

Cabinet Report

24 June 2015



Title	Duty to Cooperate		
Purpose of the report	To make a decision		
Report Author	John Devonshire		
Cabinet Member	Councillor Vivienne Leighton	Confidential	No
Corporate Priority	This item is not in the current list of Corporate priorities but still requires a Cabinet decision		
Cabinet Values	Accountability		
Recommendations	To agree the amended Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement as the Duty to Cooperate Framework as set out in Appendix B.		

1. Key issues

- 1.1 Local Authorities have a statutory 'duty to cooperate' with other authorities and relevant bodies in dealing with strategic planning issues. These are any issue extending beyond the boundary of a single authority. The duty was introduced in the Localism Act in 2011.
- 1.2 The Council has previously prepared a Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement which outlined the strategic planning issues relevant to Spelthorne and the stakeholders the Council would need to engage with on each of these issues. The Scoping Statement was agreed for consultation by Cabinet in February 2015.
- 1.3 Comments on the Scoping Statement have now been received from several respondents. These are set out in Appendix A along with the Officer's response and any changes considered necessary as a result of comments raised. Appendix B contains the Scoping Statement with the amendments as set out in Appendix A as well as other amendments necessary and as discussed at Local Plans Working Party (LPWP). For ease of reference, the amendments as presented to LPWP are shown as tracked changes in red in Appendix B and the changes arising from the LPWP are shown in blue.

2. Options analysis and proposal

- 2.1 There are no alternatives but to meet the statutory requirement and to clearly set out how the Council will meet it. It is considered that this will best be achieved by setting out a clear Framework for cooperation with other authorities and relevant bodies.
- 2.2 The options for Cabinet to consider are:

(i) To **AGREE** the amended Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement as the Duty to Cooperate Framework, as set out in Appendix B.

(ii) To **AGREE** the amended Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement as the Duty to Cooperate Framework, as set out in Appendix B with any further changes proposed by Cabinet.

(iii) To **NOT AGREE** the amended Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement as the Duty to Cooperate Framework;

2.3 It is proposed that Option (i) be agreed by Cabinet.

3. Financial implications

3.1 There are no direct implications from the agreement and publication of the Framework. Indeed its benefit is in reducing the risk and associated cost of failing to meet the 'duty'.

3.2 There are staff resource implications of meeting the duty but that is a separate matter and this has been taken on board in the growth bid for 2015/16 onward to expand the Planning Policy team.

4. Other considerations

4.1 Officers have for some while been following the principles of cooperation inherent in the 'duty' to ensure the Council is not at risk of challenge.

5. Timetable for implementation

5.1 It is proposed that the Framework, including the comments, Officer responses and intended changes are placed on the Council's web site as the Duty to Cooperate Framework.

Background papers: None

Appendices:

Appendix A – Comments and Responses to the Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement.

Appendix B – Duty to Cooperate Framework document.

Table of Responses and Comments

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
Whole Statement				
Whole	GLA	<p>Thank you for inviting the Mayor of London to respond to the Spelthorne Local Plan Duty to Co-operate Scoping Statement.</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of the Mayor and Transport for London as relevant 'Duty to Co-operate' bodies. Please can you add Transport for London to the identified bodies in Table 4-1 on page 19?</p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to our officer-level Strategic Spatial Planning Liaison Group, in which representatives from across the wider South East and London are meeting quarterly to discuss DTC issues. This group considers a range of high-level strategic issues to complement the DTC obligations of individual authorities. Further information on this group and cross-boundary strategic planning co-operation can be found at: https://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/planning/london-plan/cross-boundary-strategic-planning-co-operation</p> <p>The Mayor is also working with South East</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Borough Council is aware of the Strategic Spatial Planning Liaison Group (SSPOLG) and all Surrey Districts/Boroughs are represented by Officer's from Surrey County Council and Mole Valley DC. Reference to this group can be made in the DTC Statement.</p>	<p>TfL to be added to the identified bodies in Table 4-1.</p> <p>Add reference to SSPOLG in the DTC Statement.</p>

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>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. Spelthorne attended the Wider South East Summit held at the GLA in March 2015 which considered further arrangements for coordinating policy and infrastructure across the wider south east.</p>	
Whole	The Royal Borough Of Windsor And Maidenhead	<p>RBWM welcomes the consultation and the opportunity this offers to agree on the scope of future engagement between our authorities. RBWM agrees that it is necessary to undertake a scoping exercise and considers that the general structure and extent of the document is appropriate.</p> <p>You may wish to note that RBWM is undertaking its own Duty to Cooperate Scoping Exercise and we will shortly consult you and other stakeholders on this. In doing this we have sought to reflect the issues and linkages identified in your own scoping statement. If you consider that there is anything that has been missed or should be presented differently in our work, please feel free to respond accordingly.</p> <p>RBWM looks forward to ongoing and effective engagement with Spelthorne Borough Council and other partners under the Duty to Cooperate.</p>	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
Whole	Elmbridge Borough Council	The issues you have identified as requiring consultation between our authorities are correct, and that they may potentially require further joint working depending on the outcomes of any studies.	Noted.	
Whole	Slough Borough Council	<p>We took a report to our Planning Committee last night about your Scoping Statement.</p> <p>The Section on Spelthorne stated:</p> <p>Spelthorne</p> <p>5.16 As the first stage in the review of its Local Plan Spelthorne Borough Council has prepared a Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement to help ensure that it has identified all relevant cross boundary issues, the authorities/bodies that it will need to engage with and the mechanisms for that engagement.</p> <p>5.17 Spelthorne has joined with Runnymede to prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment which this Council has already been involved in. The key issues identified for the Local Plan are how additional housing requirements within Spelthorne can be met and whether Spelthorne requires assistance from or can</p>		

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>give assistance to other authorities in meeting needs across the local or sub housing market area?</p> <p>5.18 It is considered that the starting point for the Local Plan is that it should seek to meet its housing needs within its boundaries but it is recognised that a range of options need to be tested.</p> <p>5.19 One of the other key issues that has been identified is what the balance between housing and jobs should be in the Borough and how this could be affected by the expansion of Heathrow.</p> <p>5.20 It is considered that it is vitally important that the Spelthorne Local Plan takes full account of the possible expansion of Heathrow.</p> <p>5.21 The Scoping statement for the Local Plan has identified a number of other topics including retail, leisure, transport, open space & recreation, climate change, Green Belt and biodiversity. Slough Borough Council has been identified as an authority</p>	<p>Noted. Agreed that the starting point will be for Spelthorne & Runnymede to meet objectively assessed needs within their HMA as far as is possible in the first instance. However, if this is not possible when balancing need/supply and constraints then assistance may be required from areas outside of Runnymede/Spelthorne.</p> <p>Point regarding Heathrow is noted. This will need to be addressed once a decision regarding airport expansion in the South East has been made.</p>	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>to be engaged in discussion about all of these topics.</p> <p>It was resolved that:</p> <p>b) That Spelthorne Borough Council be thanked for Consulting the Council about its Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement and the comments set out in paragraphs 5.18 and 5.20 of this report be forwarded on to them.</p>	Noted.	
Whole	NHS NW Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>Thank you for inviting NHS North West Surrey CCG, as a prescribed body, to comment on the Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement.</p> <p>I recognise that the document necessarily has a broad remit and therefore covers multiple areas such as employment, retail, leisure, transport, utilities and flooding. Whilst noting these areas, you will appreciate that I have restricted my comments principally to those areas most directly relating the provision of health services for the population of Spelthorne. I have also set out how the CCG wishes to engage with Spelthorne Borough Council in these matters.</p>	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
Whole	Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership	<p>We have reviewed the documentation and engaging Enterprise M3 is entirely appropriate as you develop your Local Plan and we welcome the recognition of Enterprise M3 in the document. Enterprise M3's Strategic Economic Plan recognises Staines-upon-Thames as a Step-up Town and therefore we believe it is vital that we work with you on your homes and jobs; retail and leisure and infrastructure themes.</p> <p>Having reviewed the document, there are a few specific points that Enterprise M3 would like to address which I hope will be useful to you as you develop your Local Plan.</p>	Noted.	
Whole	Surrey County Council	<p>Thank you for consulting Surrey County Council on the Spelthorne Borough Council Duty to Cooperate Statement and draft SCI Consultations.</p> <p>We welcome the involvement of the County Council as a consultee in strategic matters as proposed in the Duty to Cooperate Statement. We have just two minor observations to make relating to education and aviation.</p>	Noted.	
Whole	South Bucks District Council	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Spelthorne Borough Council's Duty to	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>Co-operate Scoping Statement. The following comments have been endorsed by South Bucks District Council's Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development.</p> <p>South Bucks District Council welcomes the preparation of the Scoping Statement. We note that the Scoping Statement lists all those matters which are considered to be strategic in the Spelthorne context and identifies which other authorities and bodies may be affected having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and the advice in the National Planning Policy Guidance on matters including the likely geographic extent or area of influence.</p> <p>The Scoping Statement identifies two issues on which it proposes to engage with South Bucks District Council: (i) general housing and (ii) traveller accommodation.</p>		
Whole	Environment Agency	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above document. We look forward to working with you on your review of your Local Plan.</p> <p>Your DtC Scoping Statement is very comprehensive and we only have a few points to raise.</p>	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
Whole	Surrey Heath Borough Council	<p>Thank you for consulting Surrey Heath Borough Council on the Spelthorne Local Plan Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement. Surrey Heath Borough Council has now had the opportunity to review the document and considers that all relevant cross boundary strategic matters have been appropriately addressed and that the proposed stakeholders and mechanisms for engagement for each topic area have been identified in a suitably pragmatic manner.</p> <p>We note that Spelthorne will be undertaking work to define its Functional Economic Area over the course of the coming year. In doing so, Spelthorne should be aware that the FEA's for some areas have already been defined and established through consultation.</p> <p>I hope this information is of assistance to you. Surrey Heath would welcome the opportunity to comment on future work prepared as part of the Spelthorne Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Spelthorne will review the extent of other FEAs as part of the work on determining which FEA that Spelthorne forms part of. Surrey Heath will continue to be engaged in this process.</p>	
Whole	Hart District Council	<p>Many thanks for consulting Hart DC on the above document, with which fundamentally we have no problems. A couple of issues merit further comment:</p> <p>HOUSING GROWTH</p>		

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>Hart agrees with your identification that our two HMAs (Spelthorne-Runnymede and Hart-Rushmoor-Surrey Heath) will need to keep communicating with each other given that there is a common boundary. It is my understanding from past correspondence that each HMAs will be seeking to accommodate objectively assessed housing need within respective Areas.</p> <p>TRAVELLERS I am less sure about Hart being identified for potential joint work under this theme. Records suggest that we tend to have strongest relationships on this theme northwards towards neighbours in Berkshire and westwards towards Basingstoke. Post-2010 strategic planning does not appear to demonstrate a common relationship over travellers' needs with Spelthorne - unless of course the evidence base reveals otherwise.</p> <p>We look forward to further clarity in this respect.</p>	<p>Noted. However, should evidence show that Spelthorne/Runnymede are not in a position to meet needs in their HMA, this does not preclude further discussion with HMAs outside of Spelthorne/Runnymede.</p> <p>Noted. It is agreed that links between Spelthorne and Hart in terms of Traveller accommodation are unlikely, although this will be subject to the findings of a TAA which Spelthorne has yet to commence. Spelthorne will continue to engage with the authorities/bodies identified in the Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement once it has commenced its TAA.</p>	
Whole	Waverley Borough Council	Thank you for consulting Waverley on the above documents. We have no comments to make.	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
Whole	Transport For London	<p>Thank you for consulting TfL. In response to the consultation request letter, dated 27th February 2015, TfL have the following initial comments.</p> <p>TfL is unclear as to the appropriateness of setting out the limited selection of general and more specific 'key issues' set out at paragraph 4.50. The list appears to be overly focussed on highway capacity, with less regard to the full range of public transport modes.</p> <p>It is noted at Table A2 that Transport for London is not identified as an appropriate party in regard to the assessment of Transport (Walking / Cycling) Infrastructure. This should be corrected to have reflect TfL's function in this area.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.50 places emphasis on highway capacity as this will be one of the fundamental issues for the Local Plan to deal with in terms of both the local and strategic network. Paragraph 4.50 does also considers links to cycle networks and improved rail access to Heathrow as other key issues although it is agreed that public transport should be considered as a key issue and will be added to the list.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Public transport to be added to the list of key issues.</p> <p>TfL to be added to Table A2 for Walking/Cycling.</p>
Whole	Tandridge District Council	<p>Thank you for inviting Tandridge District Council to comment on the Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement.</p> <p>We have no specific comments to make on the scoping statement but would like to take</p>	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		this opportunity to ensure that we continue to work on strategic issues with Spelthorne in regard to the duty.		
Whole	Rushmoor Borough Council	<p>Thank you for consulting Rushmoor Borough Council on the Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement.</p> <p>In terms of general observations, we are supportive of the approach Spelthorne has taken in terms of the scope of the consultation document. In particular, we welcome the setting out of approaches to engage with each of the relevant authorities/bodies on each of the strategic matters identified.</p>	Noted.	
Whole	Office Of Rail Regulation	<p>Thanks for your e-mail of 26.02.15 in regard to the Spelthorne Borough Council Duty to Co-operate scoping statement & Draft Statement of Community Involvement. We have reviewed your proposals & note that your proposals do not affect the current or (future) operation of the mainline network in Great Britain.</p> <p>It might be helpful if I explain that the office has a number of key functions and duties in our role as the independent regulator of Britain's Railways. If your plans relate to the</p>	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>development of the current railway network including the operation of passenger and freight services, stations, stabling and freight sites (including the granting of track and station access rights and safety approvals) within your administrative area, we would be happy to discuss these with you once they become more developed so we can explain any regulatory and statutory issues that may arise.</p> <p>I have attached a copy of our localism guidance for reference, which can be found at: http://www.rail-reg.gov.uk/upload/pdf/localism-guidance.pdf</p>		
Whole	Woking Borough Council	<p>Thank you for consulting Woking Borough Council on the Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement. I have nothing further to add to the issues that have been identified. They are sufficiently comprehensive. However, I am yet to gain a full understanding of why you felt that matters such as housing provision are relevant strategic issues between Spelthorne and Woking as we are in different Housing Market Areas. Obviously the discussions will clarify that and we look forward to engage with you to define in detail the relevant strategic matters between the two authorities and how we can work together to address that.</p>	<p>The draft Spelthorne & Runnymede SHMA identifies potential overlaps with other housing market areas. The SHMA highlights that although Spelthorne/Runnymede can be viewed as a single local HMA, overlaps do exist specifically with Elmbridge, Hounslow and Woking and that the authorities should work together to explore this. As such we welcome Woking's intent to discuss and engage with Spelthorne/Runnymede on this strategic issue.</p> <p>The draft Stage 2 SHMA will be circulated to all DtC partners and as such Woking will have the opportunity</p>	No change.

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
			to comment on this document and hold further detailed discussions with Spelthorne/Runnymede as appropriate.	
Section 3				
Section 3	Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership	In Section 3 (Existing Mechanisms of Engagement and Identification of New Mechanisms), it would be helpful if this list acknowledged the relevant structures within Enterprise M3 and the role that they could play, in particular the Enterprise M3 Joint Leaders Board and the Enterprise M3 Action Groups (notably Transport and Land and Property).	Noted.	Scoping Statement to be updated to refer to EM3 LEP structures and the role they could play.
Section 3	Environment Agency	We support the existing mechanisms outlined in section 3.16 to 3.18 regarding flooding, flood risk and the River Thames Scheme (RTS). The RTS is a partnership project and these mechanisms for working together are important to ensure that all parties are involved and communicating the same messages. The Lower Thames Planning Officers Group provides a platform for discussion and sharing of best practice across a wider planning remit.	Noted.	
Section 4				
Section 4	Reigate And	- We have no evidence to suggest that both	Noted. It would appear that Reigate &	No change.

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
	Banstead Borough Council	<p>Reigate and Banstead BC, and Spelthorne BC are in the same housing market, and therefore we do not consider that there are any cross boundary issues to engage on regarding General Housing. However, RBBC recognises that authorities across Surrey as a whole have a duty to engage with the Greater London Authority on this issue.</p> <p>- We have identified potential cross-boundary issues relating to Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation with yourselves and other Surrey Authorities, and therefore we agree with your identification of engagement with our Borough on this issue.</p> <p>- We are in agreement that there are no other strategic matters to engage on with Spelthorne Borough Council.</p>	<p>Banstead and Spelthorne are not within the same or within neighbouring HMAs. However, as stated authorities across Surrey have a duty to engage with the GLA on this issue which may require a joint approach from all Surrey authorities.</p> <p>Whilst it is highly unlikely that there will be a functional link between Spelthorne and Reigate & Banstead in terms of Gypsies & Travellers, Spelthorne has not yet commenced its TAA work. Until such time as survey work discounts a functional link, Spelthorne will continue to engage on this issue.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
Section 4	Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership	In Section 4 (Transport) it would be helpful for Enterprise M3 to be included on the list of people to be engaged on the highway capacity issues mentioned in paragraph 4.49.	Noted.	EM3 LEP to be added to the list in paragraph 4.49.

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
Section 4	Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership	At section 4.53, you propose that Enterprise M3 could play a role in facilitating engagement with the utility providers. This isn't something that Enterprise M3 in the past but would be happy to discuss this opportunity with you in further detail at the appropriate time.	Noted. Spelthorne to discuss infrastructure with EM3 LEP at the appropriate time although this may partly be through the Surrey Planning & Infrastructure Framework (SPIF).	
Section 4	Surrey County Council	<p>Education</p> <p>Paragraph 4.76 states that "Education services in Spelthorne are provided by Surrey County Council." The county council's role is however rather more complex in terms of its service delivery role and we are not the sole provider of education. Something along the lines of the following extract from the Schools Organisation Plan might be helpfully incorporated into the education section:</p> <p>Surrey County Council has a statutory duty to ensure there are sufficient school places in the county to meet the present and future demand for school places. It is the role of the County Council to plan, organise and commission places for all maintained schools in Surrey in a way that raises standards, manages rising and declining pupil numbers and creates a diverse school</p>	Noted.	Scoping Statement to be amended to reflect the Schools Organisation Plan.

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>community. The County Council seeks to exercise this function in partnership with Dioceses, governing bodies of schools, head teachers, local communities and other key stakeholders.</p> <p>Aviation</p> <p>We note that in Table A3, Heathrow Airport is included as a consultee for cross boundary strategic matters. We would suggest that the County Council could also usefully be involved in joint liaison with the airport, particularly as the implications of airport expansion is likely to directly impact on transport and other county council provided strategic infrastructure and it is important that we work together to resolve potential impacts.</p>	<p>Noted. Spelthorne welcomes Surrey County Council's commitment to be involved in joint discussions with Heathrow Airport in the event of expansion.</p>	<p>SCC to be identified for Aviation in Table A2.</p>
Section 4	South Bucks District Council	<p>General Housing:</p> <p>The Scoping Statement explains that the local authorities identified for co-operation on general housing (listed in Table 4-1) have been selected based on housing market area geography. Specifically, they share a common administrative boundary with Spelthorne/Runnymede (who are undertaking a joint SHMA) and/or are authorities that are within neighbouring</p>		

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>housing market areas.</p> <p>As you are aware, in 2014 the Buckinghamshire district councils commissioned ORS and Atkins to identify the housing market areas (and functional economic areas) that the four authorities fall within, both at a strategic and more local level. ORS/Atkins were also asked to identify other authorities that fall within those areas. The study is currently being finalised, but is likely to conclude that South Bucks forms part of a Berkshire SHMA/FEMA. South Bucks DC understands that the Berkshire authorities have appointed consultants (GL Hearn) to undertake a SHMA. An early stage of that work involves determining the SHMA geography for Berkshire. Although not a commissioning authority, South Bucks is currently awaiting the recommendations of GL Hearn to see whether their conclusions are aligned with those of the ORS work on Buckinghamshire. If the Berkshire commission concludes that South Bucks does form part of the Berkshire SHMA, South Bucks will be seeking to arrange a discussion on how the SHMA will be taken forward and what role, if any, the Berkshire authorities see for South Bucks as part of the remaining stages of G L Hearn's work. It is also understood that the G L Hearn work</p>	<p>Spelthorne are aware of the SHMA work that ORS has been undertaking on behalf of the Buckinghamshire authorities and the provisional conclusions from that study. Spelthorne is also aware that the Berkshire authorities have commissioned GL Hearn to undertake a Berkshire wide SHMA and Spelthorne/Runnymede will be attending the SHMA event on 19th May and will continue to engage in the process.</p> <p>From the early work undertaken by ORS on behalf of the Buckinghamshire authorities it is Spelthorne's understanding that part of South Bucks is likely to fall within an HMA with other Berkshire authorities which could include the Borough of Slough which neighbours Spelthorne. It is noted that the study is still being finalised but that South Bucks is likely to form part of a Berks HMA. However, Spelthorne also notes that the GL Hearn study for Berkshire may not find South Bucks in a neighbouring HMA to Spelthorne/Runnymede but other areas of Berkshire.</p>	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>will be testing whether there should be one or two SHMAs based on Berkshire; if two is the conclusion South Bucks may not be in an adjoining SHMA with Spelthorne.</p> <p>Given this emerging context, the identification of South Bucks within Table 4-1 should be considered provisional and subject to review once the outcome of the SHMA geography for Berkshire is confirmed.</p> <p>Traveller Accommodation:</p> <p>The Scoping Statement explains that the local authorities identified for co-operation for traveller accommodation (listed in Table 4-2) are the same as those identified to be engaged on housing matters. In other words, the list compiled for Table 4-1 is simply replicated in Table 4-2, and the reason why South Bucks has been included in Table 4-2 is because it may form part of a Berkshire SHMA. Whilst this may be 'pragmatic', the housing market geography which is emerging based on robust, tailored methodologies and using specific, up-to-date technical evidence, does not in our opinion provide an appropriate basis for the selection of authorities for engagement for traveller accommodation. The list of</p>	<p>As such, until such time as HMA boundaries are confirmed between Berks/South Bucks, South Bucks will remain as an identified DtC partner in Table 4-1, although it is agreed that this should be reviewed if South Bucks does not fall within a neighbouring HMA to Spelthorne/Runnymede.</p> <p>Whilst it is agreed that DtC partners should be identified based on evidence relating to Travellers, the approach to using the same authorities as for general housing is a pragmatic way forward until such time as evidence has been collated. This ensures that Spelthorne engages with as wide an area as possible at the early stages of plan preparation even though subsequently links may not be seen between the two borough's (which is a likely outcome). In any event this position can be reviewed once TAA and survey evidence is in place.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>authorities in Table 4-2 should be based on evidence that relates specifically to travellers rather than assuming the same geographic extent of coverage as for general housing. South Bucks DC is not aware of any evidence that would suggest a firm and justifiable basis for its inclusion in Table 4-2.</p> <p>Other Matters</p> <p>Although we agree that South Bucks should not be included in other tables in your document, given that both of our authorities (and those around us) are at early plan-making stages we 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 Bucks is currently scoping a potential water cycle study with the Environment Agency which may have to cover a significant area as yet undefined.</p>	<p>Noted. Tables will be reviewed as evidence is updated. Spelthorne would wish to be kept informed of the potential for a water cycle study as will other authorities within the lower Thames area.</p>	
Section 4	English Heritage	As you are aware the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission (English Heritage) is a "prescribed body" by virtue of Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>is therefore required to co-operate in relation to planning of sustainable development with local planning authorities and other prescribed bodies by Section 33A of Part 2 of the Planning and Compulsory Act (as inserted by Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011).</p> <p>The activities on which the prescribed bodies are required to co-operate include the preparation of a development plan and other local development documents so far as they relate to a strategic matter; i.e. sustainable development or use of land that has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas.</p> <p>English Heritage confines its involvement in planning issues to matters that involve or otherwise affect the historic environment. English Heritage's duty to co-operate is therefore appropriate in respect of strategic matters that would involve or otherwise affect a heritage asset.</p> <p>According to our records, there is just one heritage asset, Chertsey Bridge scheduled monument, that straddles the Borough boundary and therefore might potentially be a strategic matter. There are also a number of listed buildings located in close proximity to the Borough boundary which could</p>		

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>potentially be affected by strategic matters, but you have identified these as not requiring strategic cooperation.</p> <p>I also note that cross-boundary housing sites are identified as a major issue. If any of these would involve or otherwise affect a heritage asset, then again English Heritage should be involved.</p>		
Section 4	Guildford Borough Council	<p>Thank you for consulting us on your Duty to Cooperate scoping statement. We agree with your assessment that the only two shared cross boundary strategic issues pertain to meeting wider housing and traveller need.</p> <p>Housing: whilst Guildford do not form part of the Spelthorne's housing market area, housing need and provision is a sub-regional issue. Through our respective local plans it will be important that we all maximise opportunities to sustainably meet identified needs in order to minimise pressure on remaining areas.</p> <p>Travellers: we share a common Surrey-wide methodology which our Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2012) has been prepared in accordance with. Whilst meeting traveller need is a strategic issue</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>we envisage meeting our own traveller need within our borough.</p> <p>We look forward to continuing to work with Spelthorne where relevant as we progress our local plans.</p>		
Section 4	Environment Agency	<p>Section 4 of your Scoping Statement identifies the proposed engagement for strategic cross boundary issues. We have the following comments on specific sections.</p> <p>Utilities Infrastructure</p> <p>With regard to the section on Utilities Infrastructure we are happy with the key issues in paragraph 4.55 and are pleased we are included as an identified body in Table 4-7: Proposed Engagement for Utilities Infrastructure. The issues we would want to be addressed under this heading are foul drainage infrastructure and water supply.</p> <p>Flooding and Flood Risk</p> <p>We support the section on flooding and flood risk in particular the need to update the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		Surrey Local Nature Partnership.		
Q1 – Has the Council identified all relevant cross boundary strategic matters and those which could have a significant impact on at least two planning areas?				
Q1	The Royal Borough Of Windsor And Maidenhead	All matters identified by RBWM are addressed in the document.	Noted.	
Q1	NHS NW Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group	The Scoping Statement appears to have identified relevant strategic matters. I was pleased to note that (Paragraph 4.6) the Borough Council will continue to respond to and engage with other authorities and bodies where they request this, including those which might cover a wider geographic area, and respond positively where joint working between Spelthorne and other authorities would facilitate agreement or joint approaches. An example of this joint working would be the development of the CCG's planned Locality Hubs, providing integrated services for frail older people - an initiative involving Surrey County Council and the four Borough Councils spanned by the CCG, as well as local health providers and the voluntary sector.	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
Q1	Runnymede Borough Council	RBC does not wish to add to the specified list of relevant cross boundary strategic matters and those that could have a significant impact on at least two planning areas.	Noted.	
Q1	Natural England	<p>The document should to address that part of the Borough lies in the 5-7km avoidance and mitigation zone for the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) and that a strategic cross boundary approach / solution and strategic policy NRM6 is in place for large developments over 50 units in this zone - n.b. the closest point of the Borough is 6.3km from Chobham Common Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) which is also part of the TBHSPA and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright, and Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</p> <p>The document should address the fact that any activity with potential harm to SSSIs, or likely significant effect if a Natura 2000 site, will be assessed even if the designated site lies outside of Spelthorne BC's administrative boundary.</p>	<p>Only a small part of Spelthorne lies within the 5-7km zone of influence for the TBH SPA and the whole of the Borough lies outside of the 5km zone where avoidance in the form of SANG and SAMM is required as a matter of course. The number of development opportunities for 50 or more dwellings within the area of Spelthorne in the 5-7km zone is also likely to be limited. However, reference will be made to the TBH SPA, Policy NRM6 and the TBH Joint Strategic Planning Board in this respect. It should be noted that Spelthorne is not an authority which sits on or has been invited onto the JSPB.</p> <p>Reference to activity affecting Natura 2000 sites or SSSIs sites outside of Spelthorne to be added although this would (for Natura 2000) normally be undertaken as part of a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</p>	<p>Add reference to TBHSPA Policy NRM6 and JSPB.</p> <p>Reference to activity affecting Natura 2000 sites or SSSIs to be added.</p>

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>The same point as above applies to Local Wildlife Sites, although this tier of site falls below NE's statutory remit for comment.</p> <p>Ancient Woodland as defined as irreplaceable by the NPPF should be considered in the biodiversity section and should be added in for consideration, as should Best and Most Versatile (BMV) soils as a finite resource and cross boundary issue.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Reference to Local Wildlife Sites to be added.</p> <p>Reference to Ancient Woodland and BMV soils to be added.</p>
Q1	London Borough Of Richmond Upon Thames	<p>Yes, we believe that Spelthorne has identified all relevant cross-boundary strategic matters and those which could have a significant impact on at least two planning areas.</p> <p>LBRuT looks forward to working with Spelthorne on the following strategic matters, as identified in the scoping statement: Housing; Traveller Accommodation; Employment; Retail; Leisure and other commercial; Transport infrastructure (road + walking / cycling); Flooding and flood risk; Health; Open space and recreation; Climate change; Green belt / Landscape; and Biodiversity.</p>	Noted.	
Q1	Transport For London	In regard to strategic matters, in relation to transport, yes, although comment is offered	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		below in terms of what 'key issues' are noted to arise from these matters.		
Q1	Rushmoor Borough Council	In terms of the strategic matters that are shared across Rushmoor and Spelthorne, we would support the view that this extends only to Housing related matters (including Gypsy & Traveller accommodation) given the fact that both authorities are located within neighbouring Housing Market Areas. In respect of other strategic matters, given the extent of the distance between our respective authorities, we do not feel we can comment with certainty on whether all of these have been addressed.	Noted.	
Q2 – Has the Council identified all relevant authorities, prescribed bodies and other consultees that it needs to engage and work with to maximise the effectiveness of planning policies in regards to each strategic matter?				
Q2	The Royal Borough Of Windsor And Maidenhead	Given the evolving and iterative nature of engagement, RBWM considers that a pragmatic list of stakeholders has been identified. RBWM considers that the list of stakeholders should be kept under review and revised if necessary as engagement on particular issues develops.	Noted.	The list of stakeholders will be kept under review during plan preparation and will be set out within the Framework Statement.
Q2	NHS NW Surrey Clinical Commissioning	Looking first at matters relating directly to health services, paragraph 1.18 refers to the list of prescribed bodies to which the duty		

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
	Group	<p>applies, among which, for Health, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clinical Commissioning Groups; - National Health Service Commissioning Board (now NHS England); <p>Although these are the statutory requirements, I would strongly recommend that for your local plan, you include reference to NHS Property Services, or any equivalent successor body, in ensuring meaningful engagement over health infrastructure, particularly in relation to Primary Care services. This should be added to Section 2 (Identified Bodies) in Table 4.9.</p> <p>In the same section (Para 4.65), I suggest acknowledging that the majority of the population's health service contacts take place in Primary Care - which is not currently mentioned in Para 4.65. (Primary Care includes GP services and dentists.) You may also consider adding Community Health Services - currently provided by Virgin Care Services Limited.</p> <p>Para 4.67: I suggest amending to read "The commissioning of the majority of health services..." as currently NHS England and, to a small extent, Surrey County Council (public health team) also commission some</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Reference to NHS Property Services to be added to Table 4.9.</p> <p>Reference to Primary Care to be added along with Community Health Services.</p> <p>Reference to NHS England and Surrey County Council commissioning some health services to be added to paragraph 4.67.</p>

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>health services.</p> <p>My key concern is to make clear the link between housing growth and capacity of health service infrastructure. It is essential that planning takes into account both underlying and planned population growth. The increase in housing (acknowledged in para 4.8 to be the largest type of development in the Spelthorne Plan) can put overwhelming pressure in very localised areas in terms of access to health service infrastructure, particularly in primary care.</p> <p>I note that the CCG is not included as an Identified body in Table 4-1 (or indeed in Table 4-2, in respect of Traveller communities), but is identified in table A2 for both Housing and Gypsy and Traveller communities.</p>	<p>Noted. Spelthorne (either individually or with other authorities) will engage further with the CCG as part of the work to determine housing needs and health provision in the wider area. This will be acknowledged in the general housing & Gypsy & Traveller sections.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Add CCG to stakeholders for General Housing and Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>CCG to be added to Tables 4-1 and 4-2.</p>
Q2	Runnymede Borough Council	RBC does not wish to see any amendments made to the list of consultees identified.	Noted.	
Q2	Natural England	Additional suggestions of consultees: RSPB, and Local Records Centre (could be useful for information / records). I note that the Surrey Wildlife Trust will be engaged through the Surrey LNP.	Neither the RSPB or Local Records Centre are prescribed bodies under the Duty to Cooperate. However it is considered that the RSPB could be engaged with respect to biodiversity matters given the presence of SPA	Add RSPB to list of stakeholders for biodiversity issues.

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
			and Ramsar in Spelthorne.	
Q2	London Borough Of Richmond Upon Thames	Yes, we believe that Spelthorne has identified all relevant authorities, prescribed bodies and other consultees that it needs to engage with in regards to each strategic matter.	Noted.	
Q2	Transport For London	In regard to Transport matters, largely. In regard to public transport engagement, it should be made clear that the input from the full range of public transport service operators, such as those listed at paragraph 4.47, will be fully available if coordinated by or channelled through those bodies set out in paragraph 4.49.	Noted.	Statement will be amended to clarify that engagement with the full range of public transport providers will be coordinated/channelled through the bodies set out in para 4.49.
Q2	Rushmoor Borough Council	The document offers a comprehensive approach in respect of meeting the Duty to Cooperate requirements and appears to address all of the relevant authorities and bodies as prescribed in legislation.	Noted.	
Q3 – Has the Council identified all relevant processes and mechanisms to ensure effective engagement to address strategic matters?				
Q3	The Royal Borough Of Windsor And Maidenhead	RBWM notes that a mix of mechanisms is being considered to ensure effective engagement. RBWM considers this to be an appropriate way forward.	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
Q3	NHS NW Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>We welcome the approach the Borough Council takes to collaboration, including the various working groups and partnerships which have been in operation prior to the duty to cooperate and have been in operation for some time.</p> <p>I recognise (Para 3.9) that the Surrey Leaders Group, formed from the Leaders of the 11 Surrey Boroughs and Districts and the Leader of Surrey County Council provides a forum to discuss strategic issues and to give Surrey a stronger voice in Local Government. I question where equivalent discussion takes place around planning decisions at Borough level, such as health service infrastructure and would welcome this gap being addressed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Comments regarding planning decisions at Borough level are noted. The purpose of the Duty to Cooperate is to ensure that local authorities and other prescribed bodies are engaging with one another during the preparation of Local Plans.</p>	
Q3	Runnymede Borough Council	RBC considers that SBC has identified the relevant processes and mechanisms to ensure effective engagement to address strategic matters.	Noted.	
Q3	Natural England	<p>NRM6 - good to note.</p> <p>In line with para. 118 of the NPPF, net biodiversity enhancements and gain should</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	Reference to paragraphs 118 & 119 of the NPPF to

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		<p>be sought and this para. could be reference, and we advise that enhancements are considered in a holistic and joined-up strategic way. Para. 119 could also be referenced which refers to Natura 2000 sites and the presumption of sustainable development not applying where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Habs Regs is being considered or determined.</p>		<p>be added.</p>
Q3	London Borough Of Richmond Upon Thames	<p>Yes, we believe that Spethorne has identified all relevant processes and mechanisms to ensure effective engagement - both existing and proposed new mechanisms.</p> <p>LBRuT looks forward to continuing to work together on the River Thames Scheme (RTS) as part of the Lower Thames Planning Officers Group to address strategic flooding issues across the lower Thames area. We agree with Spelthorne's statement that 'the groups already set up within the lower Thames area to deal with flooding, flood risk and the RTS are suitable vehicles for engagement under the duty to co-operate' and LBRuT will continue working together with Spelthorne and the other partners towards implementation of the Scheme.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Spelthorne confirms its commitment to working with the Lower Thames Planning Officers Group on strategic flood risk issues in the lower Thames area.</p>	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
		In respect of any potential future planning application for development at Kempton Park Racecourse which lies on the boundary of the two authorities, liaison between Richmond and Spelthorne will be necessary given the potential cross-boundary issues, as already identified in the Statement, in particular related to housing, transport and infrastructure.	Noted. Should an application come forward Spelthorne will engage with the London Borough of Richmond given the proximity of the site to the two authority areas. However, the Kempton Park site is within the Green Belt and unless any proposal conforms with paragraphs 89 and/or 90 of the NPPF, development would be inappropriate and require the demonstration of very special circumstances.	
Q3	Transport For London	No 'options for development' (of mechanisms for engagement) have been proposed in this area.	Noted.	Methods of engagement for transport issues will be developed.
Q3	Rushmoor Borough Council	Rushmoor Borough Council can only comment in respect of the Housing matters. It is considered that the mechanisms proposed provide a sufficient basis upon which to ensure these matters can be addressed as our respective Local Plans progress.	Noted.	

Q4 – Do you support the Council’s intended approach and timetable for engaging with identified authorities, prescribed bodies and other consultees?

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
Q4	NHS NW Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group	The approach and timetable seems appropriate, subject to the comments above. I would encourage the Borough Council to continue to engage with the CCG, as at present, through existing forums such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local Joint Commissioning Group - NWS Transformation Board - Spelthorne Together - Spelthorne Health and Wellbeing Group - CCG Locality Stakeholder meetings as well as engaging with us on any specific areas of planning, such as health centre development/redevelopment and the impact of housing developments on Primary Care infrastructure.	Noted.	Groups identified by CCG to be referenced in the Statement.
Q4	The Royal Borough Of Windsor And Maidenhead	Given the evolving and iterative nature of engagement, RBWM considers that the approach and timetable identified is pragmatic. RBWM considers that these matters should be kept under review and revised if necessary as engagement on particular issues develops.	Noted. The matters identified in the Scoping Statement will be kept under review and this can be referenced in the Statement.	List of matters to be kept under review during plan preparation. This will be set out within the Framework Statement.
Q4	Runnymede Borough Council	RBC has no objections to the Council's intended approach and timetable for engaging with consultees.	Noted.	

Document Section or Question	Name	Comment	Response	Amendment Required?
Q4	Natural England	No specific comments to make.	Noted.	
Q4	London Borough Of Richmond Upon Thames	Yes, we support Spelthorne's intended approach and timetable for engaging with identified authorities, prescribed bodies and other consultees.	Noted.	
Q4	Transport For London	No specific timetables have been set out in this area.	Noted. Timetables will be developed when the Council begins to consider transport issues.	
Q4	Rushmoor Borough Council	Again, Rushmoor Borough Council can only comment in respect of Housing matters. We are satisfied that the methods and timetable set out within the Scoping Statement are appropriate. Please note that our own Local Plan timetable may give rise to a need for engagement sooner than is outlined within the Scoping Statement	Noted.	

Spelthorne Local Plan

Duty to Cooperate Framework **Scoping** **Statement**

June **February** 2015



Contents

	Page
1. Introduction & Consultation Arrangements	1
2. The Spelthorne Context	7
3. Existing Mechanisms for Engagement & Identification of New Mechanisms	9
4. Identification of Strategic Cross Boundary Matters & Duty to Cooperate Bodies	15

Table A1: Cross Boundary Strategic Matters – Local Authorities

Table A2: Cross Boundary Strategic Matters – Higher Tier Authorities and Prescribed Bodies

Table A3: Cross Boundary Strategic Matters – Other Consultees

[Appendix A – Table of Responses & Comments – See separate document](#)

1. Introduction & Consultation Arrangements

The Duty to Cooperate

- 1.1 The duty to cooperate is a legal requirement on local planning authorities to take into account and plan for matters which extend beyond their local area. These matters are described as strategic cross boundary matters.
- 1.2 The role of considering and planning for strategic cross boundary matters has, until recently, been dealt with at Regional level through Regional Planning Guidance or Regional Strategies. The overall strategy, policies and aims of the Regional Plan had to be reflected within local level planning documents to ensure that strategic matters were taken into account at the local level.
- 1.3 The last regional strategy for the South East 'The South East Plan'¹ dealt with a range of cross boundary strategic matters such as housing, transport, climate change, biodiversity and economic development. As part of its localism agenda the coalition Government signalled their intention to abolish regional strategies and in 2012 the South East Plan was revoked (apart from the saving of policy NRM6 which relates to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area).
- 1.4 In recognising the gap left by revoking regional strategies and to ensure that strategic matters continue to be taken into account at the local level, Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011² amended the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to include a new section on the duty to cooperate (Section 33A³).
- 1.5 The duty to cooperate is a legal requirement to ensure local planning authorities engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plans with respect to strategic cross boundary matters. Section 33A of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) describes strategic matters as: -

'(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, or (ii) has or would have a significant impact on a county matter.'

¹ The South East Plan (2009). Available at: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100528142817/http://www.gos.gov.uk/gose/planning/regionalplanning/815640/>

² Localism Act 2011. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted>

³ Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/contents>

- 1.6 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)⁴ came into force in 2012 and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)⁵ in 2014. Both of these documents contain guidance on how local authorities can meet their legal obligations under the duty and to ensure that any cooperation between parties leads to effective Local Plan policies which reflect strategic cross boundary issues.
- 1.7 Paragraph 178 of the NPPF states that public bodies have a duty to co-operate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to strategic priorities. Paragraph 179 states that local planning authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans.
- 1.8 Paragraph 156 of the NPPF sets out the issues which are considered to be strategic priorities. The matters listed in the NPPF are: -
- The homes and jobs needed in the area;
 - Provision of retail, leisure and other commercial 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 (including heat);
 - Provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities;
 - Climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscapes.
- 1.9 As such, local planning authorities must identify matters of cross boundary and strategic significance and proactively engage with each other and other relevant bodies to ensure that such matters are taken into account and delivered through the Local Plan process.
- 1.10 The PPG note on the duty to cooperate sets out that local planning authorities should make every effort to secure necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters before they submit their Local Plans for examination⁶. The PPG note also explains that activities that fall within the duty include activities that prepare the way for or support the preparation of Local Plans such as evidence base documents and can relate to all stages of the plan preparation process⁷.
- 1.11 As it is a legal obligation, the Borough Council must be able to demonstrate at examination how it has engaged with other parties on the strategic cross boundary issues which affect the area and the outcomes of that engagement. The PPG note on the duty to cooperate states that authorities should submit

⁴ National Planning Policy Framework (2012). Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

⁵ Planning Practice Guidance (2014). Available at <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/>

⁶ Paragraph 001 & 003 of PPG Note *Duty to Cooperate*

⁷ Paragraph 011 of PPG Note *Duty to Cooperate*

robust evidence of the efforts they have made to cooperate on strategic cross boundary matters⁸. As such the Borough Council must be able to demonstrate with evidence how it has met the legal and soundness strands of the duty. Some of the other advice coming out of the PPG includes: -

- Local Planning authorities should focus on outcomes and maximise effectiveness;
- The duty is about engagement and consultation is not sufficient to meet requirements;
- The duty cannot be applied retrospectively so if a plan fails the legal test there are no mechanisms to put this right;
- The duty is on-going and engagement is expected to continue after a plan has been adopted i.e. continuing joint work with others or monitoring and implementation of the plan.

1.12 The Borough Council is also mindful that other authority Local Plans have failed the duty to cooperate either in terms of legality or effective plan making⁹. Some of the key messages highlighted by Inspectors have been: -

- Robust frameworks for cooperation need to be established and should be put in place early in the plan making process so that co-operation can be progressed and monitored;
- Cooperation should include the issues to be addressed, how these will be taken forward, the outcomes anticipated, outcomes delivered and the bodies to be involved;
- Local authorities should not be selective over which of its neighbours it cooperates with;
- The duty requires a coordinated process for securing sustainable development and resolving strategic issues;
- Whilst different authorities may be at different stages of plan making, evidence of collaborative engagement is required such as the establishment of joint committees, joint planning policies or Memoranda of Understanding;
- In depth analysis of the issues facing local planning authorities in the wider area and how these should be addressed is needed;

1.13 It is a local planning authority's duty, as the authority submitting a plan for examination to have sought to address strategic issues and Planning

⁸ Paragraph 011 of the PPG Note *Duty to Cooperate*

⁹ Letter from Inspectors to Kirklees Council 26 April 2013, Mid Sussex District Council 2 December 2013 & Letter to Runnymede Borough Council 29 April 2014.

Inspectors will expect the Borough Council to demonstrate that engagement has been constructive, active, on-going, collaborative, diligent and of mutual benefit. Whilst the PPG note on the duty explains in paragraph 003 that it is not a duty to agree, it is clear that engagement must be constructive.

The Role of this ~~Framework~~ **Scoping Statement**

- 1.14 The PPG note *Duty to Cooperate* recommends that local authorities ‘scope’ the strategic cross boundary issues which the Local Plan is likely to reflect. The ‘scoping’ exercise should also consider the geographic extent of strategic issues and identify which authorities or bodies it will need to engage with. [The Council has undertaken consultation on a Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement which has formed the basis for this Duty to Cooperate Framework.](#) ~~The~~ ~~is~~ ~~Scoping~~ ~~Statement~~ ~~and~~ ~~this~~ ~~Framework~~ forms part of the background evidence for the Local Plan and also fulfils a number of important roles, notably it: -
- Ensures the Borough Council has identified all of the strategic issues which effect the Borough and wider area at the earliest stage of plan preparation;
 - Sets out the framework for how Spelthorne Borough Council will approach engagement under the duty by identifying the authorities/bodies with which it will need to engage and the mechanism for that engagement (in broad terms);
 - Allows consultation with those authorities and bodies identified under the Duty (see paragraphs 1.18-1.19 below) who may identify other issues, bodies or mechanisms for engagement that the Borough Council has not identified;
- 1.15 It is envisaged that this ~~Framework~~ ~~scoping statement~~ will ~~evolve into and~~ form part of the Council’s evidence to demonstrate that it has met the duty and has engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis. [However, this Framework will need to be reviewed as and when issues evolve or if authorities/bodies need to be added or removed.](#)
- 1.16 Later statements will therefore show how it has engaged and the outcomes of that engagement by identifying the actions/events which have taken place, when they have taken place, who was involved, the outcomes of those actions and how they have influenced the options, strategies and policies of the Spelthorne Local Plan. How the Borough Council intends to take matters forward to ensure on-going collaborative working arrangements will also need to be considered.
- 1.17 Details will also be given in these statements of any correspondence or agreements which may have been made between the Borough Council and other parties to ensure delivery of the strategy and policies of the Local Plan.

Who does the duty to cooperate apply to?

1.18 In terms of who the duty applies to, this includes all local planning authorities, county councils and a list of prescribed bodies. Regulation 4 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012¹⁰ lists those bodies which are prescribed bodies for the purposes of the duty. This includes: -

- The Environment Agency;
- English Heritage;
- Natural England;
- Mayor of London;
- Civil Aviation Authority;
- Homes & Communities Agency;
- Clinical Commissioning Groups;
- National Health Service Commissioning Board (now NHS England);
- Office of Rail Regulation;
- Transport for London;
- Integrated Transport Authorities (no ITA covers Spelthorne);
- Highway Authorities
- Highways Agency;
- Marine Management Organisation (not relevant to Spelthorne);

1.19 Although not listed as prescribed bodies, paragraph 180 of the NPPF also states that local planning authorities should have regard to Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and Local Nature Partnerships as well as private sector bodies, utility and infrastructure providers.

¹⁰ Town & Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/made#f00016>

Consultation Arrangements

- 1.20 ~~To ensure that~~ Spelthorne Borough Council consulted on a Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement from 27th February to 30th March 2015. The role of the Scoping Statement was to ensure that the Council were ~~is~~-taking the correct approach to its duty to cooperate obligations ~~during Local Plan preparation~~ and that all strategic issues and relevant authorities/bodies were identified; ~~comments on this Scoping Statement are invited.~~ To ensure a good response a reminder email was sent to all authorities/bodies who had not responded by the deadline, to give them an extension to the 17th April 2015 to return any comments.
- 1.21 In responding to the ~~is~~ consultation there were a number of general questions which respondents were asked to answer. These are set out in the box below.~~it would be appreciated if the following questions could be addressed:~~

Consultation Questions

1. Has the Council identified all relevant cross boundary strategic matters and those which could have a significant impact on at least two planning areas?
2. Has the Council identified all relevant authorities, prescribed bodies and other consultees that it needs to engage and work with to maximise the effectiveness of planning policies in regards to each strategic matter?
3. Has the Council identified all relevant processes and mechanisms to ensure effective engagement to address strategic matters?
4. Do you support the Councils intended approach and timetable for engaging with identified authorities, prescribed bodies and other consultees?

- 1.22 Responses were received from a number of authorities and bodies and these are listed below. The comments raised and how the Council has taken them into account is set out in Appendix A to this Framework.

Local Authorities

[Elmbridge Borough Council](#)
[Greater London Authority/Mayor of London](#)
[Guildford Borough Council](#)
[Hart District Council](#)
[London Borough of Richmond](#)
[Reigate & Banstead Borough Council](#)
[Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead](#)
[Runnymede Borough Council](#)

[Rushmoor Borough Council](#)
[Surrey County Council](#)
[Slough Borough Council](#)
[South Bucks District Council](#)
[Surrey Heath Borough Council](#)
[Tandridge District Council](#)
[Waverley Borough Council](#)
[Woking Borough Council](#)

Other Bodies

[Environment Agency](#)
[English Heritage](#)
[Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership](#)
[Natural England](#)
[North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group](#)
[Office of Rail Regulation](#)
[Transport for London](#)

1.23 A number of other authorities and relevant bodies were consulted, but a response was not received. Nevertheless, the Council will continue to seek engagement with these authorities and bodies under the Duty to Cooperate through the Local Plan process especially where evidence suggests a functional link.

[Affinity Water](#)
[Ashford & St Peters Hospital Trust](#)
[Bracknell Forest Council](#)
[Colne Valley Park Partnership](#)
[Epsom & Ewell Borough Council](#)
[Heathrow Airport Ltd](#)
[Highways Agency](#)
[Homes & Communities Agency](#)
[London Borough of Hillingdon](#)
[London Borough of Hounslow](#)
[Mole Valley District Council](#)
[Mono Consultants Ltd](#)
[National Grid](#)
[Network Rail](#)
[NHS England](#)
[Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames](#)
[Southern Electric Power](#)
[Southern Gas Networks](#)
[Sport England](#)
[Surrey & Borders Partnership NHS Trust](#)
[Surrey Local Nature Partnership](#)
[Surrey Police & Crime Commissioner](#)
[Thames Water](#)

~~If you consider that the Council has not identified a strategic matter, a relevant authority/body or that other processes/mechanisms for engagement would be more suitable, then justification for an alternative approach should be provided e.g. evidence should be provided as to why the Council should engage with another authority/body on a strategic matter.~~

~~1.23 Responses to this consultation should be received no later than **Monday 30th March 2015** and e-mailed to planning.policy@spelthorne.gov.uk or alternatively posted to:~~

~~—— Planning Policy & Implementation
—— Spelthorne Borough Council
—— Council Offices
—— Knowle Green
—— Staines-upon-Thames
Surrey
TW18 1XB~~

2. The Spelthorne Context

Geographic Context

- 2.1 The Borough of Spelthorne is in north-west Surrey and adjoins the London boroughs of Hillingdon, Hounslow and Richmond to the north, the Berkshire authorities of Windsor & Maidenhead and Slough to the west and the Surrey authorities of Runnymede and Elmbridge to the south and east respectively.
- 2.2 Spelthorne covers an area of some 5,118ha, 65% of which is designated as Green Belt. The population of the borough at the time of the 2011 census was recorded as 95,598. The majority of the population are distributed to the larger centres of Ashford, Shepperton, Staines-upon-Thames and Sunbury which are also the locations of the largest retail centres in the Borough.
- 2.3 Because of its proximity to the river Thames and its tributaries, a significant proportion of the Borough is at risk from a 1 in 100 year flood event. The river Thames forms the entire southern and eastern boundary of the Borough with Runnymede and Elmbridge. The area susceptible to a 1 in 100 year flood event covers some 896ha or 17.5% of the borough, 358ha or 7% of which falls within the urban area.
- 2.4 870ha or 17% of the borough is covered by reservoirs with the Wraysbury, Staines and King George VI reservoirs also forming part of the South West London Waterbodies Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar. The area around the three reservoirs at Staines Moor is also part of the SPA and Ramsar and forms the southernmost area of the Colne Valley Regional Park which stretches up from Surrey into parts of Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire as well as the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- 2.5 Spelthorne is accessible to both the M3 and M25 motorways with junctions at Staines-upon-Thames and Sunbury. The Borough also benefits from 5 rail stations with direct links to London Waterloo, Reading, Weybridge and Windsor.
- 2.6 Heathrow airport lies just north of the Borough in the London Borough of Hillingdon and employs over 8% of Spelthorne residents. The Airports Commission is currently considering the future of airport expansion in the South East of England and has shortlisted three options, one at Gatwick and two at Heathrow. The Heathrow options include extension of the northern runway or a new northwest runway.

Spelthorne Local Plan

- 2.7 Spelthorne Borough Council adopted both its Core Strategy & Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) and its Site Allocations DPD in February and December 2009 respectively. The Core Strategy & Policies DPD contains both the strategic and detailed planning policies for the Borough up to 2026. This includes a housing target for 3,320 net additional dwellings (166 per annum) as well as 32,000sqm of retail development in Staines-upon-Thames

Town Centre.

- 2.8 However, the Spelthorne Core Strategy & Policies DPD was adopted prior to publication of the NPPF and before the revocation of the South East Plan. The Borough Council therefore considers that parts of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD are not up to date or consistent with national policy in the NPPF.
- 2.9 As such the Borough Council resolved in September 2014 to review the Core Strategy and Policies DPD with the view to publishing a new Local Plan. The timetable for review will be reflected in an updated Local Development Scheme (LDS). Prior to this decision some Duty to Cooperate activities have included the continuous review of evidence as is required by Section 13 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). However, this was not a review of the Local Plan.

3. Existing Mechanisms of Engagement & Identification of New Mechanisms

- 3.1 The Borough Council is mindful that paragraph 181 of the NPPF sets out that cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation. The PPG note on the Duty to Cooperate states that local planning authorities and other public bodies must work together constructively from the outset of plan preparation to maximise the effectiveness of strategic policies.
- 3.2 The PPG note also explains that local planning authorities and public bodies need to work together at the plan scoping and evidence gathering stages before options for the planning strategy are identified and that effective cooperation is unlikely to be met by an exchange of correspondence, conversations or consultations between authorities alone. As such, simply consulting on documents at an early or later stage of plan preparation will not be enough to meet the duty.
- 3.3 Through the scoping exercise~~Therefore~~, the Borough Council ~~will need to~~ identify existing mechanisms of engagement and whether these ~~were~~~~are~~ the most suitable and effective under the duty or whether new mechanisms ~~were~~~~ill be~~ required. This ~~should~~~~ensures~~ that ~~at this scoping stage~~ mechanisms are identified or in place at the earliest opportunity prior to Local Plan or evidence base development. In some instances the mechanisms for engagement will need to be reviewed as issues evolve.
- 3.4 Examples of mechanisms to ensure collaborative and effective working are set out in the PPG note. It explains that where two or more local planning authorities work together to prepare Local Plans or policies they could form joint committees, joint plans or align their plans so they are examined and adopted at the same time.
- 3.5 Other ways to demonstrate effective cooperation, especially if plans are not being brought forward at the same time include the use of formal agreements between local planning authorities, signed by members with a clear long-term commitment to a jointly agreed strategy on cross boundary matters.
- 3.6 The PPG note also states that agreements should be as specific as possible and contain sufficient certainty that an effective strategy will be in place for strategic matters.

Existing Mechanisms

- 3.7 The Borough Council has a history of collaborative working and engaging with other local authorities and bodies both at officer and member level. Collaborative working which Spelthorne is currently involved with includes various working groups and partnerships, some of which were set up prior to the duty to cooperate and have been in operation for some time.

- 3.8 The working groups and partnerships that Spelthorne officers or members attend provide a vehicle to discuss strategic matters and duty to cooperate issues, although not all of these will necessarily offer the most suitable or effective mechanism depending on the strategic issue at hand. The existing mechanisms include the following: -

Surrey Leaders

- 3.9 The Surrey Leaders Group is formed from the leaders of the 11 Surrey Boroughs and Districts and the leader of Surrey County Council. The Surrey leaders group is used as a forum to discuss strategic issues and to give Surrey a stronger voice in Local Government.
- 3.10 At a meeting of the Surrey Leaders group on the 26th March 2014 the need to consider a shared vision and strategic priorities for Surrey were discussed. Leaders agreed at that meeting to set up a Surrey Strategic Planning & Infrastructure Partnership Board (The Board). The Board is supported by Terms of Reference and a Memorandum of Understanding which acts as the framework for cooperation. The Memorandum of Understanding and Terms of Reference were agreed by Spelthorne Borough Council at its Cabinet meeting of 30 September 2014.
- 3.11 The terms of reference set out The Board's objectives to provide a vehicle for cooperation and joint working between authorities within Surrey and address matters relating to the duty to cooperate through:-
- Identifying and managing spatial planning issues that impact on more than one local planning authority across Surrey; and
 - Support better integration and alignment of strategic spatial infrastructure and investment priorities across Surrey.
- 3.12 The Terms of Reference also set out that The Board will act together to achieve its aims by:
- Providing a framework to evidence that Surrey Local Authorities are working 'constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis' on strategic planning matters to support compliance with the duty to cooperate and deliver 'sound' plans.
 - Being 'spatially specific' where there is a strategic focus on particular areas within Surrey or overlaps with adjoining areas.
 - Providing a basis for working collaboratively with the GLA/Mayor of London and other authorities on the long term growth of London, particularly in relation to the next full review of the London Plan and the Mayor's Long Term Infrastructure Plan.

- Integrating strategic spatial, economic and infrastructure priorities for Surrey with a clear set of (agreed) objectives for delivering 'sustainable' prosperity in Surrey. This should build on the priorities in Surrey Future, the Strategic Economic Plans and local plans and collaboration with the LEPs and Surrey Local Nature Partnership.
- Providing a positive voice for Surrey, setting out its case for investment and why it is important to the national economy.
- Helping to align business/investment priorities of other key bodies, e.g. Environment Agency, transport operators and utility companies.

3.13 The work endorsed by Surrey Leaders is the first step towards a Local Strategic Statement (LSS) for Surrey. The aim of the LSS is to set out common priorities, objectives and a broad strategic direction across Surrey so that boroughs and districts can reflect these in Local Plans and demonstrate that they have worked constructively, actively and on an on-going basis. This is to build on the work and investment priorities agreed by Surrey Future and Strategic Economic Plans. It is envisaged that a Surrey Local Strategic Statement could be finalised in 2015.

Strategic Spatial Planning Liaison Group (SSPOLG)

3.14 The Strategic Spatial Planning Liaison Group (SSPOLG) brings together an informal group of Officers from the wider south east and London. The group meets quarterly to discuss a range of high level strategic issues and is facilitated by a consultant engaged by the Mayor of London.

3.15 Since SSPOLG was formed a number of workshop events and working groups have been established dating back to October 2013. The group is the first step in considering how strategic planning issues can be coordinated across the wider south east and how engagement between the Mayor of London and authorities in the wider south east will move forward.

3.16 A wider south east summit was facilitated by the Mayor of London in March 2015 which brought together at Member level authorities from across the wider south east. The purpose of the summit was to explore options for cooperation and engagement between the Mayor and wider south east.

Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (EM3 LEP)

3.17 Local Enterprise Partnerships are partnerships between local authorities and businesses. LEP's decide what the priorities should be for investment in an area through their Strategic Economic Plans. Spelthorne is located within the Enterprise M3 LEP area which stretches 75 miles from the boundary of London to the New Forest in Hampshire and covers 14 local authority areas.

[3.18 The EM3 LEP has a number of action groups which support the EM3 Board and cover issues such as Transport and Land & Property. These action groups could play a role either in coordinating or facilitating engagement on a number of issues.](#)

Transport for Surrey (TfS)

3.194 The Transport for Surrey Partnership comprises a board which meets quarterly and includes all of Surrey's Boroughs/Districts, Surrey County Council, transport providers and transport agencies. The board is a mechanism to share emerging transport policy and enables collaborative working across Surrey boundaries.

3.2045 The TfS Partnership aims to provide a cohesive communications and consultation channel and includes the objective of improving coordination and partnership working. The TfS Partnership is supported by Terms of Reference.

Flooding, Flood Risk and the River Thames Scheme (RTS)¹¹

3.2146 The River Thames Scheme (RTS) is a project promoted by the Environment Agency aimed at reducing flood risk across the lower Thames area from Datchet to Teddington. The scheme consists of engineering works to construct three new flood channels within Runnymede, Spelthorne and Windsor & Maidenhead, improving three existing weirs at Molesey, Sunbury and Teddington and installing property level products to 1,200 homes.

3.2247 In response to flooding, flood risk and the RTS a number of groups have been set up. These comprise Officers from the local authorities of Elmbridge, Kingston, Richmond, Runnymede, Spelthorne, Windsor & Maidenhead as well as Surrey County Council and the Environment Agency. The main groups are the Lower Thames Planning Officers Group, the Programme Board and a Consents & Authorisations Project Board.

3.2348 The Programme Board has recently considered the preferred mechanism to gain planning consent for all aspects of the scheme and how local authorities across the Lower Thames can consistently reflect the RTS in their Local Plans. It is considered that the groups already set up within the lower Thames area to deal with flooding, flood risk and the RTS are suitable vehicles for engagement under the duty to co-operate, although Member level agreement may be required at some point.

New Mechanisms

3.2449 Whilst some existing mechanisms are in place to facilitate engagement and collaborative working on strategic issues, these may not be sufficient or suitable to meet duty to cooperate requirements for all strategic issues. As such new mechanisms are likely to be required, especially where functional

¹¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/river-thames-flood-risk-management-scheme>

areas cross into other county areas or London.

- | 3.250 There are a number of examples of mechanisms which demonstrate effective engagement and cooperation over wider geographical areas which have been developed in other parts of the country. Whilst not all of these mechanisms may be suitable for Spelthorne they do indicate that there are other mechanisms that could be employed to meet the duty.

*Coastal West Sussex & Greater Brighton Local Strategic Statement*¹²

- | 3.264 The Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton (CWS&GB) partnership includes six local authorities, one county council and one national park authority. The authorities have come together to form a Strategic Planning Board made up of lead Members from each authority which works in an advisory capacity and is supported by a memorandum of understanding and terms of reference signed by each of the authorities.
- | 3.272 The Strategic Board's remit is to identify and manage spatial planning issues which impact on more than one local planning area and to support the better integration and alignment of strategic spatial and investment priorities across the area.
- | 3.283 The CWS&GB group agreed a Local Strategic Statement (LSS) in October 2013 which sets out a series of long term strategic objectives and spatial priorities between 2013 and 2031. The LSS focuses on strategic issues shared across the CWS&GB area or those which impact on long term sustainability and includes a vision, four strategic objectives and five spatial priorities.
- | 3.294 Although the LSS is not a statutory document, it is envisaged that the priorities expressed in the LSS will be progressed through relevant plans and strategies, especially within the Local Plans of those authorities within the CWS&GB area. A similar approach has been undertaken in the Gatwick Diamond area which covers authorities in East Surrey & West Sussex and as set out above Surrey Leaders have endorsed work on an LSS for Surrey.

*Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Memorandum of Cooperation*¹³

- | 3.3025 The Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation was published in spring 2013 and was signed by six local authorities and one county council. The Memorandum aims to provide additional evidence that the duty to cooperate has been addressed by demonstrating that emerging local authority plans and strategies contribute toward an area wide strategic vision, objectives and spatial strategy.

¹² Coastal West Sussex & Greater Brighton Local Strategic Statement (2013). Available at: http://www.adur-worthing.gov.uk/media/media_120139_en.pdf.

¹³ Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Memorandum of Cooperation (2013). Available at: <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/sites/www.scambs.gov.uk/files/documents/Memorandum%20of%20Co-operation.pdf>.

- | 3.3126 The Memorandum sets out a vision and objectives for long term development of the area and a broad spatial approach to achieve that vision and the area's growth needs 2011-2031. The Memorandum is supported by an appendix which shows the level of objectively assessed housing need across the area and the amount which has been agreed to be taken by each authority.

*Strategic Policy Framework for the West Midlands Metropolitan Area*¹⁴

- | 3.3227 The West Midlands partnership comprises seven metropolitan boroughs which form the West Midlands Joint Committee. Established in 1985, the Committee is responsible for coordination and joint action on issues of mutual interest with the appointment of sub-committees to deal with its functions including a Planning & Transport Sub Committee.

- | 3.3328 The Strategic Policy Framework sets out that its purpose is to demonstrate commitment to on-going collaboration to meet the duty to cooperate, be a material consideration in plan preparation and continue to provide a coherent strategic spatial context for the third West Midlands Local Transport Plan.

- | 3.3429 The Policy Framework sets out a set of shared policy priorities and emerging priorities for spatial development. The Policy Framework recognises that the shared priorities cannot be considered in isolation.

*West of England Strategic Framework*¹⁵ & *West of England Duty to Cooperate Schedule*¹⁶

- | 3.3530 The West of England Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) is formed from four local authorities and is the body which is responsible for the Strategic Framework and Duty to Cooperate Schedule.

- | 3.364 The Strategic Framework sets out in one document the over-arching growth ambitions for the West of England from the strategic visions of each of the local authority Core Strategies. The Framework is primarily to assist investment making decisions and delivery priorities and contains a spatial vision for 2006-2026 supported by 7 objectives.

- | 3.372 The Framework states that the four authorities are committed to working together with relevant stakeholders to ensure strategic issues are addressed.

- | 3.383 The purpose of the Schedule is to identify the strategic planning issues affecting more than one authority area, to define the processes for taking

¹⁴ Strategic Policy Framework for the West Midlands Metropolitan Area (2012). Available at: <http://www.solihull.gov.uk/Portals/0/Planning/LDF/StrategicPolicyFrameworkWestMidlandsArea.pdf>.

¹⁵ West of England Strategic Framework (2012). Available at <http://www.westofenglandlep.co.uk/transport-and-infrastructure/duty-to-cooperate-planning>

¹⁶ West of England Duty to Co-operate Schedule (June 2014). Available at: <http://www.westofenglandlep.co.uk/transport-and-infrastructure/duty-to-cooperate-planning/the-duty-to-cooperate-schedule>

these forward and to document the outcomes delivered. The Schedule sets out the joint work which has already been established including the Strategic Framework and an emerging Joint Planning Strategy.

- | 3.394 The Schedule contains a list of actions and delivery outcomes and identifies the local authorities and other parties which will be affected.

How Spelthorne will Engage with Other Authorities & Bodies

- | 3.4035 It is recognised that the Borough Council will need to consider which mechanism of engagement is the most suitable and effective according to each strategic issue. It may be the case that for evidence documents the Borough Council will need to take a wider collaborative approach to begin with and then focus engagement and discussion to those authorities where a more formal approach will be required to deliver effective strategies.
- | 3.4136 Therefore a mix of mechanisms along with bespoke collaborative stakeholder events/mechanisms will likely be required to ensure that engagement has been active and on-going.

4. Identification of Strategic Cross Boundary Matters & Duty to Cooperate Bodies

- 4.1 Paragraph 156 of the NPPF identifies what may constitute strategic cross boundary matters. In order to understand the matters and who they may affect and hence who Spelthorne Borough Council will need to engage with, a matrix approach has been used.
- 4.2 The matrix approach lists all of those matters which are considered to be strategic in the Spelthorne context and then identifies which other authorities and bodies may be affected. The matrix approach includes all of those relevant bodies as given by Section 33A of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012 as well as paragraph 180 of the NPPF. Other bodies that are not prescribed by the Act or Regulations have also been included where the Borough Council considers that engagement would assist positive outcomes.
- 4.3 In considering the extent of the issues, regard has been had to paragraph 180 of the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should take account of different geographic areas.
- 4.4 Regard has also been had to advice in the PPG note on the duty to cooperate which states that it is important to adopt a pragmatic approach in deciding the area over which cooperation is needed. The PPG note also states that for some strategic matters the most effective outcomes may be achieved through a small number of local planning authorities while other matters may need cooperation over a larger functional area.
- 4.5 As such, the Borough Council has taken a view of whether engagement with an authority or body is required based on each specific issue under consideration and its likely geographic extent or area of influence. Appendix 1 sets out matrices of all the strategic cross boundary issues identified and with whom the Borough Council will seek to engage. Set out in the rest of this section is the Borough Council's approach to each strategic issue as set out in Paragraph 158 of the NPPF as well as its geographic extent. This also includes which authorities and bodies the Borough Council will engage with and a broad indication of how it will engage.
- 4.6 It should be noted that, just as Spelthorne will seek to engage on the matters set out in this section with other authorities and bodies, the Borough Council will also respond to and engage with other authorities and bodies where they request this. To this end Spelthorne Borough Council will: -
- Respond positively to requests from other authorities and bodies for engagement on matters which have been identified as likely to affect Spelthorne, its interests or the wider geographic area; and

- Attend and contribute toward duty to cooperate meetings or events at Officer and where necessary Member level which are organised by other authorities/bodies on matters which have been identified as being of relevant cross boundary significance; and
- Consider requests for joint evidence studies and where appropriate agree joint approaches to strategic matters where this will achieve sustainable development; and
- Respond in a timely manner to authority consultations and respond positively where joint working between Spelthorne and other authorities has facilitated agreement or joint approaches under the duty to cooperate.

4.7 Whilst the Borough Council will be constructive in its approach, it retains the right to object or raise concerns to an authority or body's Local Plan or Strategy where a strategic issue affecting Spelthorne has been identified but engagement has not been forthcoming or has been untimely. The right to object will also be retained should discussions under the duty fail to be active, constructive or on-going.

Homes & Jobs Needed in the Area

General Housing

- 4.8 Housing is likely to be the largest type of development required in a Spelthorne Local Plan. Housing needs and household moves are not restricted to single local authority areas but cross administrative boundaries. As such, an understanding of housing market geographies and future housing needs across a wider area is necessary. This will be explored through a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which will be the evidence that determines objectively assessed housing needs (OAHN) for the housing market area in which Spelthorne sits.
- 4.9 The PPG note on Housing & Economic Needs Assessments sets out that Local Planning Authorities should assess their development needs working with the other local authorities in the relevant housing market area.
- 4.10 Spelthorne and Runnymede Borough Councils have commissioned consultants to undertake a joint SHMA on their behalf which is expected to report early 2015. The SHMA has been split into two elements of work with stage 1 looking at which housing market area or areas Spelthorne and Runnymede fall into and stage 2 the consideration of objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) and housing mix. Although the SHMA is a piece of joint work between the Boroughs it is recognised that housing need is a wider issue and as such the geographic extent of the strategic matter is fairly wide.
- 4.11 Since the agreement to work together Spelthorne and Runnymede notified a number of local authorities and bodies of the intention to begin work on the stage 1 study. Spelthorne and Runnymede along with the SHMA consultants followed this with a Duty to Cooperate stakeholder event on the 20th August 2014 to discuss the draft stage 1 report. The event was attended by a number of the local authorities and bodies who were previously notified of the study. Attendees and non-attendees alike were asked to give comment on the draft stage 1 report conclusions. The comments received were taken into account in the final stage 1 report as appropriate.
- 4.12 The authorities and selected bodies invited to the stakeholder event are shown in Sections 1 and 2 of Table 4-1. The authorities/bodies chosen reflect the wide geographic extent of the issue and included all authority areas with a common boundary to Spelthorne/Runnymede and authorities which sit within neighbouring housing market areas (HMA's).
- 4.13 A pragmatic view was taken with respect to which London Borough's to engage with given that the London HMA as defined in the London SHMA¹⁷ includes all London boroughs.

¹⁷ The 2013 London Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014) Mayor of London. Available at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/planning/london-plan/draft-further-alterations-to-the-london-plan>

- 4.14 The Mayor of London published the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) in January 2014 which proposed increasing London's housing target to 42,000 dwellings per annum. However, the evidence supporting the FALP in the London SHMA pointed to a housing need of between 49,000-62,000 dwellings per annum, a minimum of some 7,000 dwellings per annum more than the proposed target.
- 4.15 Spelthorne Borough Council along with a number of other authorities outside of London raised objections through the FALP consultation and Examination in Public (EiP) about how this shortfall would be addressed. Concerns were raised that if London could not meet all of its own housing needs then areas outside of London including Spelthorne would be expected to pick up some of the shortfall. As such, the housing shortfall in the FALP adds uncertainty to housing needs within the Spelthorne and wider area outside of London. The Inspector has since found the FALP to be sound, albeit that an early review of the London Plan will be needed in 2015 and the Mayor is currently in the process of adopting the FALP. Spelthorne will continue to engage with neighbouring London authorities and the Mayor through the GLA on this strategic issue through the early review of the London Plan.
- 4.16 The Borough Council will also need to understand the latest position on housing land supply through a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The PPG note on Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment states that the assessment should be undertaken working with other local planning authorities. This area of work has not yet been commenced but engagement is likely to be with a similar set of authorities and bodies as invited to the SHMA stakeholder event.
- 4.17 Therefore the joint Spelthorne/Runnymede SHMA work, SHLAA and the FALP raise some key issues in terms of housing needs that will have to be considered through the duty to cooperate. These include: -
- How additional housing requirements within Spelthorne can be met;
 - The part that Spelthorne plays in meeting needs across the local or sub housing market area;
 - Whether Spelthorne requires assistance from or can give assistance to other authorities in meeting needs across the local or sub housing market area;
 - The dynamics for the type of housing needed within the local or sub housing market area;
 - Whether additional governance arrangements are required to ensure effective collaboration with other authorities within the local or sub housing market area.

Table 4-1: Proposed Engagement for General Housing

1. Identified Authorities	
Bracknell Forest	Richmond-upon-Thames
Elmbridge	Runnymede
Epsom & Ewell	Rushmoor
Guildford	Slough
Hart	South Bucks
Hillingdon	Surrey CC
Hounslow	Surrey Heath
Mole Valley	Tandridge
Mayor of London/GLA	Waverley
Kingston-upon-Thames	Windsor & Maidenhead
Reigate & Banstead	Woking
2. Identified Bodies	
Enterprise M3 LEP	Homes & Communities Agency
Transport for London	North West Surrey CCG
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
SHMA Stage 1 Report: Duty to Cooperate stakeholder event held August 2014 with all authorities and selected bodies.	
SHMA Stage 2 Report: Stakeholder event(s) with all authorities and selected bodies TBA for 2015.	
SHLAA – Consultation on SHLAA methodology with all authorities and selected bodies with stakeholder events if necessary – 2015	
Local Plan housing options – Meetings/Discussions with selected authorities and bodies prior to options consultation – 2015/16	
Consultation on Local Plan options – 2016.	
Housing target – Meetings/Discussions with selected authorities at officer and member level with a view to entering into agreements prior to Pre-Publication consultation – 2017	
Consultation on Pre-Publication Local Plan – 2017 & Publication Local Plan 2018.	

Traveller Accommodation

- 4.18 Whilst Traveller accommodation is unlikely to be a major source of development in the future, the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states in paragraph 8 that in setting pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plots for travelling showpeople they should work collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities. As such, Traveller accommodation is a strategic matter.
- 4.19 To date Spelthorne Borough Council has collaborated with other Surrey authorities to agree a joint methodology for Traveller Accommodation Assessments (TAA). The joint methodology was published in April 2012 and ensures consistency in the approach to accommodation assessments across Surrey. Various Gypsy & Traveller groups and forums were consulted on the methodology and the wording of an associated questionnaire before the methodology was agreed. A Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) for Spelthorne and Traveller SHLAA have not yet been commenced.
- 4.20 As with housing, a pragmatic approach to the geographic extent of engagement has been taken. All authorities identified to be engaged on housing matters are again identified to be engaged for Traveller accommodation along with selected bodies.
- 4.21 Although a TAA and Traveller SHLAA have not yet commenced, key issues are likely to be: -
- Future pitch/plot numbers for Spelthorne;
 - Whether Spelthorne requires assistance from or can give assistance to other authorities in meeting pitch/plot requirements;
 - Whether sufficient sites can be identified through the Traveller SHLAA and how requirements might be accommodated.

Table 4-2: Proposed Engagement for Traveller Accommodation

1. Identified Authorities	
Bracknell Forest	Richmond-upon-Thames
Elmbridge	Runnymede
Epsom & Ewell	Rushmoor
Hart	Slough
Guildford	South Bucks
Hillingdon	Surrey CC
Hounslow	Surrey Heath
Mole Valley	Tandridge
Mayor of London/GLA	Waverley
Kingston-upon-Thames	Windsor & Maidenhead
Reigate & Banstead	Woking
2. Identified Bodies	
Ashford & St Peters NHS Trust	Homes & Communities Agency
North West Surrey CCG	
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
Draft TAA Report: consult with all authorities and selected bodies - 2015	
Traveller SHLAA – Consultation on methodology with all authorities and selected bodies with stakeholder events if necessary – 2015/16.	
Traveller housing options – Meetings/Discussions with selected authorities and bodies prior to options consultation – 2015/16	
Consultation on Local Plan options – 2016.	
Traveller pitch/plot target – Meetings/Discussions with selected authorities at officer and member level with a view to entering into agreements prior to Pre-Publication consultation – 2017	
Consultation on Pre-Publication Local Plan – 2017 & Publication Local Plan 2018.	

Employment Land

- 4.22 Spelthorne has 11 designated Employment Areas in various locations around the Borough including several which adjoin or are close to the boundary with neighbouring authority areas. Heathrow Airport also lies to the north of the Borough boundary within the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- 4.23 The Enterprise M3 (EM3) LEP Commercial Property Market Study (2013) defines Spelthorne as being within an upper M3 market area along with Elmbridge & Runnymede with around 142,700 employees in 2011. The EM3 LEP Strategic Economic Plan also describes Staines-upon-Thames as a ‘step up’ town which is the focus for economic development and LEP growth package funding. The LEP Strategic Economic Plan identifies the creation of

52,000 new jobs by 2020 across the EM3 area.

- 4.24 A percentage of residents both live and work in Spelthorne, but a percentage of those working in Spelthorne will come from other areas and vice versa. The 2011 Census shows that 32% of Spelthorne residents work in Spelthorne and therefore the majority of residents commute out of the Borough to work. Heathrow airport employs around 8% of Spelthorne residents and large commuter flows are evident into Central and Outer London.
- 4.25 Paragraph 160 of the NPPF sets out that in understanding business needs, local planning authorities should work together with county and neighbouring authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) to prepare and maintain a robust evidence base. The PPG note on Housing & Economic Needs Assessments states that economic needs should be assessed in relation to the functional economic area and that Local Planning Authorities should assess their development needs working with the other local authorities in the functional economic market area.
- 4.26 The Borough Council has yet to establish a Functional Economic Area (FEA) and therefore in the meantime it is considered appropriate to engage with all neighbouring authority areas until such time as an FEA can be established. If authorities over a wider geographic extent wish to be engaged, then they can indicate this through this scoping consultation. Engagement will also include the Mayor of London/GLA, Surrey County Council and the EM3 LEP.
- 4.27 The Borough Council's latest Local Economic Assessment¹⁸ shows the total level of business floorspace¹⁹ in the Borough at March 2012 stood at 631,000sqm (excluding retail). Vacancy levels of office and industrial/warehousing stood at 47,799sqm in March 2012 which represents 10.2% of total floorspace. The level of vacant office and industrial/warehousing floorspace has risen to 62,748sqm as at April 2013.
- 4.28 Of the 4,555 businesses in Spelthorne, the greatest number are in the 'professional, scientific and technical' category, followed by 'construction', 'information & communication' and 'transport & storage'. These categories make up 46% of all businesses in Spelthorne. In terms of Gross Value Added (GVA)²⁰ per head of population, Spelthorne was ranked 85th in the UK in 2007. When compared to neighbouring and other Surrey authorities only Elmbridge, Epsom & Ewell and Richmond show higher rankings.
- 4.29 Heathrow airport which lies just north of the Borough boundary in the London Borough of Hillingdon employs 114,000 people in the local area and contributes £16 billion of economic output. In September 2012 the Government appointed Sir Howard Davies to chair the Independent Airports

¹⁸ Local Economic Assessment (2013) Spelthorne Borough Council. Available at: <http://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/econstrat>

¹⁹ Business floorspace for the purposes of the Local Economic Assessment includes offices, industry/warehousing, retail and other business uses.

²⁰ GVA is a measure of productivity and is the difference between the value of goods and services and the cost of producing them

Commission which was charged with considering airport expansion in the South East of England. The Commission considered a number of options which have now been reduced to three including expansion at Heathrow. The Commission will set out their final report in summer 2015.

- 4.30 Given the issues outlined there are a number of key issues which will need to be considered under the Duty to Cooperate. Key issues are considered to be:
- Defining the Functional Economic Market Area (FEA);
 - The future floorspace and land requirements arising from any additional economic or population demand or whether any existing floorspace and land could be lost to other uses both within Spelthorne and within the FEA.
 - The balance between jobs and homes.
 - The implications of airport expansion at Heathrow with respect to the balance between jobs and homes and whether additional employment land will be required for new business associated or attracted due to the airport.

Table 4-3: Proposed Engagement for Employment

1. Identified Authorities	
Elmbridge	Slough
Hillingdon	Surrey CC
Hounslow	Surrey Heath
Mayor of London/GLA	Windsor & Maidenhead
Richmond	Woking
Runnymede	
2. Identified Bodies	
Enterprise M3 LEP	
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
Establish FEA: Requests for joint study with other authorities – 2015	
FEA Stage 1 Report: Consult with identified authorities/bodies on methodology for defining FEA – 2015	
FEA Stage 2 Report: Consult with identified authorities/bodies on draft Stage 2 report which includes employment floorspace demand/supply across FEA and analysis of existing employment sites – 2015/16	
Identification of employment sites through SHLAA process – 2015/16	
Employment Land Options: Discussion/Meetings with authorities/bodies within FEMA prior to options consultation – 2016	
Consultation on Local Plan Options - 2016	
Economic Policies and Employment Land/Floorspace targets – Meetings/Discussions with FEA authorities/bodies at officer and member level with a view to entering agreements or statements of common ground 2017	
Consultation on Pre-Publication Local Plan – 2017 & Publication Local Plan 2018.	

Provision of Retail, Leisure and Other Commercial Development

Retail

- 4.31 Retail catchment areas for main town centres typically extend beyond local authority boundaries. In the Spelthorne Retail Assessment 2004 the main retail centres were identified as Ashford, Shepperton, Staines-upon-Thames and Sunbury. Only Staines-upon-Thames serves more than a local need.
- 4.32 The primary catchment for the main centres in Spelthorne extend out to areas such as Egham in (Runnymede) and Englefield Green and Old Windsor & Wraysbury (Windsor & Maidenhead). The secondary catchment area extends out over a wider area to also include Feltham (London Borough of Hounslow) and Chertsey, Addlestone and Virginia Water (Runnymede).
- 4.33 The adopted Core Strategy & Policies DPD identifies additional retail floorspace for Staines Town Centre up to 32,000sqm to 2026 with the Site Allocations Document identifying the Elmsleigh Centre in Staines Town Centre for expansion in 2 phases. The first phase (phase 3) was to deliver 2,500sqm of additional retail development in the period 2009-2014 and the second (phase 4) 18,000sqm of additional retail in the period 2019-2024. To date neither of these phases of development have secured planning permission.
- 4.34 The Borough Council begun work on an updated Retail and Town Centre Uses study in July 2014 which will consider the need for additional retail floorspace in the Borough up to 2034. As part of this the Borough Council contacted all neighbouring authorities requesting comment on the study brief. One response was received from Runnymede Borough Council indicating no comment. Given the geographic extent of Spelthorne's retail catchment, future drafts of the Retail study will be sent out to all neighbouring authorities as well as Surrey County Council, the Mayor of London/GLA and Enterprise M3 LEP for comment.
- 4.35 The key issues for retailing are considered to be: -
- How much additional retail floorspace is required across the Borough;
 - The role of existing centres in meeting retail needs.

Table 4-4: Proposed Engagement for Retail

1. Identified Authorities	
Elmbridge	Runnymede
Hillingdon	Slough
Hounslow	Surrey CC
Mayor of London/GLA	Windsor & Maidenhead
Richmond	
2. Identified Bodies	
Enterprise M3 LEP	
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
Retail & Town Centres Uses Study brief: Request comments on study brief from neighbouring authorities – March 2014	
Draft Report: Consult with identified authorities/bodies on draft report – 2015	
Retail Options & Sites: Discussion/Meetings with neighbouring authorities/bodies prior to options consultation – 2015/16	
Consultation on Local Plan Options - 2016	
Retail Floorspace Targets and Sites – Meetings/Discussions with neighbouring authorities/bodies at officer and member level if necessary – 2017.	
Consultation on Pre-Publication Local Plan – 2017 & Publication Local Plan 2018.	

Leisure & Other Commercial Uses

- 4.36 Commercial leisure uses are typically linked to retail elements of town centres and will be covered by the retail catchment. The Retail and Town Centre Uses study commissioned by the Borough Council will consider whether the existing commercial leisure facilities within the Borough are sufficient to meet demands across the catchment.
- 4.37 As such the Borough Council will engage the same authorities and bodies on this issue at the same time as retail issues. Although not a prescribed body the Borough Council will also engage with Sport England.
- 4.38 There are two leisure centres in Spelthorne at Staines-upon-Thames and at Sunbury as well as numerous sports pitches and outdoor facilities around the Borough which serve the local population. Given the local nature of facilities it is not considered that leisure centre or sports pitch provision is likely to be a strategic issue.
- 4.39 Surrey County Council are currently undertaking a study of Hotel accommodation across the county including the need for additional capacity, some of which may be required within Spelthorne. However there is no

evidence to suggest that providing hotel accommodation is a strategic issue within the local or wider area, although need could be generated by the possible expansion of Heathrow. There is also no indication that any other type of commercial development would be a strategic issue.

4.40 Given the limited scope for leisure and other commercial uses to raise strategic issues the only key issue to consider is:-

- Whether Spelthorne could assist in accommodating commercial leisure development or vice versa.

Table 4-5: Proposed Engagement for Leisure & Other Commercial

Identified Authorities	
Elmbridge	Runnymede
Hillingdon	Slough
Hounslow	Surrey CC
Mayor of London/GLA	Windsor & Maidenhead
Richmond	
2. Identified Bodies	
Enterprise M3 LEP	Sport England
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
Retail & Town Centres Uses Study brief: Request comments on study brief from neighbouring authorities – March 2014	
Draft Report: Consult with identified authorities/bodies on draft report – 2015	
Commercial Leisure Options & Sites: Discussion/Meetings with neighbouring authorities/bodies prior to options consultation – 2015/16	
Consultation on Local Plan Options - 2016	
Commercial Leisure Targets/Sites – Meetings/Discussions with neighbouring authorities/bodies at officer and member level if necessary – 2017.	
Consultation on Pre-Publication Local Plan – 2017 & Publication Local Plan 2018.	

Infrastructure for Transport, Telecommunications, Waste Management, Water Supply, Wastewater, Flood Risk and the Provision of Minerals and Energy (including heat)

Transport

- 4.41 The Strategic Road Network (SRN) in Spelthorne includes the M3 and M25 motorways with junction 1 of the M3 located at Sunbury Cross and junction 13 of the M25 at Staines-upon-Thames. Local roads include the A30 which runs from Hampshire up into London and the A308 which runs from Egham, through Spelthorne and onto Hampton Court. Within Spelthorne the Highways Agency is responsible for the strategic road network and Surrey County Council as the Highways Authority is responsible for the local road network.
- 4.42 Development in one area can affect traffic flow and volume on both the strategic and local road networks within other areas and vice versa. To understand traffic flow and how this will change over time with or without development, the Borough Council will need to undertake transport assessments and studies which take account of traffic data and conditions over a wider area. The studies may reveal a need for mitigation or highway infrastructure improvements which cross authority boundaries. Cycling and walking strategies which aim to join routes across Surrey and London are also strategic in nature.
- 4.43 It is likely that Surrey County Council as the Highways Authority will undertake transport assessments/studies on behalf of the Borough Council. The PPG note *Transport Evidence Bases in Plan Making* states that the transport assessment should be produced at Local Plan level in partnership with all relevant transport and planning authorities, transport providers and key stakeholders. The PPG note also states that assessments may have to cover an area wider than the Local Plan.
- 4.44 Therefore, where highway assessments or studies are undertaken, the Borough Council and Surrey County Council will need to engage with the Highways Agency and neighbouring authorities including the Mayor of London/Transport for London (TFL). As the body responsible for local highways infrastructure funding, engagement with the EM3 LEP will need to take place.
- 4.45 Where the outcome of transport assessments identifies a need for mitigation or highways infrastructure improvements, these will need to be reflected in an Infrastructure Needs Assessment and/or an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The Borough Council has published an IDP as part of its evidence for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which will need updating regularly.
- 4.46 Where highway matters have a wider geographic scope i.e. assessment of capacity across a stretch of motorway covering several authority areas, the Borough Council may seek to enter into wider discussions, although it is not possible to identify who this will be with at this moment in time.

- 4.47 In terms of public transport the Borough is served by a number of rail stations which lie either on the Windsor-Waterloo, Reading-Waterloo and Shepperton-Waterloo lines. The sole operator of rail services in Spelthorne is South West Trains who also own all of the stations. The track infrastructure is owned and managed by Network Rail. Several bus operators run services within the Spelthorne area including Abellio (London & Surrey), London United, First, Bear Buses, Dicksons Travel and Carlone Buses.
- 4.48 The influence of Heathrow on the wider area in terms of traffic generation is clearly a cross boundary strategic issue as is the prospect of improved surface access with the potential to extend the Cross Rail 2 project to Staines-upon-Thames and provide a southern rail access to Heathrow.
- 4.49 Therefore, for highway capacity issues the Borough Council will engage with neighbouring authorities, Surrey County Council, the Highways Agency, ~~and~~ Mayor of London/TFL and Enterprise M3 LEP. In terms of public transport, in order to consider input from the full range of public transport service operators, engagement will need to be coordinated or channelled ~~be~~ through the Transport for Surrey Partnership and Mayor of London/TFL and other neighbouring unitary authorities. The Borough Council will also engage with Heathrow Airport Holdings.
- 4.50 As such, the key issues which will need to be considered under the Duty are: -
- Whether local highway capacity is sufficient to meet development requirements in the wider area;
 - Whether any mitigation measures will be required on the local highway along with its funding;
 - Whether capacity at strategic highway junctions is sufficient to meet development requirements in the wider area and whether any mitigation measures are required;
 - How strategic level projects will be identified and planned;
 - Whether there is scope to link cycle networks across boundaries;
 - Whether there is scope to improve surface access to Heathrow through extending the Cross Rail 2 project to Staines-upon-Thames.
 - Whether public transport and access to public transport requires general and/or capacity improvements including rail, bus, cycle, walking and other modes.

Table 4-6: Proposed Engagement for Transport Infrastructure

1. Identified Authorities	
Elmbridge	Runnymede
Hillingdon	Slough
Hounslow	Surrey CC
Mayor of London/GLA	Windsor & Maidenhead
Richmond	
2. Identified Bodies	
Civil Aviation Authority	Network Rail
Enterprise M3 LEP	Office of Rail Regulation
Heathrow Airport Holdings	Transport for London
Highways Agency	
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
No options for development have been considered and at this moment in time it is not possible to identify where cross boundary transport impacts may lie. However the Borough Council will ensure engagement through Transport Assessments to discuss transport issues under the Duty as well as through Infrastructure Needs Assessment/Infrastructure Delivery Plans (IDP).	

Utilities Infrastructure

- 4.51 Utilities infrastructure includes water supply, wastewater treatment, energy supply and telecommunications. These services and their associated infrastructure are provided by the private sector utility companies which operate within and around the Spelthorne area.
- 4.52 An understanding of utilities capacity is necessary to understand whether developments proposed in Local Plans can be realised without the need for significant additions or whether any further capacity is required including strategic level projects. As with Transport, to understand capacity, the Borough Council will need to undertake an Infrastructure Needs Assessment and translate any projects into an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The PPG note *Water Supply, Wastewater and Water Quality* outlines that liaison between local planning authorities, Environment Agency and water and sewerage companies should be from the outset of plan preparation.
- 4.53 As part of the work on an Infrastructure Needs Assessment the Borough Council will need to engage and work with utility providers to understand infrastructure capacity requirements and through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan project delivery. Engagement with utility providers could be facilitated through the EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) as this could be the vehicle through which strategic projects (if any) can be identified. This will need to be confirmed.
- 4.54 There could also be issues which require joint evidence or a joint approach between utility providers and authorities/prescribed bodies i.e. Water Cycle Studies. If such evidence or a joint approach is required, the Borough Council

will engage with the relevant authority areas, the appropriate prescribed bodies and Surrey County Council/Mayor of London. At this stage it is not possible to identify all parties which will be subject to engagement as this will depend on the specific issue at hand.

- 4.55 The key issues which will need to be considered under the Duty are: -
- Whether existing capacity is sufficient to meet demand in the local/wider area or whether upgrades/reinforcement is required;
 - Whether any strategic projects to deliver utility upgrades/improvements are required and how/when these will be delivered;

Table 4-7: Proposed Engagement for Utilities Infrastructure

1. Identified Authorities	
Depends on the Issue	
2. Identified Bodies	
Affinity Water	Southern Gas Networks
Enterprise M3 LEP	Telecoms Operators
Environment Agency	Thames Water
Southern Electric Power	
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
No options for development have been considered and at this moment in time it is not possible to identify where cross boundary utility infrastructure impacts may lie. However the Borough Council will ensure engagement through an Infrastructure Needs Assessment/Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and if possible through the Local Enterprise Partnership.	

Minerals & Waste

- 4.56 Surrey County Council is the minerals and waste authority for the whole of Surrey and is responsible for the Surrey Minerals and Waste Plans. Spelthorne Borough Council is required to take account of the Surrey Minerals and Waste plans within its Local Plan by safeguarding areas identified for mineral workings or waste management.
- 4.57 There are several sites in Spelthorne identified in the Minerals Core Strategy & Primary Aggregates DPD for mineral workings or safeguarding, some of which lie on the boundary with neighbouring authorities. The current Waste Plan also includes two sites in Spelthorne for waste proposals.
- 4.58 The PPG note *Waste* states that integrated working between county and district planning authorities is critical to the preparation of Local Plans. As such, Spelthorne and the County Council will need to engage with one another. In forming its Minerals and Waste Plans Surrey County Council are also required to engage with other minerals and waste authorities to understand capacity and consider the potential import/export of waste to other areas. As part of these discussions, Spelthorne Borough Council may be required to engage with neighbouring minerals and waste authorities along with Surrey County Council.

Flooding & Flood Risk

- 4.59 Large areas of Spelthorne lie within the floodplains of the river Thames, Colne and Ash with only limited flood defence. Over 2,800 properties lie within flood zone 3 which also covers large commercial areas and parts of Staines Town Centre. 17% of the Borough lies within the 1:100 year flood risk zone (7% of which is urban) and 33% within the 1:1000 year zone. Therefore, flooding and flood risk is a serious issue in Spelthorne as recently demonstrated during the flood events of Winter 2014 inundating and causing damage to property in areas of Staines, Shepperton and Sunbury.
- 4.60 The Environment Agency has a River Thames Strategy (RTS) in place for Datchet to Teddington which was highlighted in Section 3. The strategy recommends a mix of flood plain management and the creation of flood channels and is estimated for completion by **20257**. ~~The cost of the project is £300m.~~
- 4.61 Partners in the River Thames Strategy include the Environment Agency, Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA), Surrey County Council and the local authorities of Spelthorne, Windsor & Maidenhead, Runnymede, Elmbridge, Kingston and Richmond. Engagement for the RTS will continue through the groups which have already been set up to deal with this issue.
- 4.62 To understand flood risk in general and account for the RTS as well as updated modelling by the Environment Agency the Borough Council will require an updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) as part of its evidence for a new Local Plan.
- 4.63 Given the geographic scope of flood risk to Spelthorne and the wider area, any update to the SFRA and how this translates into Local Plan policies will involve engagement with all those partners involved in the RTS, through existing mechanisms.
- 4.64 The key issues which will need to be considered under the Duty are: -
- Exploring opportunities to align Local Plan policies, text or approaches to take account of the RTS;

Table 4-8: Proposed Engagement for Flooding & Flood Risk

1. Identified Authorities	
Elmbridge	Runnymede
Mayor of London/GLA	Surrey CC
Kingston	Windsor & Maidenhead
Richmond	
2. Identified Bodies	
Environment Agency	
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Study brief: Request comments on study brief from authorities within RTS area and Environment Agency – 2015	
Draft Report: Consult with identified authorities/bodies on draft report – 2015	
Options & Sites: Discussion/Meetings with neighbouring authorities/bodies prior to options consultation - 2016	
Consultation on Local Plan Options - 2016	
Policy & Sites – Meetings/Discussions with neighbouring authorities/bodies at officer and member level if necessary - 2017	
Consultation on Pre-Publication Local Plan – 2017 & Publication Local Plan 2018.	

Provision of Health, Security, Community and Cultural Infrastructure and other Local Facilities

Health

- 4.65 [The majority of the population's health service contacts take place in primary care such as GP and dental surgeries.](#) Major health facilities within Spelthorne include Ashford Hospital which forms part of the Ashford & St Peters Hospitals NHS Trust and the Surrey & Borders Partnership which provides mental health services within Surrey and parts of Hampshire. [Community Health services are also provided by Virgin Care Services Ltd.](#)
- 4.66 With St Peters Hospital located in Chertsey, the Ashford and St Peters NHS Trust operates over a wider area than Spelthorne alone. Ashford Hospital serves Spelthorne and areas within Windsor & Maidenhead, the London Borough of Hounslow and the London Borough of Richmond whilst St Peters serves areas within Spelthorne, Elmbridge, Runnymede and Woking. Surrey & Borders Partnership services are partly delivered at St Peters Hospital.
- 4.67 The commissioning of [the majority of](#) health services in Spelthorne is delivered by the North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) [and NHS England and to a limited extent Surrey County Council.](#) The North West Surrey CCG covers the area of Spelthorne, Runnymede and Woking as well as small areas within Elmbridge and Surrey Heath. As such, both the delivery and commissioning of services are cross boundary.
- 4.68 The PPG note *Health & Well Being* states that the first point of contact for health and well-being issues should be the Director of Public Health. This will initially be through the Surrey Public Health Team at Surrey County Council. The PPG note also identifies key groups that local planning authorities should engage with. This includes the Health & Well Being Board, local commissioning groups and NHS England.
- 4.69 Therefore, the Borough Council will engage with the prescribed bodies responsible for health delivery and commissioning within Spelthorne to understand whether additional health facilities are required to meet population growth. The Borough Council will also need to engage with the prescribed bodies and other local authorities that form part of NHS Trust catchments or commissioning areas outside of Spelthorne if a need for joint evidence or a joint approach is identified. This may need to be translated through the Infrastructure Needs Assessment and/or an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- 4.70 [Spelthorne will also need to continue to engage with the CCG through a number of existing forums such as:](#)
[- Local Joint Commissioning Group](#)
[- NWS Transformation Board](#)
[- Spelthorne Together](#)
[- Spelthorne Health & Wellbeing Group](#)
[- CCG Locality Stakeholder meetings](#)

4.710 As such, the key issues which will need to be considered under the Duty are: -

- The requirement for primary health facilities in Spelthorne from additional demand as a result of population growth;
- The requirement for expanded secondary health facilities due to wider population growth;
- How and where additional facilities may be delivered whether within or outside of Spelthorne.

Table 4-9: Proposed Engagement for Health

1. Identified Authorities	
Elmbridge	Surrey CC
Hounslow	Surrey Heath
Richmond	Windsor & Maidenhead
Runnymede	Woking
2. Identified Bodies	
Ashford & St Peters NHS Trust	North West Surrey CCG
NHS Property Services	Surrey & Borders Partnership
NHS England	Surrey & Borders Partnership
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
No options for development have been considered and at this moment in time it is not possible to identify where cross boundary health impacts may lie. However the Borough Council will ensure engagement with health providers and other authorities as appropriate and reflect needs through an Infrastructure Needs Assessment/Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	

Security

4.724 Spelthorne is not aware of any security issues or requirement for land in this respect. Therefore, no strategic issues have been identified. However the Borough Council will engage with the Civil Aviation Authority with respect to safety at Heathrow and the impact of Local Plan growth aspirations.

Community & Cultural Facilities

4.732 Community and cultural facilities include a range of services for example libraries, community centres, museums, theatres, art galleries etc. Spelthorne Borough Council provides some community services as does Surrey County Council whilst other community and cultural facilities are run by volunteers or the private sector.

4.743 The catchment for some cultural facilities may extend across Spelthorne's boundaries into other areas and some community services and voluntary sectors such as adult services may be provided to Spelthorne residents outside of Spelthorne or vice versa. However the level of cross over is likely to be limited.

- 4.754 As such, the geographic scope for engagement will be narrow. The Borough Council will engage with Surrey County Council in terms of the services and facilities that it provides. Neighbouring authority areas may be engaged depending on the issues identified.
- 4.765 As such, the key issues which will need to be considered under the Duty are: -
- The degree to which facilities within Spelthorne are being used by persons from outside Spelthorne and vice versa;
 - The requirement for additional community or cultural facilities in Spelthorne as a result of population growth;
 - Whether population growth in Spelthorne necessitates additional services or facilities outside of the borough or vice versa;
 - How and where additional facilities may be delivered whether within or outside of Spelthorne.

Table 4-10: Proposed Engagement for Community & Cultural Facilities

1. Identified Authorities	
Depends on the Issue	Surrey CC
2. Identified Bodies	
None	
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
No options for development have been considered and at this moment in time it is not possible to identify where cross boundary impacts may lie. However the Borough Council will ensure engagement through an Infrastructure Needs Assessment/Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	

Education

- 4.776 Education services in Spelthorne are provided by Surrey County Council. [The County Council has a statutory duty to ensure there are sufficient school places in the county to meet present and future demand for school places. It is the role of the County Council to plan, organise and commission places for all maintained schools in Surrey in a way that raises standards, manages rising and declining pupil numbers and creates a diverse school community. The County Council seeks to exercise this function in partnership with Dioceses, governing bodies of schools, headteachers, local communities and other key stakeholders.](#)
- 4.78 Pupils generated from Spelthorne may not necessarily all attend schools in Spelthorne as there may be some crossing of borders including into the London area or vice versa. As such, the provision of education and school places is a cross boundary strategic matter in Spelthorne and will need to be factored into an Infrastructure Needs Assessment and/or Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- 4.797 As the education provider Surrey County Council will be engaged by Spelthorne to determine pupil flows, demand and how these translate into projected pupil numbers and what this means for school places. However,

given the close proximity of settlements outside of Spelthorne, the Borough Council with Surrey County Council will also need to engage with neighbouring authority areas and the Mayor of London to understand cross boundary flows and the impact these may have on school places in the future.

4.8078 The Borough Council is only aware of cross boundary flows between Spelthorne and the London Borough of Hounslow.

4.8179 As such, the key issues which will need to be considered under the Duty are: -

- The requirement for additional education facilities in Spelthorne as a result of population growth;
- Whether population growth in Spelthorne necessitates additional education facilities outside of the borough or vice versa;
- How and where additional facilities may be delivered whether within or outside of Spelthorne.

Table 4-11: Proposed Engagement for Education Infrastructure

1. Identified Authorities/Bodies to be Engaged	
LB Hounslow	Surrey CC
2. Identified Bodies	
None	
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
No options for development have been considered and at this moment in time it is not possible to identify where cross boundary education impacts may lie. However the Borough Council will ensure engagement with and through Surrey County Council as the Education Authority and through an Infrastructure Needs Assessment/Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	

Open Space & Recreation

4.8280 Areas of open space and recreation are designated as Protected Areas of Open Space under Policy EN4 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy & Policies DPD. The Borough Council will need to undertake a review of these spaces and recreation/sports in general for the Local Plan.

4.834 Four of the open space areas lie adjacent to the borough boundary with Runnymede. The site at the Memorial Gardens in Staines-upon-Thames is a Council owned park and the three other areas are urban green spaces at Riverside Flats, Laleham Road in Staines-upon-Thames and at Penton Hall Drive and Penton Hook Road, Staines-upon-Thames. However, the four areas are all separated from the neighbouring borough of Runnymede by the river Thames which is a recreational facility in its own right.

4.842 There are three playing fields adjoining the borough boundary. Two are private sports grounds in the Green Belt adjacent to the boundary with the London Borough of Hounslow in Ashford/Lower Feltham and the other is

Lammas Recreation Ground on the Wraysbury Road adjacent the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead. These playing fields are not covered by any policy designation/protection other than Green Belt. Bedfont Lakes in the London Borough of Hounslow is also an important area of open space for Ashford residents.

- | 4.853 The majority of open space, sports & recreation facilities in Spelthorne will therefore only serve a local need and any change in designation or size of facility/space as a result of a review is unlikely to have any cross boundary impacts. However, the Spelthorne Playing Pitch Strategy 2013-2018²¹ identifies that a number of sports clubs outside of the Borough use facilities within Spelthorne and sports clubs within Spelthorne have members from outside of Spelthorne and vice versa.

- | 4.864 The PPG note *Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities, Public Rights of Way and Local Green Space* states that in assessing need for open space local planning authorities should have regard to the duty to cooperate where open space serves a wider area. As such, open space, sport and recreation is considered to be a strategic matter but with a narrow geographic scope. The Borough Council will therefore engage with neighbouring authorities, Surrey County Council and Sport England during Local Plan preparation in this respect.

- | 4.875 As such, the key issues which will need to be considered under the Duty are: -
 - The requirement for additional open space, recreation or playing pitch facilities in Spelthorne as a result of population growth;
 - Whether population growth in Spelthorne necessitates additional facilities outside of the borough or vice versa;
 - How and where additional facilities may be delivered whether within or outside of Spelthorne.

Table 4-12: Proposed Engagement for Open Space & Recreation

1. Identified Authorities/Bodies to be Engaged	
Elmbridge	Runnymede
Hillingdon	Slough
Hounslow	Surrey CC
Mayor of London/GLA	Windsor & Maidenhead
Richmond	
2. Identified Bodies	
Sport England	
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
No options for development have been considered and at this moment in time it is not possible to identify where cross boundary open space, sport & recreation impacts may lie. The Borough Council will ensure engagement through future Open Space, Sports and Recreation studies (or similar) and/or Infrastructure Needs Assessment/Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	

²¹ A Playing Pitch Strategy for Spelthorne 2013-2018 (2013) Spelthorne Borough Council. Available at: <https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/article/2415/Playing-Pitch-Strategy>

Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation, Conservation and Enhancement of the Natural and Historic Environment, including Landscapes

Climate Change

- 4.886 It is generally accepted that emissions of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere are contributing to climatic impacts and is an issue which affects the whole of the UK.
- 4.897 However, targets for carbon dioxide emission reductions from built development are set through national standards and incorporated into the Building Regulations and emissions of carbon dioxide from aviation traffic are also a national and global issue. Therefore these are not issues to which it is considered the Duty applies given their national coverage.
- 4.9088 Emissions reductions from traffic on the local road network is a cross boundary issue which the Borough Council can consider although this is only likely to be in relation to supporting strategies and projects which promote a modal shift away from the private car to public transport and walking/cycling.
- 4.9189 In this respect Spelthorne will engage with Surrey County Council as the Highways Authority, Transport for London, Mayor of London and neighbouring authority areas. A Staines-upon-Thames/Feltham cycle link is listed in the London Borough of Hounslow's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), although at this moment no work has been undertaken and no funding has been secured.
- 4.920 Other ways of reducing carbon dioxide emissions would be through the use of renewable and low carbon technologies and opportunities for decentralised energy and heating. Spelthorne will engage with neighbouring authorities, Surrey County Council and Mayor of London/GLA to identify whether opportunities for joint studies or policy approaches exist.
- 4.934 [Adaptation to climate change is also another important issue to consider and government published 'The National Adaptation Programme' in July 2013. The programme lists a number of focus areas including for the built and natural environment and infrastructure. ~~Other climate change impacts such as~~ Flooding and flood risk have already been considered earlier in this Scoping Statement, however other aspects of adaptation will need to be considered as the Local Plan develops over time.](#)
- 4.942 As such, the key issues which will need to be considered under the Duty are: -
- How carbon dioxide emissions reductions in Spelthorne can help to meet national targets;
 - Promoting modal shift away from the private car to other forms of transport;

- Whether there is a requirement for new cycling/walking routes in Spelthorne and how existing or new routes can integrate with routes in neighbouring authority areas;
- [Whether there are opportunities to deliver decentralised energy and heat.](#)
- [Contributing to local adaptation strategies and how these can help achieve the national adaptation strategy.](#)

Table 4-13: Proposed Engagement for Climate Change

1. Identified Authorities/Bodies to be Engaged	
Elmbridge	Runnymede
Hillingdon	Slough
Hounslow	Surrey CC
Mayor of London/GLA	Windsor & Maidenhead
Richmond	
2. Identified Bodies	
Transport for London	
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
No options for development have been considered and at this moment in time it is not possible to identify strategies for modal shift, further opportunities for integrating cycling/walking routes or opportunities for decentralised energy & heat.	

Green Belt & Landscape

- | 4.953 All land outside of settlement areas in Spelthorne is designated as Green Belt which accounts for 65% of the Borough or 3,320ha. The Green Belt continues over the borough boundary into all neighbouring local authority areas including the London Boroughs.
- | 4.964 The Green Belt in Spelthorne was designated in June 1956 and has been assessed on four consecutive occasions during the preparation of previous Local Plans. Each assessment has concluded that all land outside settlement areas in Spelthorne meets the purposes of the Green Belt and its designation, should remain unaltered. This has been confirmed at Local Plan examinations.
- | 4.975 Since the Council last undertook an assessment of the Green Belt in Spelthorne, the NPPF replaced Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: *Green Belts*. The five purposes that the Green Belt serves remain the same in the NPPF as were set out in PPG2 and as such national Green Belt policy has not changed in this respect.
- | 4.986 As with previous Local Plans the Council will need to assess and confirm the extent of the Green Belt in Spelthorne.
- | 4.997 The geographic scope for engagement on any assessment will be reasonably wide. Engagement will include all neighbouring authority areas, Surrey County

Council and the Mayor of London.

- | 4.10098 There are no designated landscapes within Spelthorne. Surrey County Council is due to publish a County wide landscape study which will reveal areas of common landscape typologies across Surrey. If issues arise which require a strategic approach the Borough Council will engage with the relevant neighbouring authorities and Surrey County Council.
- | 4.10199 As such, the key issues which will need to be considered under the Duty are: -
 - Whether a Green Belt assessment is required for Spelthorne and the outcomes of such a study;
 - Whether a joint approach or strategy is required for landscape typologies which cross administrative boundaries;

Table 4-14: Proposed Engagement for Green Belt/Landscape

1. Identified Authorities/Bodies to be Engaged	
Elmbridge	Runnymede
Hillingdon	Slough
Hounslow	Surrey CC
Mayor of London/GLA	Windsor & Maidenhead
Richmond	
2. Identified Bodies	
None	
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
If a Green Belt assessment is required Spelthorne Borough Council will request comments on a study brief from neighbouring authorities 2015/16	
Draft GB assessment: Consult with identified authorities on a draft assessment 2015/16	
Discussion/Meetings with neighbouring authorities/bodies prior to options consultation 2016	
Consultation on Local Plan Options - 2016	
Meetings/Discussions with neighbouring authorities/bodies at officer and member level if necessary - 2017	
Consultation on Pre-Publication Local Plan – 2017 & Publication Local Plan 2018.	

Historic Environment

- | 4.1020 Spelthorne has 195 statutory listed buildings & structures, 159 locally listed buildings & structures, 8 conservation areas, 4 scheduled ancient monuments, 2 other sites and monuments of county archaeological

importance as well as numerous areas of high archaeological potential.

- | 4.103⁴ The vast majority of the historic environment in Spelthorne does not cross the authority boundary or lie adjacent to it. However, five of the conservation areas lie on the Spelthorne boundary with either Runnymede or Elmbridge but separated by the river Thames. Chertsey Bridge which is a scheduled ancient monument also lies on the Spelthorne/Runnymede boundary.
- | 4.104² Other than Chertsey Bridge the Borough Council has not identified any specific cross boundary issues and it is not envisaged that there will be any strategic cross boundary matters relating to the historic environment. However Spelthorne will continue to engage with English Heritage and Surrey County Council over heritage matters.

Biodiversity

- | 4.105³ There are several sites in Spelthorne which are designated for their importance to wildlife and biodiversity at international, national and local level, some of which partly fall within other local authority areas.
- | 4.106⁴ International sites in Spelthorne include parts of the South West London Water Bodies Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar. This site is protected under the European Birds Directive (79/409/EEC) and Ramsar Convention for its importance to support rare or vulnerable bird species and wetland habitats.
- | 4.107⁵ In Spelthorne the SPA & Ramsar includes the King George VI, Staines, Wraysbury and Kempton Park reservoirs along with the Staines Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The adjoining authority areas of Windsor & Maidenhead, Runnymede, Elmbridge and the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames hold the rest of the SPA & Ramsar. All four of the nationally designated SSSI's in Spelthorne form part of the South West London Waterbodies SPA & Ramsar.

4.108 Although not within Spelthorne the Thames Basin Heaths SPA lies between 5-7km from the borough boundary. Impacts from recreation and urban intensification has led to a Joint Strategic Planning Board (JSPB) being established which comprises all of the local authorities within a 5km zone of the SPA. As Spelthorne lies outside of the 5km zone, it is not part of the JSPB.

4.109 Although Regional Strategies were revoked in 2012, Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan which specifically deals with the Thames Basin Heaths SPA has been saved. This sets out that developments of 50 or more dwellings within 5-7km of the SPA may require avoidance measures. Only a small area of Spelthorne lies within the 5-7km zone.

4.110 Any activity within Spelthorne which has potential to harm an international or nationally designated site (including those which lie outside of Spelthorne) will

[need to be assessed. Further, paragraph 119 of the NPPF states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring a Habitats Regulations Assessment is required.](#)

4.111~~06~~ Spelthorne also has 26 locally designated Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), some of which lie adjacent to the borough boundary with neighbouring authorities including the stretch of the river Thames from Staines-upon-Thames to Sunbury.

4.112~~07~~ Paragraph 114 of the NPPF states that in their Local Plans, local planning authorities should set out a strategic approach to plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity. Paragraph 117 sets out that planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape scale across local authority boundaries [and paragraph 118 that biodiversity enhancements and gain should be sought.](#) As such, given the surrounding network of designated sites, biodiversity is a strategic cross boundary matter.

4.113~~08~~ In considering biodiversity issues, including whether a review of SNCI boundaries is required and given the geographic extent of designated sites at international, national and local level, the Borough Council will engage with all neighbouring authorities. Engagement will also include the Surrey Local Nature Partnership (LNP) which includes a number of other stakeholders such as Surrey County Council, Natural England and Surrey Wildlife Trust. Neighbouring Nature Partnerships may also be engaged. [This will also apply to Ancient Woodland which is defined in the NPPF as irreplaceable and Best and Most Versatile \(BMV\) soils.](#)

4.114~~09~~ The Colne Valley Regional Park lies to the west of London and stretches north from Surrey through areas of Windsor & Maidenhead, Slough, the London Borough of Hillingdon, authority areas in Buckinghamshire and up into Hertfordshire. The area of Spelthorne within the Colne Valley Park includes Staines Moor. The Colne Valley Park is a joint initiative aimed at promoting informal recreation. The environmental enhancement of the area is an important part of the park strategy. The Park is managed by a Community Interest Company (CIC) which includes Surrey County Council.

4.115~~0~~ Given the geographic area covered by the Park, it is a strategic cross boundary matter. However, many of the issues relating to the Park are already included within the previous matters stated in this section. Therefore for matters, such as open space/recreation which are specific to the Park, the Borough Council will seek to engage through the existing Colne Valley Park partnership which comprises a number of authorities and prescribed bodies.

Table 4-15: Proposed Engagement for Biodiversity

1. Identified Authorities/Bodies to be Engaged	
Elmbridge	Richmond
Hillingdon	Runnymede
Hounslow	Slough
Mayor of London/GLA	Windsor & Maidenhead
2. Identified Bodies	
Surrey LNP	Colne Valley Park Partnership
3. Mechanisms for Engagement	
<p>If SNCI reviews are required Spelthorne Borough Council will request comments from neighbouring authorities and the LNP on the methodology and outcomes of the review - 2015/16.</p> <p>Discussion/Meetings with neighbouring authorities/bodies prior to options consultation on approach to biodiversity – 2015/16.</p> <p>Consultation on Local Plan Options - 2016</p> <p>Meetings/Discussions with neighbouring authorities/bodies at officer and member level if necessary – 2017.</p> <p>Consultation on Pre-Publication Local Plan – 2017 & Publication Local Plan 2018.</p>	

Table A1 - Cross Boundary Strategic Matters Identified – Local Authorities

	Homes & Jobs			Retail & Leisure			Infrastructure											Built & Natural Environment						
	Housing	Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation	Employment Land	Retail Provision	Commercial Leisure Capacity	Open Space & Recreation	Transport (Road)	Transport (Rail)	Transport (Walking/Cycling)	Transport (Aviation)	Education	Water Supply	Wastewater Capacity	Waste Management	Energy Supply	Telecommunications	Minerals	Health	Community & Cultural Facilities	Flood Risk	Green Belt & Landscape	Historic Environment	Climate Change	Biodiversity
Local Authorities																								
Bracknell Forest	✓	✓																						
Elmbridge	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓									✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Epsom & Ewell	✓	✓																						
Guildford	✓	✓																						
Hart	✓	✓																						
London Borough of Hillingdon	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓												✓		✓	✓
London Borough of Hounslow	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓							✓			✓		✓	✓
London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓									✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Mole Valley	✓	✓																						
Reigate & Banstead	✓	✓																						
Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames	✓	✓																		✓				
Runnymede	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓									✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Rushmoor	✓	✓																						
Slough	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓												✓		✓	✓
South Bucks	✓	✓																						
Surrey Heath	✓	✓	✓																					
Tandridge	✓	✓																						
Waverley	✓	✓																						
Windsor & Maidenhead	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓									✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Woking	✓	✓	✓															✓						

Table A2: Cross Boundary Strategic Matters Identified – Higher Tier Authorities & Prescribed Bodies

	Homes & Jobs			Retail & Leisure			Infrastructure											Built & Natural Environment						
	Housing	Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation	Employment Land	Retail Provision	Commercial Leisure Capacity	Open Space & Formal Recreation	Transport (Road)	Transport (Rail)	Transport (Walking/Cycling)	Transport (Aviation)	Education	Water Supply	Wastewater Capacity	Waste Management	Energy Supply	Telecommunications	Minerals	Health	Community & Cultural Facilities	Flood Risk	Green Belt & Landscape	Historic Environment	Climate Change	Biodiversity
Higher Tier Authorities & Prescribed Bodies																								
Mayor of London (GLA)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓											✓	✓		✓	
Surrey County Council	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Environment Agency	✓											✓	✓							✓				
English Heritage																						✓		
Natural England																								✓
Civil Aviation Authority	✓									✓														
Homes & Communities Agency	✓	✓																						
North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group	✓	✓																✓						
NHS England	✓	✓																✓						
Office of Rail Regulation	✓							✓																
Transport for London	✓						✓	✓	✓														✓	
Highways Agency	✓						✓																	

Table A3: Cross Boundary Strategic Matters Identified – Other Consultees

	Homes & Jobs			Retail & Leisure			Infrastructure										Built & Natural Environment							
	Housing	Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation	Employment Land	Retail Provision	Commercial Leisure Capacity	Open Space & Formal Recreation	Transport (Road)	Transport (Rail)	Transport (Walking/Cycling)	Transport (Aviation)	Education	Water Supply	Wastewater Capacity	Waste Management	Energy Supply	Telecommunications	Minerals	Health	Community & Cultural Facilities	Flood Risk	Green Belt & Landscape	Historic Environment	Climate Change	Biodiversity
Other Bodies																								
Affinity Water											✓													
Ashford & St Peter's Hospitals NHS Trust	✓	✓																✓						
Colne Valley Park Partnership																								✓
EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓		✓	✓									
Heathrow Airport Holdings									✓															
Network Rail								✓																
NHS Properties Services																		✓						
Southern Electric Power Distribution														✓										
Southern Gas Networks														✓										
Sport England					✓	✓																		
Surrey & Borders Partnership	✓																	✓						
Surrey LNP																								✓
Telecommunications Operators															✓									
Thames Water											✓	✓												

