p>	<p>It is not clear as to whether all relevant cross boundary strategic matters have been identified.</p>	<p>Current planning legislation and guidance does not place a requirement on Local</p>

	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that a community needs assessment has been carried out to shape the strategic issues in the first place.</p> <p>It is difficult to identify whether all relevant bodies have been listed in a complex governed county like Surrey, as the various lists assigned to the strategic issues are too vague. Listings such as 'Surrey County Council' or 'NHS Commissioning Board' are too generic for it to be clear that sufficient consideration has been given to ensuring that all the relevant parties in these organisations would be consulted.</p>	<p>Planning Authorities to produce a community needs assessment. Officers do not consider that such a document is required to be produced to feed into this Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement. In any instance, officers are confident that the scoping statement addresses appropriately the relevant strategic cross boundary issues. Paragraph 156 of the NPPF has been followed to ensure completeness.</p> <p>In identifying which bodies should potentially be consulted in relation to different strategic matters, the Council has followed the legislative requirements set down in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 which identifies the relevant prescribed bodies. Prescribed bodies for health for example, as identified in chapter 12 of the report, include Ashford and St Peters NHS Trust, NHS England, Surrey County Council, North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group, Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust and the Windsor, Ascot and Maidenhead Clinical Commissioning Group. Officers consider that in each area of the report, all reasonable efforts have been made to identify the relevant bodies to consult with.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>The Council has not identified the most appropriate processes and mechanisms to encourage effective involvement in the development of the local plan. The section on Infrastructure is weak, as not all partners required are clearly identified.</p> <p>Some of the strategic issues overlap, whereas they are presented in a compartmentalised way. One cannot be sure whether aspects would be missed as a result. For example with flooding, housing and with transport. Local authorities need to ensure that the health impacts of different policies are assessed and health considerations are integrated into planning across all departments.</p>	<p>The mechanisms for engagement have been strengthened throughout the report to respond to this comment. See officer response to point above confirming how Officers have sought to identify all relevant partners for individual topic areas.</p> <p>Officers consider that the approach used has ensured that all strategic matters have been taken into account and addressed appropriately.</p>
<p><b>15) London Borough of Richmond upon Thames</b></p>	<p>LBRuT believes that Runnymede has identified all relevant cross boundary strategic matters. LBRuT recognises it does not share a direct boundary but looks forward to working with Runnymede on several of the strategic matters identified in the scoping statement.</p> <p>LBRuT believes that Runnymede has identified all the required bodies, local authorities and</p>	<p>Support for approach noted. Positive approach to future engagement welcomed. On reflection it is considered that the London Borough of Richmond is not a relevant DtC body for matters relating to gypsies and travellers, climate change, biodiversity and TBHSPA and transport. The report has been amended accordingly. LBRuT will be notified of these changes.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>

	<p>consultees.</p> <p>LBRuT believes that Runnymede has identified the most appropriate processes and mechanisms to encourage effective involvement in the development of the Local Plan.</p> <p>No further comments.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p><b>16) South Bucks District Council</b></p>	<p>The preparation of the Scoping Statement is welcomed. It is noted that there are two issues where the scoping statement proposes to engage with SBDC.</p> <p><u>Housing</u></p> <p>Scoping statement indicates that the local authorities identified for co-operation on housing have been selected based on housing market area geography. Specifically, they are authorities within other HMAs that have links with the Runnymede/Spelthorne HMA. The statement also notes that those authorities with the strongest links with the Runnymede/Spelthorne HMA are Elmbridge, Hounslow and Woking Boroughs. Given this, RBC may want to consider identifying 'core partners' and 'other partners'. If this were done, SBDC would be an 'other partner' – subject to the following consideration.</p>	<p>Officers consider that this is a helpful approach and have amended the Scoping Framework accordingly to identify core Local Authority partners for each identified matter.</p>

	<p>In the 2014 Buckinghamshire HMA/FEMA study, South Bucks was found to form part of a Berkshire SHMA/FEMA. South Bucks understands that the Berkshire authorities have appointed consultants to undertake a SHMA. This work will involve determining the SHMA geography of Berkshire. South Bucks are awaiting the conclusions of this study to see if the conclusions are aligned with the work carried out for the Bucks authorities. The identification of South Bucks within Table 1 should be reviewed once the outcome of the SHMA geography for Berkshire is confirmed.</p> <p><u>Gypsies and Travellers</u></p> <p>In table 1 of the Scoping Statement, the list of authorities identified for co-operation for traveller accommodation is the same as that identified to be engaged on housing matters.</p> <p>The list of authorities is simply replicated and the reason why South Bucks has been included in the Gypsies and Travellers section of table 1 because it may form part of a relevant SHMA.</p> <p>This may be pragmatic but the housing market geography does not in SBDC opinion provide an appropriate basis for the selection of authorities for engagement for traveller accommodation.</p>	<p>Officers confirm that the list of partners for housing matters can be reviewed once the conclusions of the Berkshire HMA work are known.</p> <p>Noted, although this approach has been amended in the final version of the report.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	---	---

	<p>The list of authorities should be based on evidence that relates specifically to travellers rather than assuming the same geographic extent of coverage as for general housing.</p> <p>SBDC is not aware of any evidence that would suggest a firm and justifiable basis for its inclusion as a Duty to Co-operate body on gypsies and travellers.</p> <p><u>Other Matters</u> SBDC agree that it should not be included in other tables in RBC's document, given both authorities are at early plan making stages, SBDC suggest that the tables are kept under review as evidence base work emerges in case the circumstances change. Although unlikely, there could be changes. For example South</p>	<p>Officers at Runnymede are not aware of any published evidence which concludes on the 'Housing Market Areas' most appropriate for travellers. However, officers agree that the housing market geography for conventional bricks and mortar housing may not necessarily be an appropriate starting point for identifying appropriate partners for gypsy and traveller related work. As such officers have reviewed the potential partners to engage on matters relating to gypsies and travellers and can confirm that the list has been amended to include all Surrey boroughs as core partners (as the districts and boroughs in Surrey have produced a joint methodology for producing TAAs and collaborate on issues related to travellers). Other potential Local Authority partners are identified as those with the strongest economic links to Runnymede. All other Local Authorities, including South Bucks have been deleted from the list of partners.</p> <p>Officers at Runnymede agree with the approach suggested by SBDC. Please note that officers have suggested in the revised DtC Scoping Framework that South Bucks is identified as a 'Secondary Local Authority' partner for flooding given the links through</p>
--	--	---



	Bucks is currently scoping a potential water cycle study with the Environmental Agency which may have to cover a significant areas as yet undefined.	the Lower Thames Planning Officers Group which both Authorities attend.
<b>17) Tandridge District Council</b>	<p>TDC acknowledges and welcomes the opportunity to have effective and ongoing dialogue under the Duty to Co-operate with RBC. Co-operation will also be carried out by way of the provisions set out in its own DtC Scoping Statement.</p> <p>TDC's main comment is that the Duty to Co-operate should be carried out as a two way dialogue and is ongoing. TDC are working to a slightly different timetable as Runnymede and would hope that discussions between both authorities are able to reflect this.</p> <p><u>Housing</u> The outcome identifies that Runnymede is unable to accommodate its own needs. It is unclear if the evidence gathering on the strategic matter of housing is complete to determine that this is the outcome. The stages for involvement state 'discussions with other Housing Market Areas (HMAs)' and that TDC is a body this issue should be discussed with. However, it is unlikely that TDC have a strong link with Runnymede HMA and vice versa. On the other hand, TDC recognise the importance of working on the Surrey Local Strategic Statement and the Infrastructure Plan to identify the baseline</p>	<p>Positive approach noted.</p> <p>Officers at Runnymede are aware that Local Authorities in the surrounding area are working to different timetables and agree that this will need to be borne in mind for future engagement.</p> <p>Runnymede has not yet completed its housing evidence and as such is not yet in a position to confirm whether or not it will be able to accommodate its own needs. The text in the housing chapter has been amended to clarify this point. Similar to the response given to RBBC (rep 04 above), it is considered that housing is a cross boundary issue that could require discussions with HMA groupings beyond those HMAs immediately bordering the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA area. Furthermore as TDC identify, both RBC</p>

	<p>situation within the wider Surrey area.</p> <p><u>Gypsies and Travellers</u> The outcome identifies that Runnymede may be able to accommodate its need. However, the stages for involvement state ‘discussions with neighbouring authorities to assist in meeting Runnymede’s need and for potential locations’.</p> <p>From this, it would appear that the evidence to understand whether Runnymede can meet its own need for Gypsy and Traveller has yet to be completed and therefore any unmet need or additional capacity has yet to be determined. Consequently, TDC would like to engage on this strategic matter.</p>	<p>and TDC have signed up to the Surrey LSS which seeks to produce a collaborative evidence base with other Authorities across Surrey relating to housing need. In addition, the Surrey Authorities have a duty to engage with the GLA on the issue of housing. In light of these points it is considered prudent that RBC retains TDC in the ‘who is involved’ box of the housing chapter in the RBC DtC Scoping Framework.</p> <p>The outcome box states that Runnymede will aim to meet its identified needs within the Borough. At the current time however, TDC is correct that Runnymede is yet to complete its land availability work and subsequent strategy work which will identify whether Runnymede is able to meet its identified needs (for all types of development, including the needs of gypsies and travellers) within the Borough. RBC will continue to engage with TDC as it continues with this work and as the conclusions become clearer.</p>
<p><b>18) Environment Agency</b></p>	<p>The opportunity to be involved in the preparation of the Local Plan is welcomed.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	<p>The covering letter and the Scoping Statement have not clarified the framework context or the expected outcomes from the document. Our assumption is that this is an initial step in the process, and that there will be opportunity to co-operate and review further material as the process continues.</p> <p>The specific communication methods identified within this document are very generic and need to be more prescriptive.</p> <p><u>Page 10, table 1: identified Duty to Cooperate issues of relevance and cooperation partners:</u></p> <p>The EA wishes to be included in the Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA section. The role within these issues may be slightly restricted, but would be interested in being consulted.</p> <p>The issue of biodiversity is of concern as the biodiversity of watercourses falls under a water framework development assessment criterion. EA is a consultee for development within 20 metres of a main river, and therefore any future policies regarding biodiversity are of concern.</p> <p>Welcomes inclusion in the Flooding and the Infrastructure sections.</p> <p><u>Section 8.0 Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA</u></p>	<p>This is correct.</p> <p>The EA has been included in the list of bodies to be engaged with on this topic as requested.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	---	--

	<p>This section puts the main emphasis on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. A greater consideration to other biodiversity issues should be considered including the watercourses within the Borough.</p> <p><u>Section 10.0 Flooding</u></p> <p>The outcome for this issue should be revised as the current outcome implies that new development in flood risk areas will be allowed with the inclusion of mitigation measures which is not necessarily the case. The outcome should stress the need for a robust flood risk policy based on sound local evidence that seeks to reduce flood risk in the Borough overall.</p> <p>The following comments apply to the Infrastructure section:</p> <p><u>Methods of Engagement</u></p> <p>Needs to be more specific.</p> <p>EA needs to be included in discussions along with any other DtC body.</p> <p>Also, needs to be more specific on the method of correspondence, as to whether this will be predominantly by email, letter, phone calls, etc.</p>	<p>Agreed. Officers have amended the text in this chapter in line with the comments made.</p> <p>This chapter has been revised in line with the comments made.</p> <p>The methods of engagement sections in the document have been amended to provide more detailed information.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Officers have sought to provide a clearer indication of the methods of correspondence that will likely be sought.</p>
--	---	--

<p><b>19) Surrey County Council (Spatial Planning)</b></p>	<p><u>Minerals and Waste</u></p> <p>There should be reference to the need to co-operate with Surrey County Council as Mineral Planning Policy and Waste Planning Authority and a specific Action should be included to ensure engagement with these authorities.</p> <p><u>Older people</u></p> <p>The need to provide housing for older people is critical given the projected increase in the number of households aged 65 and over. This and the related issues of infrastructure provision and services for an ageing population should therefore be included in the housing section on housing market assessments. An action could be usefully included to liaise with Surrey County Council Adult Social Care and also with SCC Public Health on these issues.</p> <p>Their inclusion would accord with the following statement in the Planning Policy Guidance which related to the assessment of housing need: “Plan makers will need to consider the size, location and quality of dwellings needed in the future for older people in order to allow them to live independently and safely in their own home for as long as possible, or to move to more suitable accommodation if they so wish”. (Paragraph:</p>	<p>A new chapter has been added at Chapter 13. This considers engagement on matters related to minerals development during the course of Plan preparation.</p> <p>The Council’s SHMA considers the level of need for older people over the Plan period.</p> <p>In the ‘who is involved’ box it has been clarified that the Adult Social Care and Public Health teams at Surrey County Council should be consulted on matters relating to housing as the Local plan work progresses.</p> <p>Quote noted</p>
--	--	--

	<p>014, Ref. ID: 2a-014-2014030).</p> <p>The SCC Commissioning team is in course of updating an accommodation and support strategy, to include independent living options with care through to nursing care.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <p>Concerned that there is very little reference to heritage included in the draft statement, particularly as conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape is included as a priority in paragraph 156 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The County Council fulfils the NPPF requirement for Runnymede, as the local planning authority, to “have up-to-date evidence about the historic environment in their areas and use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to their environment” by maintaining the County Historic Environment Record (HER) – which is the comprehensive and definitive database of all of Surrey’s heritage assets and historic environment resources.</p> <p>The County Council should therefore be identified as a contact to provide advice to the Borough, and explain how local heritage assets</p>	<p>Noted. Officers would be interested to see this study once completed.</p> <p>A new chapter has been added at Chapter 13. This considers engagement on matters related to the historic environment during the course of Plan preparation. In addition, further text on the natural environment has been added into chapter 9 to help address the concerns raised.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Surrey County Council has been noted as one of the key bodies for engagement on matters related to the historic environment in</p>
--	---	---

	<p>fit with the County-wide view of Surrey's heritage assets.</p> <p>SCC can make recommendations with regard to areas of paramount strategic importance or heritage significance, as well as outlining sites that require enhancement or specialist management.</p> <p>SCC would welcome being consulted at an early stage of the plan-making process so that constraints to any proposed development sites are identified at the earliest possible stage.</p> <p>Historic England (HE) should also be listed as a consultee, although HE will only comment upon nationally designated heritage assets.</p>	<p>chapter 13 of the scoping framework.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Historic England has been noted as one of the key bodies for engagement on matters related to the historic environment in chapter 13 of the scoping framework.</p>
<p><b>20) Enterprise M3 LEP</b></p>	<p>Welcome recognition of LEP in document. Vital that RBC and LEP work together on themes of: Housing; Economic Development; Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA; Transport and Infrastructure.</p> <p>Issues:</p> <p>In section 1, you recognise that the Surrey Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership offers the opportunity to assist in meeting the</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Noted. Officers at Runnymede welcome this offer for assistance. In light of this representation, a meeting has been arranged</p>

	<p>Duty to Cooperate. In paragraph 1.14 RBC correctly state that it is important to work with partners outside the county boundary and this should include partners in both London and Hampshire. It may be that Enterprise M3's structures can help you to achieve this and we would be more than happy to discuss this further with RBC.</p> <p>Whilst Enterprise M3 support the principles set out in the scoping statement, we would be keen to discuss in further detail the nature and timing of engagement so that we have a clearer idea of how this will be put into practice.</p>	<p>to discuss this further with the LEP.</p> <p>Request noted. As confirmed above, since this representation was submitted, officers have made contact with the LEP and a meeting arranged to discuss the points raised.</p>
<p><b>21) Network Rail</b></p>	<p>Please could Network Rail be added to the list of consultees in paragraph 1.6 of the document.</p> <p>Network Rail is mentioned in Table 1 'Identified</p>	<p>Officers consider that it would not be appropriate to add Network Rail to the list in paragraph 1.6 as Network Rail is not one of the bodies prescribed in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. However, officers welcome Network Rail's commitment to working with officers as the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan is progressed and Network Rail is identified in the Transport chapter of the Scoping Framework as a body who the Council would wish to engage with.</p> <p>The requirements of the Town and Country</p>



	<p>'Duty to Co-operate' Issues and Relevance and Co-operation Partners'. However, since the adoption of The Town and County Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 it will now be necessary for Local Planning Authorities to notify Network Rail of all applications for planning permission within 10m of the railway land, in accordance with Section 16, Part 3 of the DMPO.</p> <p>Network Rail would therefore appreciate being consulted on the developments of the Local Plan and associated documents in the future.</p>	<p>Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (DMPO) are recognised and to ensure that Network Rail is engaged with on any proposed allocations, have been added into the list of consultees in the housing, gypsies and travellers and economic development chapters of the Scoping statement, as well as into the list of consultees in the Infrastructure chapter.</p> <p>Request noted.</p>
<p><b>22) Hart District Council</b></p>	<p>Approach taken, stated potential issues and partners identified appear to be appropriate.</p> <p><u>Housing</u>  Appropriate to recognise Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA and the Hart-Rushmoor-Surrey Heath HMA - The HRSH HMA anticipates that the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA will seek to accommodate its objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) within its own boundaries.</p> <p>On page 12, it is stated that, in the event that Runnymede-Spelthorne cannot accommodate its own need, you would approach adjoining HMAs</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. This is the aim of the Runnymede-Spelthorne HMA grouping although if it is found that this is not possible, discussing the issue of unmet need with other Local Authorities will be necessary.</p> <p>Hart is correct that in such a scenario, the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA grouping would start by approaching those Authorities</p>

	<p>and ‘these authorities have been identified as Elmbridge, Hounslow and Woking Boroughs’. This is considered to be the appropriate approach.</p> <p><u>Gypsies and Travellers</u> Hart’s own DTC scoping exercise did not identify a necessity for strategic planning on this issue with Runnymede.</p> <p>If Runnymede has evidence to the contrary Hart would be glad to be informed.</p> <p><u>Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA</u> Agree that the identification of this as a strategic planning matter is completely appropriate.</p>	<p>it has the strongest links with which are Hounslow, Woking and Elmbridge. If these Authorities could not assist, additional local authorities would need to be approached.</p> <p>Officers at Runnymede are not aware of any specific evidence that has been gathered by any Local Authority in the south east to evidence the areas that travelling families tend to move within. Officers have clarified in the Scoping Framework that for the purpose of the DTC the core Local Authority partners that Runnymede will cooperate with will be the other Surrey Authorities (as the Surrey Authorities have worked together on producing joint methodology to producing TAAs and an officer group meets in Surrey to discuss issues relating to travellers). A number of other Local Authorities who have links for housing or economic reasons have also been identified as having potential links but Hart has been removed from this list.</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>23) Highways England</b>	No comment at present. However, one minor point	Noted. Textual change made as suggested

	<p>is within 9.1 under Transport – the issue and the need for involvement. It states that ‘The Local Plan will be capable of sustainable delivery, without unacceptable adverse impact on the Strategic Highway Network (managed by Highways England) ...’. The word ‘Highway’ needs to be replaced with ‘Road’. Otherwise, HE is happy with the content of the document.</p>	
<p><b>24) Greater London Authority</b></p>	<p>The GLA welcomes the inclusion of the Mayor and TfL as relevant DTC bodies.</p> <p>Can RBC add Transport for London as a Duty to Cooperate Body for the strategic issues of Housing and Economic Development in Table 1, as well as in the relevant tables in section 4 for these issues?</p> <p>The GLA officer-level Strategic Spatial Planning Liaison Group is where representatives from across the wider South East and London are meeting quarterly to discuss DTC issues. Additionally, the Mayor is working with South East England Councils/ South East Strategic Leaders, the East of England Local Government Association and other agencies to explore further arrangements to more effectively coordinate strategic policy and investment across the wider South East of England.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Transport for London has been added to the list of bodies engaged with for Housing and Economic Development matters as requested.</p> <p>Noted</p>

<p><b>25) Bracknell Forest Borough Council</b></p>	<p>Agree with the strategic topic areas of Housing, and Gypsies and Travellers, together with Biodiversity and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, for Bracknell Forest BC to be consulted on. BFBC's draft Functional Economic Area (FEA) study indicates that there are some economic links between Runnymede and Bracknell Forest (although local authorities are not in the same core FEA) so ask to be consulted on economic evidence and policy issues as they progress. As the section on housing refers to the need for potential discussions with adjoining HMAs if housing needs cannot be met in the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA area, ask that BFBC is also consulted on Green Belt matters. BFBC considers that it is likely that DtC discussions surrounding transport and infrastructure will take place by way of Surrey County Council, due to ongoing strategic transport issues such as the M3. Therefore, BFBC do not specifically need to be consulted on these issues.</p> <p>There are some economic links between Runnymede and Bracknell Forest. It would therefore be useful for Runnymede to engage with the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership.</p> <p>Processes and mechanisms set out in the statement appear to be appropriate for the development of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Officers have added Bracknell Forest Borough Council to the list of bodies that are to be engaged with on economic development and Green Belt matters as requested.</p> <p>The Thames Valley Berkshire LEP has been added to the list of bodies to engage with on economic development matters as suggested.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>


<p><b>26) Surrey Nature Partnership</b></p>	<p>Fully support the inclusion of the SyNP as a body with which to co-operate as indicated in section 1.7. Additionally, would like to suggest the specific inclusion of SyNP with regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Issue: 8.0 Climate Change, Biodiversity and TBHSPA</li> <li>• Strategic Issue: 10.0 Flooding, and</li> <li>• Strategic Issue: 11.0 Infrastructure: Open Space and Recreation</li> </ul> <p>With all of these issues, SNP would be pleased to contribute evidence as required.</p>	<p>Officers have added the Surrey Nature Partnership to the list of bodies that are to be engaged with on the subject areas requested.</p> <p>Positive approach noted.</p>
<p><b>27) Heathrow Airport Ltd.</b></p>	<p>HAL acknowledges that Heathrow Airport is not a statutory consultee, and so welcomes RBC's recognition of the need to engage on strategic cross-boundary transport issues.</p> <p>Broadly support the Council's Scoping Statement – given Runnymede's proximity to Heathrow, only right that consideration of cross boundary transport issues is given proper consideration in the Council's review of its Local Plan.</p> <p>Would suggest that consideration be given to the following :</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">That some consideration might be given to collaboration with Heathrow on economic development matters as part of the Local Plan</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed. Officers have added Heathrow to the list of bodies consulted with on economic matters.</p>

	<p>evidence base and future opportunities.</p> <p>That the transport section (issues and outcome) focuses also on transport opportunities in conjunction with infrastructure needs rather than just ‘traffic impacts’. As presently worded, it appears very reactive in terms of assessing traffic impacts of the Local Plan on and beyond the borough. This lacks the cross-boundary dimension one might expect to see here which could also consider influences from outside the borough and reflect the breadth of the agencies and bodies proposed to be involved in this issue.</p> <p>That, pending the outcome of the Airports Commission’s review of future airport runway capacity, the expansion of Heathrow might be one of those cross-boundary influences that warrants consideration.</p>	<p>The text in this chapter has been amended in line with the suggestions made.</p> <p>This Duty to Cooperate Framework is a living document that will be amended during the course of Plan preparation to take account of changes that may occur and which may impact on the matters that the Council needs to cooperate on. As such if expansion at Heathrow Airport is approved, the statement can be amended at the appropriate time to take this into account.</p>
<p><b>28) Rushmoor Borough Council</b></p>	<p>The document is well aligned to the ‘Rushmoor Local Plan – Meeting the Duty to Co-operate’ document. Rushmoor welcomes the positive engagement with Runnymede since the publication of the document in March 2015.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>

<b>29) RHUL</b>	No comments at this stage.	Noted
<b>30) Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust</b>	Conclude that this is an important opening document for the Local Plan. Pleased to be included as health providers.	Noted

*This page has been left intentionally blank*





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: [planning@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:planning@runnymede.gov.uk)

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

2015

