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1. Introduction

Document status

1.1 This Duty to Co-operate Compliance Statement has been prepared to provide a detailed record of how the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead ("RBWM") has complied with the Duty to Co-operate ("DtC") under section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended by the Localism Act 2011 ("the 2004 Act"), when undertaking the preparation of the Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033 ("the BLP").

1.2 The purpose of this DtC Compliance Statement is to support the BLP Submission Version ("BLPSV"), when it is submitted to the Secretary of State for Independent Examination at the end of January 2018.

1.3 This version of the Statement provides an update to the 'Duty to Co-operate Statement' that was prepared in May 2017 to support the Regulation 19 publication of the BLP ("the 2017 Statement"). It supplements, corrects and clarifies the 2017 Statement and updates the DtC compliance record to cover the period up to Submission in late January 2018. Accordingly, this version of the DtC Compliance Statement represents the most up-to-date record of Cross-boundary compliance and supersedes the 2017 Statement.

1.4 As the engagement required by the DtC is additional to other forms of statutory consultation, this Statement should be read in conjunction with the other documents submitted with the BLP, including the following consultation documents:

- Updated Consultation Statement 2018 which sets out how and with whom the Council has consulted at each stage of preparing the Local Plan in accordance with the Council's 2016 Statement of Community Involvement;
- Regulation 18 Consultation Statement 2017, which reports on the scope and nature of the consultation, the representations received, and the Council’s responses thereto; and
- Regulation 22(1)(c) Consultation Statement of 2018, the primary focus of which is the Regulation 19 Publication stage and the Regulation 20 representations received.

What is the Duty to Co-operate?

1.5 The DtC imposed by section 33A applies in respect of the preparation of development plan documents "so far as relating to a strategic matter" (subsection (3)), as defined in subsection (4) as "sustainable development or use of land that has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas, [etc]"). The question of whether
development or use of land would have a significant impact on two planning areas is a matter of planning judgement.

1.6 The obligation (see subsection (1)) is to co-operate in "maximising the effectiveness" with which plan documents can be prepared, including an obligation "to engage constructively [etc]" (subsection (2)). Deciding what ought to be done to maximise effectiveness and what measures of constructive engagement should be taken requires evaluative judgments to be made by the person subject to the duty regarding planning issues and use of limited resources available to them.

1.7 The engagement required under subsection (2) includes, in particular, "considering" adoption of joint planning approaches (subsection (6)). Again, the nature of the issue and the statutory language indicate that this is a matter for the judgement of the relevant planning authority, with a substantial margin of appreciation or discretion for the authority. A local planning authority subject to the DtC must have regard to any guidance given by the Secretary of State about how the duty is to be complied with: subsection (7).

1.8 The NPPF states that public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to the strategic priorities set out in paragraph 156, namely:

- The homes and jobs needed in the area;
- Provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
- Provision of infrastructure and minerals and energy;
- Climate change mitigation and adaptation, and conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment.

1.9 Crucially, Local Plans are expected to be based on co-operation with neighbouring authorities and public sector organisations, amongst others. The NPPF highlights the importance of joint working across boundaries to meet development requirements that cannot be wholly met within a single local planning area, through either joint planning policies or informal strategies such as infrastructure and investment plans.

1.10 Further guidance on how the cross-boundary should be applied in local planning is included in the Secretary of State’s Planning Practice Guidance (“PPG”).

**Content of the Statement**

1.11 This Statement lays out the processes and actions undertaken, and the outcomes secured by RBWM to address and comply with the DtC in relation to the preparation of the BLP.

1.12 Chapters 2 and 3 identify the prescribed bodies and cross-boundary strategic matters relevant to RBWM and the preparation of the Plan. Chapter 4 provides a record of
how RBWM has co-operated on cross-boundary strategic matters before explaining how the joint working has influenced the development of BLP policy in Chapter 5.
2. Relevant Duty to Co-operate bodies

Neighbouring Authorities

2.1 RBWM has contiguous boundaries with the following local authorities:

**Unitary and District/Borough Councils:**
- South Buckinghamshire District Council
- Slough Borough Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Bracknell Forest District Council
- Wokingham Borough Council
- Wycombe District Council

**County Councils:**
- Buckinghamshire County Council
- Surrey County Council

The spatial nature of these relationships is shown on Map 1.

2.2 Although they do not share a common administrative boundary with RBWM, cross-boundary relationships exist with the following local authorities by virtue of geography, historic administrative boundaries and current political working patterns, namely:

- Chiltern District Council
- Reading Borough Council
- West Berkshire Council
- Greater London Authority

The location of these authorities is shown on Map 1.
Other prescribed bodies

2.3 Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 ("the Local Planning Regulations") specifies the bodies prescribed for the purposes of section 33A of the 2004 Act. In addition to the aforementioned local authorities, RBWM has also developed ongoing working relationships with the following prescribed bodies:

- Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Highways England
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Network Rail
- Homes England
- Thames Valley Berkshire Local Economic Partnership
- Clinical Commissioning Group
3. Cross-boundary strategic matters

3.1 The key cross-boundary strategic matters considered relevant to the preparation of the BLP are set out below:

- Population growth in RBWM & wider area;
- Housing need and pressures arising from RBWM, HMA partner authorities (RBWM, Slough and South Bucks) and other nearby local authority areas;
- Employment pressures in RBWM and adjoining and nearby local authority areas;
- London growth;
- Flooding;
- Air quality and pollution;
- Traffic increase and provision of sustainable transport;
- Internationally and nationally important nature conservation habitats;
- Internationally and nationally important wildlife species;
- Strategic infrastructure, including road and rail;
- Affordable housing need;
- Traveller accommodation;
- Minerals and waste requirements; and
- Potential Heathrow expansion.
4. How RBWM has co-operated on cross-boundary strategic matters

Chronological background

4.1 The DtC was introduced by the Localism Act in 2011 and came into force on 15 November 2011. Further guidance concerning the requirement of the DtC was provided in the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") in 2012, Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (latest update 19 May 2016), various court judgments and the outcome of various Local Plan examinations.

4.2 DtC Activities undertaken by RBWM concerning the preparation of the BLP commenced in 2012. The intensity of those activities gradually increased from 2014 onward and have continued to January 2018. Particular focus has been given to joint working and co-operation around the key stages of the plan making process – namely, the lead up to Preferred Options consultation in 2014, Regulation 18 consultation in 2016, Regulation 19 Publication in 2017 and the BLP Submission in January 2018.

4.3 Early DtC work (in 2012 and 2013) involved a series of meetings with adjoining and nearby neighbouring authorities on an individual basis to discuss strategic cross-boundary matters. Meetings also took place in 2013 with Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee ("TRFCC").

4.4 Meetings with individual authorities to discuss cross-boundary matters continued through 2014 and have been on-going up to the present day. In 2016, Cross-boundary meetings with specific authorities were convened over the year coinciding with the redrafting of the BLP between Regulation 18 Issues and Options stage and Regulation 18 draft BLP stage. Discussions to address specific Cross-boundary issues arising from the Regulation 19 publication have been undertaken with Slough, South Bucks (and Chiltern), Surrey Heath, Runnymede and Bracknell Forest from mid-2017 onwards.

4.5 The following series of DtC meetings, which have taken place since 2014, are considered to be the most important discussions and examples of joint-working on cross-boundary strategic matters:

- A series of meetings between the Berkshire authorities, South Bucks and the Thames Valley LEP to deal with the preparation of the SHMA, FEMA and EDNA;
- The SHMA Member Reference Group series of meetings which primarily focussed on the preparation of the SHMA. These meetings involved Members. This Group was renamed the Berkshire Member Strategic Planning Group in late 2017;
- A series of meetings between RBWM, South Bucks/Chiltern and Slough to forge joint cross-boundary working and deal with issues arising from the emerging RBWM BLP including fundamental disagreements over Housing Market Area (HMA) geography. Latterly, this has included facilitated meetings on 17th October 2017 and 22nd December 2018, the last involving Members. The facilitated sessions have had significant outcomes;
• Meetings between RBWM, Surrey Heath and Runnymede Borough Council’s;
• Meeting with Bracknell Forest and Wokingham Councils.

4.6 Regular discussions have also taken place with prescribed bodies, including Natural England, Thames Water, Environment Agency, Historic England, Highways England and Thames Valley LEP.

4.7 Appendix 1 sets out a detailed chronology of the cross-boundary meetings in which RBWM has been involved since 2012.

4.8 In December 2014, RBWM signed the 'Memorandum of Understanding between the Berkshire Unitary Authorities on Strategic Planning the "Duty to Co-operate" on planning matters in Berkshire' ("the Berkshire DtC MoU"), which sets out a framework for joint working between the Berkshire authorities. A copy of the Berkshire DtC MoU is available on the Council’s website at: https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/200209/planning_policy/1339/duty_to_cooperate

4.9 In 2015, RBWM undertook a DtC scoping exercise based upon consultation with a range of stakeholders, the results of which informed the preparation of a DtC Plan based upon the issues identified by scoping exercise. RBWM has used the DtC Plan prepared in 2015 to inform the preparation of the BLP.

4.10 Since 2012, RBWM has responded positively and constructively to the increasing number of requests from neighbouring authorities and prescribed bodies to co-operate on strategic matters in the preparation of their own plans and programmes.

4.11 In February 2017, RBWM signed an MoU with Wycombe District Council covering a range of cross-boundary matters. A copy of the MoU is available on the Council website at: https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/200209/planning_policy/1339/duty_to_cooperate

4.12 From late 2017 onward, to facilitate closer strategic joint working, RBWM has actively sought to agree Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with the following authority groupings:

• RBWM, Slough Borough & South Bucks/Chiltern District Councils;
• RBWM, Runnymede & Surrey Heath Borough Council (with Surrey County Council as a signatory).

4.13 The SoCG agreed with Runnymede, Surrey Heath and Surrey County Council was signed in January 2018 and follows the template proposed in the Government’s 'Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places' Consultation (September 2017) and deals with specific topics specific to a limited cross-boundary area. This SoCG is included in Appendix 3 to this Statement and can also be viewed on the Council’s website at: https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/200209/planning_policy/1339/duty_to_cooperate
4.14 Despite RBWM’s efforts, at a meeting on 22 January 2018, South Bucks/Chiltern District Councils decided not to participate in the four-way SoCG proposed by RBWM. Subsequently, RBWM and Slough Borough Council have decided to proceed with the preparation of a bi-lateral SoCG. The preparation of this draft SoCG is at an advanced stage and it is hoped that the final signed version will be published by 31 January 2018. The SoCG will identify the specific cross-boundary issues relevant to RBWM and Slough Borough, the outcomes of discussions and the points of agreement between the two authorities, including proposals for further work together. Once signed a copy will be made available on the Council website at: https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/200209/planning_policy/1339/duty_to_cooperate

4.15 In January 2018, RBWM proposed and took the lead on the preparation and submission of three joint bids for Government funding (Planning Delivery fund) for various strategic cross-boundary projects on behalf of various authority groupings. The bids and authority groupings were as follows:

- **Wider area Growth Study**
  
  Submitted with South Bucks District, Chiltern District & Slough Borough Councils;

- **A308 Transport Corridor Study**
  
  Submitted with Runnymede Borough, Surrey County Council and Buckinghamshire County Council

- **A30 Transport Corridor Study**
  
  Submitted with Runnymede Borough, Surrey Heath Borough and Surrey County Council as identified in the signed Statement of Common Ground.

Key types and mechanisms of joint working

4.16 The following are considered to be the key types of joint cross-boundary working which have influenced the preparation of the draft BLP:

- Commissioning of shared evidence base studies:
  - Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA);
  - Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Methodology, Functional Economic Market Assessment (FEMA); and
  - Economic Development Needs Assessment);

- Participation in joint management and strategic planning bodies at member and officer level:
  - SHMA Member Reference Group;
  - Berkshire Member Strategic Planning Group;
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- Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Joint Strategic Planning Board (JSPB);
- Berkshire Leaders Group Berkshire Strategic Transport Forum;
- Berkshire Strategic Flood Risk Management Partnership (including Hampshire);

- Participation in officer working groups:
  - Development Plans Group;
  - Berkshire Heads of Planning;
  - Infrastructure Reference Group; and
  - Local Plan Working Group;

- On-going consultation, meetings and discussions with DtC partners to discuss specific issues;

- Formalising in agreements relative positions and agreed outcomes on cross-boundary matters;

- DtC workshops, including independently facilitated workshops, and project specific workshops;

- Formal consultation on the various stages of the BLP (as set out in the Regulation 22(i)(c) Consultation Statement).
5. How joint working has influenced policy preparation in the draft BLP

Scoping of the issues and required cross-boundary working relationships

5.1 As stated above, a scoping exercise was undertaken by in early 2015 to fully understand the strategic issues, who these were shared with and to prepare a DtC Plan to guide plan making going forward. From this RBWM undertook a targeted consultation exercise with neighbouring authorities and the relevant prescribed bodies. There was a positive and comprehensive response to this consultation, with 23 bodies responding. No major objections were raised to the topics identified in the scoping document. Appendix 2 sets out the bodies that were consulted and the issues that were felt to be relevant. From this exercise the strategic cross-boundary matters set out in Section 3 of this Statement were identified.

5.2 Based on that consultation, a DtC Plan was prepared in 2015 to help inform the preparation of the emerging BLP until February 2016. The Plan identified a programme of work to be undertaken relating to the following strategic matters:

- Housing need and demographics
- Housing development and distribution
- Implications of the SHMA
- Gypsy & Travellers
- FEMA and employment land requirements, allocations and policies
- Retail study and policy issues
- Transport policy (including updating transport model and strategic transport schemes)
- Heathrow
- Water supply and sewerage
- Flood relief infrastructure
- Thames Basin Heaths SPA

5.3 The results of this scoping exercise informed RBWM’s approach to DtC compliance going forward from 2015. The DtC Plan formed the framework for understanding with whom and how we should be working and the identified the desired and effective outcomes. The outcomes from the scoping exercise have fed into the draft BLP as it proceeded through the various plan-making stages. Depending on the issues, some co-operation has taken place as part of formal and regular working groups whilst the
majority have required a more targeted and issue-specific approach. A copy of the DtC Plan is included within Appendix 3.

Consultation feedback

5.4 As the draft BLP was developed through the statutory consultation stages, RBWM carried out a series of formal consultations with DtC partners (amongst other bodies). Comments received as part of the consultation stages have been taken into account and have had a significant input into the shaping of the Plan, particularly the BLPSV published on 30 June 2017.

Specific issues

Housing

5.5 The Council recognises that both the scale and distribution of housing development are key strategic issues for the Royal Borough and its neighbouring authorities. It is often important to consider issues of housing need and supply at a wider spatial scale than single authorities.

5.6 Prior to 2014, regular meetings took place, primarily with Berkshire local authorities but also with Buckinghamshire and Surrey district and county councils, regarding the methodology for assessing housing need, including affordable housing, processing of population data and delivery issues. Various options were considered for joint working and the Berkshire Chief Executive and Leaders Groups in July and September 2014 considered papers regarding joint initiatives for the assessment of housing need and related topics. Given the historical links with the former Berkshire County Council area and existing working arrangements between the constituent authorities it was agreed that the six Berkshire authorities, together with the Thames Valley Local Economic Partnership (TVBLEP) would work together to prepare a SHMA.

HMAs and geographic basis for cross-boundary working

5.7 The NPPF is clear that local planning authorities should work together at a housing market area (HMA) level, to plan strategically for housing provision.

5.8 In December 2014, the Berkshire Councils and the LEP commissioned consultants GL Hearn to prepare a SHMA. The first step in the process involved identification of the Housing Market area/s. Using a ‘best fit’ to local authority boundary approach, the SHMA identified there was strong evidence to support the definition of two separate housing market areas contained in the geographic areas covered by the Berkshire Authorities and South Bucks District Council:

- A Western Berks best fit HMA comprising West Berks, Wokingham, Reading and Bracknell Forest;
• An Eastern 'best fit' HMA comprising RBWM, Slough and South Bucks.

The main differences between the two 'best fit' HMAs are the links to London and the impact this has on migration, travel to work and house prices.

5.9 Best fit was used in the Berkshire (with South Bucks) SHMA as opposed to functional HMA areas as a practical and pragmatic response to data availability. Paragraph 5.21 of the Planning Advisory Service Technical Advice Note 13 supports this, concluding that:

"it is best if HMAs, as defined for the purpose of needs assessments, do not straddle local authority boundaries. For areas smaller than local authorities data availability is poor and analysis becomes impossibly complex. On this basis we consider that HMAs should be defined based on the 'best fit' to local authority boundaries; albeit that SHMAs can (and should) recognise cross-boundary influences and interactions."

5.10 The HMA formed the foundation for the assessment of need which followed in the remainder of the SHMA.

5.11 Officer and Member engagement with South Buckinghamshire District Council was considered once it was identified as part of the area covered by the Berkshire SHMA, and South Bucks Council was invited to be part of the commissioning of the second part of the SHMA once the Housing Market Areas had been defined, but ultimately declined.

5.12 Although 60% of South Bucks District was identified by the March 2015 Buckinghamshire Housing and Economic Development Needs Analysis (HEDNA) (prepared by ORS) as falling within the Reading and Slough functional HMA, South Bucks DC has consistently challenged its incorporation within the 'best fit' Eastern Berks HMA. Paragraph 7.30 of the HEDNA states:

“Given this context, whilst accepting that South Bucks district is divided and that the final conclusion is inevitably based on a judgement, it is possible to determine a hierarchy for the best fit – with the first preference being London, the second being Berkshire and the third being with the rest of Buckinghamshire. This conclusion is supported by the data on both commuting and migration flows. As previously discussed, we would not recommend that South Bucks is included within the London HMA given the particular issues relating to way housing is planned in the London region. The most appropriate alternative “best fit” for South Bucks would be for the district to be considered as part of the Reading & Slough HMA, given the stronger relationships in terms of both commuting and migration as well as the functional HMA covering the largest proportion of the district’s population.”

5.13 In November 2015, Chiltern DC and South Bucks DC agreed to produce a joint Local Plan. Subsequently, South Bucks DC indicated to RBWM, and the other Berkshire Authorities, that it wished to align its housing market areas with what it regarded as a best fit to its
plan making area. Chiltern and South Bucks Councils were of the view that this was the Central Buckinghamshire HMA and South Bucks should now form part of a “best fit” for a Central Bucks HMA comprised of South Bucks, Chiltern, Aylesbury Vale and Wycombe Councils. Evidence was produced by Opinion Research Services (HMAs and FEMAs in Buckinghamshire: The Impact of a Joint Plan for Chiltern and South Bucks’ (January 2016)) to support this decision. This concluded that this decision does not change the functional HMAs identified in the Bucks SHMA (i.e. South Bucks falling into a Berkshire-wide HMA) but provides a pragmatic arrangement for South Bucks in establishing the evidence needed for the plan making process.

5.14 Both RBWM and Slough BC consider that the evidence indicates that South Bucks sits within the Eastern Berks HMA and that the three authorities should be working together as an HMA to meet housing need in the HMA area. South Bucks DC have strongly and consistently resisted this idea, as reflected in its Regulation 20 representation on the RBWM BLPSV. Leaving aside the HMA disagreement, RBWM and Slough BC consider that there remains a fundamental basic geography strongly indicating the three areas have close cross-boundary links and should be working together. Again, South Bucks DC has had difficulty in accepting this.

5.15 RBWM was concerned that the geographical foundation for dealing with housing need in the area was being undermined. This is creating a dysfunctional cross-boundary approach leading to difficulties in progressing with strategic plan making for a number of parties, including other Berkshire authorities and the TVBLEP. Aware of this issue, RBWM has consistently tried to broker a tri-partite solution with South Bucks and Slough from 2016 through until January 2018 in the belief it is possible to resolve these difficulties given the evidence. The most significant attempts involved meetings in 2017 and January 2018 involving officers and Members of Slough, South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM Councils.

5.16 In October 2017 RBWM arranged and funded an officer meeting at an independent venue to try and resolve the issue. The meeting was facilitated by Keith Holland of Independent Plans and Examination (“IPE”). Although the HMA issue was not resolved at this meeting, two key outcomes of it were an agreement to prepare a draft Statement of Common Ground and a recognition by all four authorities that they should work together on a wider growth study to deal with strategic issues. A copy of the IPE advice note is appended at Appendix 4.

5.17 In December 2017 RBWM produced a draft tri-partite (or arguably 4 way with the inclusion of Chiltern DC) Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) and circulated it to Slough and South Bucks/Chiltern officers for comment. The purpose of the SoCG was to provide a mechanism & framework for the 3 main authorities (RBWM, Slough & South Bucks) to work together on shared cross-boundary strategic matters (Chiltern was identified as a potential signatory given South Bucks working arrangement with this authority. It was hoped that a finalised and agreed document could be placed before Members in January 2018 for signing. A copy of this document is contained in Appendix 5.

5.18 Based on feedback received from South Bucks DC and Slough BC, a revised version of the SoCG was circulated by RBWM on 16 January 2018 for comment. A copy of this
document is contained in Appendix 6. South Bucks/Chiltern DCs circulated their own proposed SoCG based on South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM working relationship with Slough being identified as a possible signatory. Based on its understanding of the fundamental geography of the area, RBWM found the exclusion of Slough unacceptable.

5.19 On a positive note, RBWM was able to submit a joint bid in January 2018 to Government for funding from the Planning Delivery Fund on behalf of the 4 authorities for a Wider Strategic Growth Study.

5.20 A meeting was convened on 22 January 2018 involving officers and Members from RBWM, Slough, South Bucks and Chiltern to establish an agreed way forward. The meeting was chaired by Keith Holland of IPE. As it was not proving possible to agree on the circulated SoCG, a series of eight basic propositions to form the basis of joint working were circulated as part of the Agenda. The Agenda (including the eight propositions) is attached as Appendix 7. In the event, only four of the agenda points were discussed as little common ground could be agreed. A series of matters were agreed at the meeting, including recognition that the four authorities should work together and that the four authorities shared cross-boundary strategic matters. RBWM’s understanding of the agreed matters are set out in Appendix 8 based on subsequent email correspondence. However, it was not possible to agree a geographic basis for an appropriate working relationship or what the shared cross-boundary matters were.

5.21 Despite the dysfunctional nature of the HMA working relationship and failure to establish a basis for the agreed joint working, RBWM has undertaken their plan making basis from 2015 to present day based on the Berkshire(with South Bucks) SHMA findings and the best fit Eastern Berkshire HMA geography.

5.22 Subsequent to the 22 January 2018 meeting, RBWM and Slough BC have been working towards agreeing a joint SoCG (see paragraph 4.14 above).

5.23 In addition to the HMA based geographic working, RBWM has also developed other geographic working relationships to deal with cross-boundary matters. These include a number of formal working groups with the six Berkshire authorities at Member and Officer level including the Berkshire Heads of Planning, Berkshire Leaders Group and Development Plans Working Group. The Berkshire SHMA Members Reference Group (now re-named the Berkshire Members Strategic Planning Group) also involved the TVBLEP. This latter group oversaw the preparation of the SHMA and discussion/debate relating to it. A significant topic of discussion in the early days of the SHMA preparation related to the geographic definition of the HMA’s. RBWM’s support for the HMA definitions & the Berkshire SHMA has underpinned the housing evidence base informing the preparation of the BLP and justifies the housing strategy and policies in the BLPSV.

5.24 RBWM has also developed working relationships with other geographically defined areas. A SoCG was agreed with Runnymede, Surrey Heath and Surrey County Council in January 2018. This Statement provides a framework for addressing matters primarily arising from RBWM and Runnymede’s emerging plans relating to the impacts of
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cumulative development, traffic & air pollution, the A30 transport corridor and SANG provision. A copy of the signed Statement is contained in Appendix 9.

5.25 RBWM has also been a participant of the Joint Strategic Planning Board (JSPB) that oversees the response of 11 local authorities to the Thames Basin Heath’s Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). Involvement with this body has directly affected the production of Policy NR4 of the BLPSV.

Housing evidence

5.26 Meetings between the Berkshire authorities in 2012 saw an agreement to work jointly on the assessment of housing need for housing and employment, including the determination of Housing Market and Functional Economic Areas in Berkshire. A meeting between the Berkshire authorities in July 2013 initiated joint consideration of a Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMAA).

5.27 Further meetings coincided with the publication of the RBWM Local Plan Preferred Options consultation in early 2014, and joint Berkshire authorities agreed a brief for consultants to work on a SHMAA. At this stage, the joint working also included South Bucks District Council.

5.28 In December 2014, the Berkshire Councils and the LEP commissioned consultants GL Hearn to prepare a SHMA for the relevant housing areas which produced figures for the objectively assessed need (OAN) for housing. As noted previously, the SHMA Member Reference Group (of which RBWM is a member) oversaw the preparation of the SHMA and has monitored outcomes from it was published in 2016. RBWM took full part in the discussions and debate whilst the SHMA was being prepared. At a meeting on the 19th January 2016 RBWM indicated that it would proceed with plan making and preparing policy based on the Eastern Berkshire HMA results.

5.29 The jointly prepared SHMA therefore underpins the understanding of the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) for RBWM, the identified housing target and the housing policies of the BLPSV.

Housing target and unmet housing needs

5.30 The jointly produced Berkshire SHMA identified the full OAHN for RBWM. Due to land supply and other constraints, RBWM initially considered setting a housing target well below the OAHN for the plan period. This was of concern to a number of authorities and a series of intense discussions with Reading BC, Wokingham BC, Bracknell Forest BC, Slough BC, West Berkshire Council, and South Bucks/Chiltern took place in 2016 to address the concerns these authorities had with RBWM’s approached to site allocations, methodology and unmet needs. Responding to the concerns raised at these meetings, RBWM reviewed its evidence base and land supply position to establish whether it was able to meet its OAHN in full and position its housing policy to deliver this. As a result of this re-appraisal exercise RBWM was able to indicate that it could meet its housing needs in full through densification and Green Belt release with a case made for exceptional circumstances. The methodological basis for this position is based on the results of the Borough’s Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and Edge of Settlement Study which provide a rigorous base for site allocations. This also
meant that it would not need to request neighbouring authorities to accommodate unmet housing needs.

5.31 Policies were developed and consulted on to deliver this. The Berkshire authorities (and others) have subsequently welcomed RBWM’s policies which set the housing target around the OAHN and enable the borough to meet its needs in full without needing to rely on other authorities.

5.32 During the preparation of the draft BLP other authorities have made formal approaches to RBWM for assistance in accommodating their anticipated unmet housing need. In early 2017 both Slough and Surrey Heath approached RBWM. In both instances RBWM formally responded with an indication that it did not feel it was in a position to assist due to the high level of constraints in the borough. Copies of the formal RBWM responses are contained in Appendix 10. Both Slough and Surrey Heath have recognised the level of constraints operating on Windsor & Maidenhead and Slough has indicated that it would not expect RBWM to be in a position to accommodate any southern extension of Slough to meet its expected unmet housing needs.

5.33 As at January 2018 South Bucks has not quantified its level of unmet housing need to the Eastern Berks HMA partners, despite a request to do so. Neither has South Bucks approached its Eastern Berkshire HMA partners with a request to assist in meeting any unmet housing need arising in their plan area. In July 2017 an agreement was put in place amongst the Buckinghamshire authorities to export the unmet housing need from the combined Chiltern/South Bucks area to Aylesbury Vale. From that signed Buckinghamshire MOU it can be seen that in June 2017 it was agreed that Chiltern and South Bucks Districts have an OAHN of 7,175 (plan period 2014-2033) and that Aylesbury Vale DC agreed in July 2017 to take the unmet need of both districts of 5,725. Both RBWM and Slough have expressed concern to South Bucks at this approach believing that unmet need should be met close to where it is generated alongside the related affordable housing need and economic needs in order to create sustainable communities.

5.34 Responses to the draft BLP consultation and publication stages suggested that the Borough should have considered housing targets above the OAHN to help meet unmet need in the HMA, principally Slough. A number of these responses came from neighbouring authorities, including South Bucks, Slough, Bracknell Forest and Wokingham. In response, RBWM has tested housing number and spatial distribution options above the OAHN via the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) process. An update to the SA in Jan 2018 concluded that the best performing number and spatial distribution was that promoted by the draft BLP. As noted above, Slough has accepted that RBWM is unable to accommodate a southern extension of Slough due to physical and policy constraints. Other spatial options to accommodate unmet housing needs are expected to be explored through the Wider Growth Study, for which the South Bucks, Chiltern, Slough and RBWM Councils have
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submitted a joint funding bid to Government. RBWM’s position is that overcoming environmental, land supply and infrastructure constraints would make it extremely unlikely that any potential option for RBWM to accommodate unmet housing need could come forward in the current plan period.

**Site allocations**

5.35 Slough BC raised in regulation 18 responses that it’s issues and options plan had identified (and consulted upon) the release of two Green Belt sites located within RBWM to meet Slough’s needs. Of these two sites, one is proposed for allocation within the draft BLP as HA44 land east of Queen Mother Reservoir to meet RBWM own needs. The other site at Ditton Park was not considered suitable for allocation due to the presence of heritage assets; this has been subsequently reviewed as part of DtC discussions but the same conclusion reached as to its unacceptability for allocation.

5.36 In DtC discussions, no other specific sites have been identified by adjoining authorities. The testing above the OAHN contained in the January 2018 published SA was shared with adjoining authorities under the DtC. Discussions with Wokingham and Bracknell Forest Borough Councils have identified that the area of search for future growth beyond this Plan period will most likely be on the western side of the Borough. It is agreed that this will be the subject of DtC discussions pursuant to the next RBWM local plan.

5.37 Natural England has commented specifically on those proposed site allocations which fall within the 5km linear distance from the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The Council has identified those sites which will require a bespoke, on site SANG solution in order to mitigate the impact of residential development on the TBHSPA. A SANG trajectory will be prepared for Examination and ongoing work will be made available to Natural England and published as appropriate.

5.38 The Borough is significantly constrained by the main rivers running through it; much of the east of the Borough is located within Flood Zones as set out in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (June 2017). The Council has maintained discussions with the Environment Agency through-out the plan-making stages regarding flooding and sites and is a Member of the Berkshire Strategic Flood Risk Management Partnership.

**Affordable housing**

5.39 The jointly produced SHMA identified the affordable housing needs in terms of numbers, tenure type and size. This formed the starting point for the preparation of the affordable housing policy in the draft BLP (Policy HO3).

5.40 Slough has consistently raised concerns that the policy does not explicitly identify social rent and affordable rent as being part of the affordable housing requirement. Slough was concerned that the Borough would not be able to meet its need for this type of accommodation and would thus end up placing additional pressure on Slough. As a result of the 17 October 2017 facilitated DtC meeting, and a subsequent Member/officer meeting between Slough BC and RBWM on 18 December 2017, RBWM confirmed by way of a letter dated 18 January 2018 that it would seek to clarify its
intention to provide for social and affordable rent provision through the Examination process. A copy of the letter is contained in Appendix 11.

**Employment needs**

5.39 The balance between housing growth and the economy is fundamental and, whereas in self-contained city regions it can be relatively straightforward to assess employment need, in areas between major towns and cities, there are overlapping market areas for both housing and employment land needs which require a more pragmatic approach. Joint studies with neighbouring authorities of employment needs have arisen from the work done on housing need which demonstrates the strong linkages between these areas.

5.40 An Employment Land Review was commissioned by RBWM from consultants Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners in 2009 which projected employment space requirements for the main economic sectors and provided a basis for proposals in the Maidenhead Area Action Plan. The Action Area Plan was found sound in examination and did not identify a major need for additional employment site allocations.

5.41 The Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVBLEP) was established in 2010. It has no statutory powers but works with the community sector, education sector (HE & FE) and the business organizations (CBI, IoD, FSB & Chamber) along with all six of the Berkshire Local Authorities to co-ordinate the efforts of these partners. All six of the local authorities have endorsed the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) which emerged under the overview of the LEP and which was which was adopted in 2014. The LEP has a continuing role of leadership in the area and will co-ordinate the efforts of these partners in support of the SEP, whilst avoiding duplication of their individual agendas and activities.

5.42 Following this, joint work in 2012 with Slough Borough Council took place through the East Berkshire Local Economic Assessment which examined key issues for the east of Berkshire economy.

5.43 A series of meetings were held during the period of this work to review progress and outcomes results. The methodology and definitions of Functional Economic Market Areas (FEMA) were discussed initially in late 2014 with the Berkshire authorities, led by Bracknell Forest. Simultaneously meetings were held with Buckinghamshire, led by Wycombe BC (September 2014), which presaged the reorientation of South Bucks towards Buckinghamshire functional market areas rather than Berkshire.

5.44 More recent joint working on the Housing Market Areas has been described above and led to additional work to identify Functional Economic Market Areas (FEMA) being commissioned from Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners in 2015 between the six unitary authorities of RBWM, Bracknell Forest, Reading, Slough, West Berkshire, and Wokingham, and the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVBLEP). The study established three Functional Economic Market Areas (FEMAs) that operate across the Berkshire sub-region and the economic development needs that local authorities should be planning for within these FEMAs. A draft of the report by NLP was
circulated for consultation in November 2015. RBWM was affected by two of the three FEMA; the Central and Eastern Berkshire FEMA.

5.45 Of the three FEMA identified the Eastern Berkshire FEMA has the greatest degree of relationship and influence with areas beyond Berkshire, with South Bucks consistently standing out as sharing strong economic linkages with eastern parts of Berkshire. The consultant’s work developed appropriate methodologies to identify economic development needs to 2036, reflecting the fact that the geographical extent of local economies does not necessarily adhere to administrative boundaries, as recognised in the PPG (ID: 2a-012-20140306).

5.46 A steering group meeting of the Berkshire authorities took place in October 2015 which reviewed the results of the NLP study. A consultation draft of the FEMA study was released in November 2015. Some concerns were raised, particularly with regard to future industrial uses and the sector mapping to land use class definitions used.

5.47 The second part of the evidence comprises an Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) for each of the FEMA identified in the first part. It uses the methodology developed as part of this work to identify the future quantity of land or floor space that will be required for economic development uses over the period to 2036 in each local authority area and in each of the defined FEMA(s). This includes both quantitative and qualitative assessments of the need for new development. Consultation drafts of these documents for each Berkshire FEMA were circulated in June 2016.

5.48 In November 2016, the TBVLEP, which commissioned the work on behalf of the Berkshire authorities, published the FEMA and EDNA studies as a common basis for the assessment of employment space need throughout the county area. In the Regulation 18 consultation draft of the BLP, the Borough incorporated projections for employment space based on past trends (scenario 2 from the EDNA). A number of authorities responded to the Regulation 18 consultation setting out concerns about using the past trends figures, specifically Bracknell Forest. Consequently, the Council carried out sensitivity analysis using local data from the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) and the Interdepartmental Business Register (IDBR) in order to a) test the sector to space mapping was appropriate to our economy and b) to review the approach taken in the EDNA to the margins for replacement of lost floorspace and a delivery buffer. Both of these were very high in the EDNA and led to floorspace and land requirement figures being substantially inflated. The Submission Version BLP is now based on the jobs growth forecast from Scenario 3 – Labour Demand in the EDNA. The new figures arising from this sensitivity testing have been used to identify a locally appropriate OAN for employment floorspace to meet the jobs forecast. The FEMA has been used a starting point for the preparation of employment policies ED1, 2 & 3 in the draft BLP.

5.49 The Borough expects to be able to meet the OAN for employment space within the plan period through a combination of new sites to be developed with employment space in combination with other appropriate uses, by supporting the intensification and upgrading of existing employment sites within built up areas and by protecting the existing sites within the borough from loss to non-employment uses. In response to concerns from other authorities, the Council has also commissioned market testing of
the objectively assessed need identified in the plan to ensure that provision will continue to meet the market needs of occupiers into the future.

5.52 South Bucks DC, acting with Chiltern DC as a partner in a joint Local Plan, has made clear that they do not regard the FEMA studies for Berkshire as relevant to their circumstances. The implications of this situation are that RBWM and Slough BC within the Eastern Berkshire FEMA accept the outcomes of the FEMA studies as providing the objectively assessed need for future jobs growth. Slough has indicated that they do not expect to be able to meet all their EDNA identified employment need particularly in regard to distribution uses.

**Strategic transport**

5.41 The Council has worked constructively with key transport infrastructure providers throughout the development of the BLP to assess the implications of planned growth on the delivery of their services, and to identify effective solutions to transport issues. Where the identified need for infrastructure raises cross-boundary concerns, the Council has worked with neighbouring authorities to address these.

5.42 The primary means by which collaboration with infrastructure providers has been undertaken is through joint working on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which accompanies the draft BLP and sets out the infrastructure schemes required to support planned growth. The IDP is a live document and was initially prepared in 2015 and updated in 2017 and 2018 alongside the various stages of the draft BLP.

5.43 With regard to strategic transport provision, RBWM is the highways authority and other transport stakeholders are Highways England, Network Rail, Great Western Railway, local bus operating companies and neighbouring planning authorities. There are two major forums which meet regularly for the consideration of major transport issues in Berkshire.

5.44 The Berkshire Strategic Transport Officers Forum (BSTOF) comprises senior officers from the councils which meets at six weekly intervals to identify significant issues relating to strategic highways, public transport, cycling and walking. The Berkshire Local Transport Body meets quarterly and comprises both Members and officers, and is administered by the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Economic Partnership and considers issues such as the Growth Deal Capital Programme. RBWM participates in both these forums and cross-boundary issues are identified for joint action where appropriate.

**Highways**

5.45 Transport modelling undertaken on behalf of the Borough by WSP has concentrated on identifying specific junctions on the road network which are under pressure and in certain cases there are implications for neighbouring authorities with regard to congestion and poor traffic conditions. Cross border issues which relate to strategic roads linking the Borough with Wycombe, Bracknell Forest and Surrey Heath have been discussed and reviewed at a series of bilateral DtC meetings since 2012.
5.46 Highways pressure may be exacerbated by proposed developments both in the Borough and in neighbouring areas and existing transport modelling incorporates the impact of approximately 600 units in Bracknell Forest. Pressure points affecting neighbouring authorities include the A404 Bisham roundabout and through road routes.

5.47 A new model was developed in 2017 to reflect present conditions and shared with neighbouring authorities. It included similar assumptions regarding future development in Bracknell Forest and Wokingham.

5.48 The Berkshire Local Transport Body, serviced by the TVBLEP, identifies and monitors the Growth Deal Capital Programme for strategic transport investment. The only project in the Local Growth Deal affecting the Borough in the present programme is improvements to the Maidenhead station approach, in preparation for the introduction of Crossrail (The Elizabeth Line).

5.49 Highways England is the national body with responsibility for the M4 which runs through the Borough. Junction 8/9 lies in the Borough and is subject to significant congestion at peak hours. Discussions with Highways England are continuing with regard to the draft BLP and inputs into the existing and new transport models and the impact of planned development on the strategic highway network, including the M4.

5.50 A number of representations to the Regulation 19 publication raised concerns relating to the impacts of traffic generated air pollution on the health of humans and internationally important wildlife habitats. Through discussions with Natural England RBWM its consultants Ricardo have developed a methodology for a detailed assessment of specific air pollution impacts and mitigation measures. The methodology and the findings have been shared with other authorities, including Runnymede, Surrey Heath, Slough, Wokingham, Bracknell Forest and South Bucks.

5.51 Representations to the Reg 19 publication also raised concerns relating to the impacts of cumulative development on the A308 and A30 transport corridors. Both these routes run through a number of authorities along their lengths and will require cross-boundary working to address the issues in a comprehensive manner. RBWM submitted joint funding bids to government for corridor studies on both the A30 and the A308. The RBWM, Surrey Heath, Runnymede and Surrey County SoCG agrees that a A30 corridor study will take place in the next 3 years to address traffic related issues arising from cumulative development.

**Rail**

5.52 Discussions with Network Rail and Great Western Railway have previously taken place under the auspices of the Thames Valley Regional Working group and responses to the Wessex Route Study which has limited impacts for Maidenhead as a main line rail station. Limited improvements have been made to Maidenhead station recently.

5.53 The introduction of the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail) with a key station at Maidenhead will have some impact on the town centre and surrounding areas. A meeting in June 2016 with Crossrail indicated that they did not anticipate a major increase in rail usage in Maidenhead as a result of the introduction of the London Underground Elizabeth Line,
which will increase capacity and convenience but is not expected to impact significantly on commuter travel times.

5.54 A specific area of co-operation in the future may be the joint promotion of improvements to the Maidenhead to Marlow (via Bourne End) railway line with Wycombe District Council. The Memorandum of Understanding with Wycombe DC mentions specifically the aspiration to improve this service which may help to reduce congestion on main road routes in both authorities’ areas.

**Flooding**

5.55 Flooding is a particular issue in parts of the Borough relating to the Thames flood plain and affects several neighbouring authorities in terms of providing constraints to future development. The main tool to assess the potential risk from flooding is the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) which categorises land in terms of flood risk and constraints to development.

5.56 Previous work was undertaken by consultants WSP in summer 2014 prior to consultation on the First Preferred Options document. The Environment Agency responded initially in July 2016 to an informal draft of the BLP and then to the Regulation 18 draft BLP, seeking evidence of the SFRA and Sequential Testing of Sites to steer development to areas at lowest risk of flooding. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) was completed in 2017 working with Environment Agency input.

5.57 The BLP takes account of strategic flood risk in its Spatial Strategy (Policy HO1) and as part of the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA).

5.58 The Borough has been represented at Member level in the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (TRFCC) which reviews cross-boundary issues throughout the Thames Basin. The Borough is also a partner in the Lower River Thames Flood Alleviation Scheme and is engaged in pre-application discussions with other authorities and the Environment Agency through the Consents and Authorisations Group. A scoping opinion was issued in 2017 in relation to the proposed Lower River Thames scheme. Officers also attend the Berkshire and North Hampshire Strategic Flood Partnership which discusses and seeks to implement strategic projects and joint work. The Environment Agency and Thames Water also attend.

**Green Belt**

5.59 In total, 83% of the Borough is designated Metropolitan Green Belt which provides a major constraint to potential development and is passionately defended. Both RBWM and most neighbouring authorities have been concerned with identifying the possible release of Green Belt, notwithstanding the Government’s intention to strengthen its protection.
5.60 The Green Belt has been a regular item for discussion at DtC meetings between neighbouring authorities since 2012. Various methodologies are used by neighbouring authorities seeking to categorise Green Belt in terms of several criteria, often including landscape character and quality, and their contribution to the objectives of the Green Belt.

5.61 The most significant discussion of Green Belt release methodology took place with Slough BC in early 2014 when it became apparent that there would need to be de-designation of most of its Green Belt in the light of the objectively assessed need for housing land in Slough. This was reflected in discussions with neighbouring authorities, specifically West Berkshire and Bracknell Forest Councils. Most recently as January 2018 Slough has indicated its continuing intention to release all of its Green Belt to meet development needs.

5.62 The Council proceeded with an Edge of Settlement Study, in two parts, during 2015 and 2016, following the decision to concentrate future development in Maidenhead and the existing larger settlements. Previously, neighbouring authorities had expressed concern about the lack of transparency with regard to the methodology and results of the study, and these were promoted at the Cross-boundary meetings for the Berkshire authorities and South Bucks/Chiltern DCs organised by the RBWM in June and July 2016.

5.63 Discussions continue with DtC authorities around accepting the variations in methodology employed and the results achieved for each authority. This has been a issue of particular interest to South Bucks and RBWM has sought to respond to all South Bucks questions and probing on this matter. It is anticipated that a strategic green belt review may be one of the matters considered for inclusion in the Wider Growth Study that South Bucks, Slough RBWM and Chiltern have given a commitment to commencing in 2018.

Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

5.64 The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) extends across eleven local authority areas in southern England and comprises largely heathland that supports three species of protected bird; the Dartford warbler, nightjar and woodlark, which are vulnerable to disturbance from human activity. No net increase in the number of dwellings is legally possible within five kilometres of the SPA unless there is evidence that the development would not cause harm to the SPA.

5.65 The eleven Special Protection Area local authorities, plus the relevant county councils, Natural England and nature conservation bodies work together to implement an avoidance and mitigation package that will ensure there are no adverse effects on the SPA arising from development. A Joint Strategic Partnership Board (which is a Member body) and an officer group enables a joint policy approach to be developed. The approach involves providing Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) mitigation. A formal legal agreement between all local authorities codifying the SAMM approach was agreed in 2011.
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5.66 The Joint Strategic Partnership Board (JSPB) also undertakes research into the effectiveness of SANGs. Local authorities implement agreed SANG policy and are formalising the policy at a local level as their Local Plans are reviewed. When all authorities have adopted such a policy, the ‘saved policy’ of the South East Plan (Policy NRM6) can be rescinded.

5.67 The JSPB and officer group both meet approximately twice a year with e-mail correspondence as required. Progress will be monitored through the following:

- in policy terms, BLP monitoring e.g. number of housing completions within five kilometres of the SPA against available SANG capacity;

- in environmental terms, Hampshire County Council acts as account holder for SAMM monies collected and Natural England implements the SAMM approach under instruction from the JSPB, regular surveys of the numbers of breeding pairs of birds within the SPA and surveys of visitor behaviour on the SPA and on SANGs.

5.68 There is continuing concern that the pressure for development increases the need for SANG and there is insufficient appropriate land available within the SPA authorities. Accordingly, in terms of DtC, there is the need for neighbouring authorities to request provision in order for planning permissions to be compliant.

Other strategic matters

5.69 Concerns relating to the provision of accommodation and sites for Gypsies and Travellers have been raised at DtC meetings since 2012. The Borough has indicated that it will begin preparation of a specific Gypsy and Travellers Local Plan commencing in 2018 and this intention has been transmitted to neighbouring authorities via the published Local Development Scheme (LDS). In its Regulation 20 representation, Bracknell Forest BC indicated that it would expect RBWM to adhere to the timetable set out in the published LDS. A Travellers Accommodation Assessment (TAA) has been commissioned by the Council from Arc4 who have also undertaken similar work for two adjoining authorities. This draft report has been received and a report to Cabinet on need for Traveller Accommodation is anticipated in April 2018.

5.52 Increasingly important in the future will be the impact of Heathrow airport and its planned expansion. RBWM attends the Heathrow Strategic Planning Board as a local authority directly affected, together with neighbouring authorities and major transport, business and resident stakeholders. Currently RBWM is an observer on this group, the intention is to progress becoming a full Member during 2018. Membership of the HSPG is not to be taken as an indication of any alteration of the Council’s position in relation to expansion of Heathrow airport, to which the Council has consistently and robustly objected.

5.70 Impacts are likely to include infrastructure and housing effects and at present these are subject to further analysis. Responses by neighbouring authorities relate to their...
respective positions regarding the construction of the third runway; whereas Slough is supportive, the majority of neighbouring local authorities are opposed.

**Summary of RBWM’s DtC work on key strategic matters**

5.71 A summary of the DtC work on key cross-boundary strategic issues undertaken by RBWM is contained in Table 1.

### Table 1: Summary of RBWM’s DtC work on key cross-boundary strategic issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Strategic Issue: Sub-regional Development Strategy</th>
<th>On-going?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thames Valley Berks LEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Berkshire authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other neighbouring authorities in Eastern Berks (with South Bucks) HMA and in Heathrow Strategic Planning Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 11 authorities involved in JSPB relating to TBHSPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LEP and Member Joint Working Group established in January 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LEP published strategy in March 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Slough, South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM made joint Planning Delivery Fund bid for a Wider Area Growth Study in 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agreement between Slough, South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM to commence a Wider Area Growth Study in 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RBWM, Runnymede, Surrey Heath &amp; Surrey County Council signed Statement of Common Ground, Jan 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Slough &amp; RBWM prepared Statement of Common Ground, Jan 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On-going management of the TBHSPA JSPB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On-going input into work around potential expansion of Heathrow airport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Strategic Issue: Housing Need, Supply and Distribution</th>
<th>On-going?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Berkshire authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thames Valley Berks LEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Neighbouring authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-going?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wider Area Growth Study in 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participation in Berkshire Members Strategic Planning Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Outcomes:
- Berks (with South Bucks) SHMA, 2016
- Jointly produced HELAA Methodology
- Slough, South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM made joint Planning Delivery Fund bid for a Wider Area Growth Study in 2018
- Agreement between Slough, South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM to commence a Wider Area Growth Study in 2018
- RBWM, Runnymede, Surrey Heath & Surrey County Council signed Statement of Common Ground, Jan 2018,
- Slough & RBWM prepared Statement of Common Ground, Jan 2018
- Formal DtC letter to Surrey Heath in June 2017 on their anticipated unmet housing needs
- Formal DtC letter to Slough in July 2017 on their anticipated unmet housing needs

## C. STRATEGIC ISSUE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

### Partners:
- Berkshire authorities
- Thames Valley Berks LEP
- Neighbouring authorities

### On-going?
- Yes:
  - Wider Area Growth Study in 2018

### Outcomes:
- Berks (with South Bucks) SHMA, 2016
- HELAA Methodology
- Slough & RBWM prepared Statement of Common Ground, Jan 2018
- Agreement with Slough to clarify position on provision of Social and affordable rent tenure mix in Policy H)3

## D. GYPSIES & TRAVELLERS

### Partners:
- Adjoining & other neighbouring authorities

### On-going?
- Yes:
  - Preparation of evidence base

### Outcomes:
- Commitment to commencement of RBWM Traveller Local Plan in 2018

## E. EMPLOYMENT

### Partners:
- Thames Valley Berks LEP
- Berkshire authorities
- Other neighbouring authorities in Eastern Berks (with South Bucks) HMA and in Heathrow Strategic Planning Group
- 11 authorities involved in JSPB relating to TBHSPA

### On-going?
- Yes:
  - Wider Area Growth Study in 2018
  - Participation in Berkshire Members Strategic Planning Group

---
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### Duty to Co-operate Compliance Statement

#### Outcomes:
- LEP and Member Joint Working Group established in January 2014
- LEP published strategy in March 2014
- Joint preparation of FEMA and EDNA
- Slough, South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM made joint Planning Delivery Fund bid for a Wider Area Growth Study in 2018
- Agreement between Slough, South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM to commence a Wider Area Growth Study in 2018
- RBWM, Runnymede, Surrey Heath & Surrey County Council signed Statement of Common Ground, Jan 2018,
- Slough & RBWM prepared Statement of Common Ground, Jan 2018
- On-going management of the TBHSPA JSPB
- On-going input into work around potential expansion of Heathrow airport.

### F. INFRASTRUCTURE

#### Partners:
- Berkshire authorities
- Thames Valley Berks LEP
- Other neighbouring authorities
- Berkshire Strategic Transport Forum
- Berkshire Strategic Flood Risk Management Partnership (including Hampshire)
- Network Rail
- Other infrastructure providers

#### On-going?
| Yes: |
| Wider Area Growth Study in 2018 |
| A30 Corridor study |
| A308 Corridor Study |
| Participation in Transport and Flood Risk Forums |

#### Outcomes:
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan (prepared in combination with infrastructure providers)
- Slough, South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM made joint Planning Delivery Fund bid for a Wider Area Growth Study in 2018
- Agreement between Slough, South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM to commence a Wider Area Growth Study in 2018
- Agreement between RBWM, Runnymede, Surrey Heath and Surrey County Council to commence an A30 Corridor Study
- Agreement between RBWM, Runnymede, and Buckinghamshire County Council to commence an A30 Corridor Study
- RBWM, Runnymede, Surrey Heath & Surrey County Council signed Statement of Common Ground, Jan 2018,
- Slough & RBWM prepared Statement of Common Ground, Jan 2018

### G. GREEN BELT

#### Partners:
- Berkshire authorities

#### On-going?
| Yes: |
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### Outcomes:
- Slough, South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM made joint Planning Delivery Fund bid for a Wider Area Growth Study in 2018
- Agreement between Slough, South Bucks, Chiltern and RBWM to commence a Wider Area Growth Study in 2018
- Consultation and discussion with adjoining authorities on RBWM & other authorities evidence base related to Green Belt

### H. THAMES BASIN HEATHS SPA

**Partners:**
- Natural England
- 11 authorities involved in JSPB relating to TBHSPA

**On-going?**
Yes: Participation in JSPB for TBHSPA

**Outcomes:**
- Policy NR4 based on JSPB working
- Agreed approach to avoidance and mitigation
6. Conclusions

6.1 Throughout the preparation of the BLP, RBWM has sought to work jointly and co-operatively on an on-going basis with adjoining and nearby local authorities as well as other statutorily prescribed bodies. This engagement has not been without difficulty but RBWM has consistently responded to concerns and points raised by others and also regularly taken a pro-active and initiating role in seeking to resolve areas of dispute and disagreement.

6.2 Table 1 (in the previous chapter) sets out a summary of the cross-boundary working on key strategic matters. Table 2 below identifies the inputs and joint working with a variety of DtC partners that RBWM feels underpins the BLP policies and approaches. On this basis, RBWM considers it has met the cross-boundary requirements.

Table 2: Summary of Duty to Cooperate working underpinning RBWM BLP policy development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLP Policy</th>
<th>DtC working under-pinning policy development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SP1 Spatial Strategy| • Jointly produced evidence base: (SHMA, FEMA, EDNA, SFRA)  
|                     | • Joint discussions                           |
|                     | • Strategic working groups                   |
|                     | • MOU’s & Statements of Common Ground         |
| SP2 Sustainability and Placemaking | N/A                                      |
| SP3 Character and design of new development | • Joint discussions |
| SP4 River Thames Corridor | • Jointly produced evidence base (SFRA)  
|                     | • Joint discussions                           |
|                     | • Strategic working groups                   |
| SP5 Development in the Green Belt | • Joint discussions  
|                     | • Strategic working groups                   |
|                     | • MOU’s & Statements of Common Ground         |
| SP6 Local Green Space | N/A                                      |
| HO1 Housing development sites | • Jointly produced evidence base: (SHMA, Joint HELAA Methodology, SFRA)  
<p>|                     | • Joint discussions                           |
|                     | • Strategic working groups                   |
|                     | • Berks MOU &amp; Statements of Common Ground     |
| HO2 Housing mix and type | • Jointly produced evidence base: (SHMA)       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLP Policy</th>
<th>DtC working under-pinning policy development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N/A Strategic working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO3</td>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jointly produced evidence base: (SHMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint discussions and informal agreements with Slough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emerging Slough/RBWM Statement of Common Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO4</td>
<td>Gypsy and Travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO5</td>
<td>Housing density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO6</td>
<td>Loss and sub-division of dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED1</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jointly produced evidence base: (FEMA, EDNA, SFRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• MOU’s &amp; emerging Statement of Common Ground with Slough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED2</td>
<td>Employment sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jointly produced evidence base: (FEMA, EDNA, SFRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED3</td>
<td>Other sites and Loss of EmploymentFloorspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jointly produced evidence base: (FEMA, EDNA, SFRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED4</td>
<td>Farm diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR1</td>
<td>Hierarchy of Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jointly produced evidence base: (SHMA, FEMA, EDNA, SFRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2</td>
<td>Windsor Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jointly produced evidence base: (SHMA, FEMA, EDNA, SFRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR3</td>
<td>Maidenhead Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jointly produced evidence base: (SHMA, FEMA, EDNA, SFRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR4</td>
<td>District Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR5</td>
<td>Local Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR6</td>
<td>Strengthening the Role of Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR7</td>
<td>Shops and parades outside defined centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR8</td>
<td>Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLP Policy</td>
<td>DtC working under-pinning policy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vt1</td>
<td>Visitor development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE1</td>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE2</td>
<td>Windsor Castle and Great Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE3</td>
<td>Local Heritage Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR1</td>
<td>Managing Flood Risk and Waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR2</td>
<td>Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR3</td>
<td>Nature Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR4</td>
<td>Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>Renewable Energy Generation Schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP1</td>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP2</td>
<td>Air Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP3</td>
<td>Artificial Light Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP4</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP5</td>
<td>Contaminated Land and Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF1</td>
<td>Infrastructure and Developer contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF2</td>
<td>Sustainable Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF3</td>
<td>Green &amp; Blue infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF4</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF5</td>
<td>Rights of Way and access to the countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF6</td>
<td>New Sports and Leisure Development at Braywick Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLP Policy</td>
<td>DtC working under-pinning policy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF7</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jointly produced evidence base: (IDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF8</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jointly produced evidence base: (IDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint discussions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1: Chronology of DTC meetings 2012 to 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wycombe DC</td>
<td>20/8/12</td>
<td>Agreed Dtc topics (initial proforma): -Bisham roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede BC</td>
<td>20/8/12</td>
<td>Agreed Dtc topics (initial proforma): -SHMA; RBWM methodology agreed, no appetite by R’mede for shared SHMA. Both constrained auths. -pop’n data: R’mede using SEPlan figs, ok with RBWM using POPCORN -afford hg; studies to be updated -employ and retail; no concerns -RBWM no opinion on DERA site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne BC</td>
<td>21/8/12</td>
<td>Agreed Dtc topics (initial proforma): SHMA, housing need, pop’n data, affordable housing, ELR, SHLAA. No major issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks DC</td>
<td>22/8/12</td>
<td>Agreed Dtc topics (initial proforma): -SHMA; no real appetite for joint SHMA, Bucks auths at different stages of LP prep. -afford hg; similar trends for both auths. -housing need; both auths. constrained -scenarios; S Bucks believe scenarios too narrow -infra; concerns over A4 Slough to Maidenhead capacity, traffic modelling needed -Gs and Ts; auths to liaise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham BC</td>
<td>6/9/12</td>
<td>Agreed Dtc topics (initial proforma): -SHMA, housing need, pop’n data, affordable housing, ELR, SHLAA. No major issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading BC</td>
<td>11/9/12</td>
<td>Agreed Dtc topics (initial proforma): -SHMA; update of Berks SHMA required, RBWM will need to look at GB -afford housing; will continue to be an issue -employ and retail; existing ELR likely to be robust. Reading’s Sites &amp; Detailed Pols DPD found sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath BC</td>
<td>13/9/12</td>
<td>Agreed Dtc topics: -housing shortfall; RBWM considering target below need. SHBC target in Core Strat; meeting need -Traveller provision; Atkins study for RBWM and Berks auths; minor provision by RBWM. SHBC undertook own GTAA – 19 pitches required -SANGs; Allen’s Field capac 400 units. Need more in Sunningdale area, potential SANG in SHBC for RBWM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Berks C</td>
<td>3/10/12</td>
<td>Agreed DtC topics (proforma): -SHMA and need; concern about discrepancy with Census -employ/ELR; growth rates unrealistic -Green Belt; need for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough BC</td>
<td>15/10/12</td>
<td>Agreed DtC topics (proforma): -SHMA; assessment should be beyond the two borough boundaries -ELR; SBC office market is struggling, past projections too high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (TRFCC) (Clr Grey)?</td>
<td>14/1/13</td>
<td>Agreed to support an increase in the Thames Levy by 5% for 2013/14 to £10.5 million. Agreed to support an above inflation increase each year for the next five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRFCC (Clr Grey)</td>
<td>26/6/13</td>
<td>EA and LLFA teams working closely together to draw up the Thames Programme bid for projects proposed by risk management partners throughout the Thames area. Questioned need to strengthen links with LEPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFRCC (Clr Grey)</td>
<td>16/10/13</td>
<td>Berkshire and North Hants to continue to work together on strategic elements of local flood risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycombe DC</td>
<td>22/10/13</td>
<td>Discussion of the extent of HMA. Ability to meet housing need. Scale of need much higher than identified capacity. Note (21.10.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks DC</td>
<td>13/11/13</td>
<td>DtC topics agreed: -housing need; methodology for SHMA, S Bucks in HMA but not all districts equally relevant -housing delivery; h’hold increase in SHMA exceeds delivery, will need GB release, S Bucks can take no excess from RBWM, looking to others for housing. -infra; traffic issues relating to A4 -education; overflow from Slough for both auths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFRCC (Clr Grey)</td>
<td>13/1/14</td>
<td>Discussion with Thames Water regarding 6 year investment programme. Focus on surface water flooding alleviation via sewer upgrade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne BC</td>
<td>14/1/14</td>
<td>DtC topics agreed: -lack of strategic framework for cooperation. -HMA and impact of Aylesbury Vale decision letter. -signif. of housing overspill from London. -Spelthorne cannot take RBWM housing need. -release of GB will be needed in RBWM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath BC</td>
<td>20/1/14</td>
<td>Proforma mins. Re housing numbers, SH BC cannot take any excess housing from RBWM. Traffic on A30 – cumulative effects. Both councils object to DERA proposal at Longcross. SPA and efficiency of SANG. Effect of developing strategic sites eg Ascot High St, Sunningdale station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>23/1/14</td>
<td>RBWM offered meeting re flooding policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede BC</td>
<td>30/1/14</td>
<td>Discussion of common topics wrt RBWM Preferred Options and Runnymede Core Strategy. Topics: Housing: Joint Berks SHMA being considered. RBWM objected to Runnymede Core Strategy on basis of constraints. R’mede understood the approach taken re HMA but would expect more refined approach after Census data is available. R’mede cooperating with 2 other Surrey authorities to prepare SHMA but no offers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>3/2/14</td>
<td>Concerns relating to Triangle site. Re evidence base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough BC</td>
<td>26/2/14</td>
<td>Topics covered: -housing need; in 2012 no neighbouring boros willing to work with RBWM; SHMA changed that -affordable housing; SBC major concern re RBWM manifesto commitment on equity stake only housing delivery; will need edge GB release in RBWM, SBC will be asking neighbours to help transport; SBC needs RBWM support for western rail access to Heathrow, and Slough-Windsor rly M and W; RBWM/SBC taking similar approach infra; no fundamental constraints, trans modelling required for RBWM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Valley Berks Local Econ P’ship (TVBLEP)</td>
<td>11/3/14</td>
<td>Discussion on items of common interest. LEP supports M’head regen, higher densities for development. Strategic Econ Plan being prepared. Crossrail and Heathrow seen by LEP as positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Berks C</td>
<td>12/3/14</td>
<td>Agreed DtC topics (proforma): -SHMA and need; commitment to joint approach -housing deliv; GB and PDL land key to supply -no other major strategic issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Berks C, Reading BC, S Oxon DC, Vale of White Horse DC</td>
<td>18/3/14</td>
<td>Oxon SHMA consultation at W Berks; relationship with surrounding SHMAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire auths, TVBLEP, South Bucks DC</td>
<td>20/3/14</td>
<td>Discussion of SHMA brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor, Ascot and M’head CCG</td>
<td>14/4/14</td>
<td>Part of Local Plan preparation process. Re key issues from BLP. Implications of new households. No proposals for super hospital or tertiary facility. More planning for healthy comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTRFCC (Cllr Grey)</td>
<td>25/4/14</td>
<td>Discussion of progress with schemes, forward planning of investment in flood defences and schemes and sharing best practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham BC</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>DtC meeting. No minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>19/5/14</td>
<td>Cooperation regarding SPA and SANG issues. Input from NE on HRA screening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFRCC (Cllr Grey)</td>
<td>4/6/14</td>
<td>Establishment of common approach to environmental enhancement in TFRCC projects Biodiversity elements included could be supported by appropriate LEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire Leaders Group (W Berks, Bracknell For, Wokingham, Slough)</td>
<td>23/7/14</td>
<td>Discussion on Berks-wide strategic planning. RBWM seen as in a unique position, but work done seen as flawed due to lack of consultation. Joint SHMA discussed and supported by most auths. in principle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire and North Hampshire Strategic Flood Partnership (BNHSFP)</td>
<td>29/7/14</td>
<td>Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFA) particularly as regards to acting as SAB (SUDs approval body) Possibility of co-ordinated bylaws for riparian management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire Heads of Planning/Development Plans Group</td>
<td>14/8/14</td>
<td>Discussion re joint SHMA, following decisions of Berkshire Leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne BC, Runnymede BC</td>
<td>20/8/14</td>
<td>Discussion of draft findings of Stage 1 SHMA and G and T issues. No substantive issues raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Oxon DC, Berks auths. (exc Slough BC)</td>
<td>2/9/14</td>
<td>Update on status of all Berks plans. Discussion of Oxon SHMAs, infrastructure issues (full minute produced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire Leaders Group (W Berks, Reading, Wokingham, Slough, Bracknell For)</td>
<td>22/9/14</td>
<td>General agreement to proceed with a joint SHMA. RBWM reluctant initially, but would await Wokingham decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>26/9/14</td>
<td>Letter regarding RBWM Level 2 SFRA and sequential testing of sites. Concerns raised by EA regarding a number of site allocations, and clarifications and further descriptions requested. Deliverability is challenged with regard to safe egress for certain sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks auths. (led by Wycombe BC)</td>
<td>29/9/14</td>
<td>Methodology for HMA and FEMA study workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNHSFP</td>
<td>24/10/14</td>
<td>Sharing of progress and best practice in joint working to provide coordinated provision to manage flooding. Possibility of coordinated bylaws for riparian management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks Leaders</td>
<td>17/11/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire auths. TVBLEP South Bucks DC</td>
<td>18/12/14</td>
<td>Formal evaluation of SHMA tenders. Commissioning of consultants, identification of issues and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE, Bracknell For C</td>
<td>26/1/15</td>
<td>Re SANG. Implications for planning permissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNHSFP</td>
<td>29/1/15</td>
<td>Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA, preparation of LFRMS on a district and catchment area basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire Local Nature P'ship Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust Natural England</td>
<td>1/2/15</td>
<td>Discussed approach to development near the SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire auths. TVBLEP</td>
<td>17/3/15</td>
<td>Discussion of SHMA chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNHSFP</td>
<td>20/4/15</td>
<td>Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA and preparation of LFRMS on a district and catchment area basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell For BC</td>
<td>29/4/15</td>
<td>DtC Scoping. Detailed comments on housing, transport, FEA, environment, G and Ts, infra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVBLEP</td>
<td>30/4/15</td>
<td>DtC Scoping. Issues agreed. Acknowledged joint working in several areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough BC</td>
<td>1/5/15</td>
<td>DtC Scoping. Agreed list of issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede BC</td>
<td>6/5/15</td>
<td>DtC Scoping. Similar to RBWM scope so appropriate and correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks DC</td>
<td>11/5/15</td>
<td>Cross-boundary topics: -SHMA; ongoing, S Bucks engaged -Gs and Ts; common methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire auths. TVBLEP Spelthorne BC Runnymede BC</td>
<td>15/5/15</td>
<td>Discussion of SHMA chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell For BC</td>
<td>1/6/15</td>
<td>Invitation to attend workshop on landscape designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham BC</td>
<td>1/6/15</td>
<td>G and T issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire auths TVBLEP</td>
<td>18/6/15</td>
<td>Discussion of drafts of SHMA chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Officers, Berks and Hants</td>
<td>17/7/15</td>
<td>Discussion of common policy approach to catchment management for all Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFA) in Berkshire and Hampshire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNHSFP</td>
<td>27/7/15</td>
<td>Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA and preparation of LFRMS on a district and catchment area basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire auths. TVBLREP</td>
<td>28/7/15</td>
<td>Discussion of SHMA chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough BC S Bucks DC Chiltern DC TVBLEP Bucks Thames LEP</td>
<td>30/7/15</td>
<td>LP Summit (W Berks auths. declined to attend): Principle of joint MoU between S Bucks and Berks auths. raised. Concerns over geographies and unmet need and lack of S Bucks support for an urban extn north of Slough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire auths. TVBLEP</td>
<td>10/9/15</td>
<td>Discussion of SHMA chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHMA Members Reference Group</td>
<td>15/9/15</td>
<td>- notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHMA Members Reference group.</td>
<td>12/10/15</td>
<td>Response to South Bucks noting their objections to best fit HMA split Organisation of Stakeholder event for emerging SHMA Progressing technical aspects of the SHMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Officers</td>
<td>14/10/15</td>
<td>Coordination of responses to applications between EA and LLFA re flooding issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNHSFP</td>
<td>26/10/15</td>
<td>Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA and preparation of LFRMS on a district and catchment area basis. Approach to managing risks arising across the catchment area, in particular in meeting costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water, Environment Agency (EA)</td>
<td>1/11/15</td>
<td>Agreed way forward for water supply; policy wording suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough BC Chiltern/ S Bucks DCs</td>
<td>3/11/15</td>
<td>Slough, S Bucks, RBWM Reference Group. Topics: initial meeting of Ref Grp for DtC to coincide with major milestones; RBWM to chair update on Boro positions discussion of SHMAs; new geography for Chiltern/S Bucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern/S Bucks DCs, Slough BC,</td>
<td>18/12/15</td>
<td>Officers meeting re housing need, delivery, FEMA and best fit geography, involvement of Mems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire auths. Chiltern/S Bucks DCs</td>
<td>22/12/15</td>
<td>DtC meeting chaired by RBWM. Topics: HMA/FEMA boundary issue re Chiltern/S Bucks DCs now part of Bucks HMA OAN and delivery discussed, constraints identified HELAA methodology discussed (RBWM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern/S Bucks DCs Slough BC</td>
<td>19/1/16</td>
<td>DtC meeting chaired by Chiltern DC. Topics: decision of Chiltern/S Bucks DCs to prepare a joint LP, Slough/RBWM regard geography as unchanged key issue is accommodating unmet needs implications of differing HMAs and geographies disappointment expressed by Chiltern/S Bucks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNHSFP</td>
<td>26/2/16</td>
<td>Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA and preparation of LFRMS on a district and catchment area basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede BC</td>
<td>2/6/16</td>
<td>DtC Topics: employ: common concerns re NLP study results credibility, need to engage with Heathrow SPA: needed for RBWM proposals, ongoing issue -G and T: G and Ts, SFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire auths. TVBLEP Chiltern/S Bucks DCs Wycombe DC</td>
<td>29/6/16</td>
<td>DtC meeting chaired by RBWM. Topics: Edge of Settlement Study results re Green Belt study, consistency issues raised presentation of draft BLP revision, significant comment from neighbouring auths. re evidence. LPAs do not want to object but concerns raised RBWM presently satisfying 66% of OAN, LPAs sought further info sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-issues raised re employment figures, infrastructure, unmet needs, methodologies, possible impact on timetable for submission -BCs/DCs updated LP progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA Crossrail</td>
<td>4/7/16</td>
<td>DtC meeting chaired by RBWM. Topics: -presentation of draft BLP revision draft; with allocated sites, employment figures, Green Belt issues and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water TVBLEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire auths.</td>
<td>14/7/16</td>
<td>DtC meeting chaired by RBWM. Topics: -technical issues regarding housing, employment, Green Belt, infrastructure issues, unmet need in BLP arising from meeting of 29/6/16 -legal advice being sought -timetable issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern/S Bucks DCs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycombe DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVBLEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell For BC</td>
<td>18/7/16</td>
<td>Joint letter from HoP requesting further time prior to BLP submission; several issues raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Berks C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire auths.</td>
<td>19/7/16</td>
<td>Discussion of anticipated outcomes from further discussions re DtC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>20/7/16</td>
<td>General status discussion with regard to SPA and amendments to BLP Policy 52 suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks HoP</td>
<td>21/7/16</td>
<td>DtC issues discussed. Need to clarify how policy decisions are made. HoP meetings relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>26/7/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern/S Bucks DCs</td>
<td>27/7/16</td>
<td>Letter raising ‘best fit’ issue and HMA geographies etc and stating S Bucks position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycombe DC</td>
<td>27/7/16</td>
<td>Presentation of draft Local Plan. Identified joint transport issues and no call on RBWM for housing needs. (Slides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNHSFP</td>
<td>27/7/16</td>
<td>Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA and preparation of LFRMS on a district and catchment area basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire authorities</td>
<td>9/8/16</td>
<td>DtC meeting chaired by RBWM. Topics: -housing numbers; several LPAs challenged RBWM position. S Bucks not co-operating in Berks HMA, looking to Bucks (Aylesbury Vale mainly) -Green Belt, -spatial distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough BC</td>
<td>21/9/16</td>
<td>DtC meeting chaired by LEP. Topics: -evidence base from HMA/FEMA studies; geographies discussed. Chiltern/S Bucks view that HMAs unsound -initial discussion on draft MoU template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern/S Bucks DCs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVBLEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough BC</td>
<td>10/11/16</td>
<td>DtC meeting chaired by LEP. Topics: HMA geography; draft DtC position statement produced by LEP for Berks auths. EDNA results imminent. MoUs agreed as way forward. Each BC updated progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern/S Bucks DCs TVBLEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede BC</td>
<td>6/12/16</td>
<td>Officer session; agreement on MoU schedules and drafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Berks C</td>
<td>19/12/16</td>
<td>Welcoming 100% OAN and promising response to draft BLP. Not seeking Mem meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Bucks/Chiltern DC</td>
<td>21/12/16</td>
<td>Officer session; discussion on MoU schedules and topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath BC</td>
<td>22/12/16</td>
<td>Officer session; SHBC not interested in MoU. Exchange of letters. Agreed minute issued identifying specific issues of concern to both authorities (02.02.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycombe DC</td>
<td>13/2/17</td>
<td>Signature of Memorandum of Understanding between the two Councils (Cllrs Wilson/Johncock). Covering housing, employment, Green Belt, transport, flooding issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne BC</td>
<td>22/2/17</td>
<td>Draft MoU tabled and discussed...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough BC</td>
<td>28/2/17</td>
<td>Draft MoU tabled and discussed...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBWM</td>
<td>26/9/17</td>
<td>Officer discussion on cross-boundary issues, proposed joint working arrangements, draft SoCG to deal with specific topic issues and RBWM responses to Surrey Heath and Runnymede representations on RBWM Reg 19 BLP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHMA Member Reference Group</td>
<td>26/4/17</td>
<td>Decision to remove South Bucks from meeting attendance Decision to continue Local Plan work on basis of current SHMA Amend draft MOU to include all 6 authorities (but not South Bucks) and circulate for comment Slough and Reading to circulate notes re unmet need position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHMA Member Reference Group</td>
<td>28/6/17</td>
<td>Agreed to have Berkshire wide MOU covering SHMA methodology and geography Revised draft to be circulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHMA Member Reference Group</td>
<td>29/9/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBWM</td>
<td>17/10/17</td>
<td>Officer discussion on joint working, potential strategic growth study, how to overcome South Bucks objection to being included in Eastern Berks best fit HMA, preparation of draft SoCG, and RBWM responses to Slough and South Bucks DtC objections to RBWM Reg 19 BLP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks Chiltern Slough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBWM South Bucks/Chiltern Slough</td>
<td>22/10/18</td>
<td>Member and officer discussion to seek agreement on draft Statement of Common Ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire Member Strategic Planning Group</td>
<td>8/12/17</td>
<td>Draft Berks MOU Agreement on content of lobbying paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBWM Slough</td>
<td>18/12/17</td>
<td>Member &amp; officer discussion on affordable housing and RBWM responses to Slough’s representations on RBWM Reg 19 BLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>19/01/18</td>
<td>To discuss IDP and concerns residents raised in relation to water, sewerage capacity in Cookham. Ham Island STW capacity in light of proposed BLP development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBWM, Slough, South Bucks Chiltern</td>
<td>22/01/18</td>
<td>Facilitated meeting to discuss various circulated draft Statements of Common Ground with a view to preparing an agreed document. Also discussed Berkshire MOU, joint bids and South Bucks/Chiltern representation on RBWM Reg 19 BLP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBWM Bracknell Forest Wokingham</td>
<td>24/01/18</td>
<td>Officer discussion on cross-boundary issues, draft Berks MOU, proposed joint working arrangements with other authorities of interest to Bracknell forest and RBWM responses to Bracknell Forest &amp; Wokingham representation on RBWM Reg 19 BLP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: 2015 DtC scoping exercise

Duty to Cooperate – Scoping of Issues and Bodies

RBWM is preparing a replacement Borough Local Plan. As part of this exercise, the council has a Duty to Cooperate (DTC) with specific bodies in relation to planning of sustainable development and strategic matters.

The council has identified a number of stakeholders as Duty to Cooperate bodies, and has already engaged with many of these to discuss issues of common interest and the development of planning policies. As part of the DTC process, the council has identified the likely strategic, cross boundary planning issues and with whom the council should be engaging on these issues. The issues and topics identified, and the relevant DTC bodies, are shown in the following table.

The council is now talking with the identified bodies to seek agreement to the issues and topics identified and the list of stakeholders that should be involved. We may already be discussing some of these issues with you.

Please can you consider the list of issues and topics as it relates to your organisation, and let us know if you agree.

It is envisaged that a series of meetings, workshops and other engagement will be undertaken as the Borough Local Plan progresses, with the degree and method of engagement being proportionate to the subject matter and the stakeholders involved. We will therefore be seeking some specific meetings with relevant bodies and hosting a series of workshops to engage with our partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Suggested Partner Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing need and demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints and our approach to assessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suggested Partner Organisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Berkshire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycombe District Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transport issues of cross-border significance (including Heathrow)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suggested Partner Organisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell Forest Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Aviation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB Schenker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Great Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freightliner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Hillingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Rail Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Berkshire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycombe District Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The economy, including FEMA, projections for employment growth and retail floorspace need

**Core partners:**
- Bracknell Forest Council
- Reading Borough Council
- Slough Borough Council
- South Bucks District Council
- Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
- West Berkshire Council
- Windsor 2030 Business Forum
- Wokingham Borough Council

**Other partners:**
- Buckinghamshire County Council
- Hart District Council
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey County Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Wycombe District Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Suggested Partner Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the historic environment</td>
<td>Historic England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Protecting the natural environment, including Thames Basin Heaths SPA| **Core partners:**  
  - Berks Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust  
  - Berkshire Local Nature Partnership  
  - Bracknell Forest Council  
  - Environment Agency  
  - Natural England  
  - Reading Borough Council  
  - Runnymede Borough Council  
  - Slough Borough Council  
  - South Bucks District Council  
  - Spelthorne Borough Council  
  - Surrey Heath Borough Council  
  - Wokingham Borough Council  
  - Wycombe District Council  
  **Partners for SPA issue only:**  
  - Elmbridge Borough Council  
  - Guildford Borough Council  
  - Hart District Council  
  - Rushmoor Borough Council  
  - Waverley Borough Council  
  - Woking Borough Council  
  **Other partners:**  
  - Buckinghamshire County Council  
  - Oxfordshire County Council  
  - Surrey County Council |
| Meeting the needs of gypsies and travellers                          | **Core partners:**  
  - Bracknell Forest Council  
  - Homes and Communities Agency  
  - Reading Borough Council  
  - Slough Borough Council  
  - West Berkshire Council  
  - Wokingham Borough Council  
  **Other partners:**  
  - Buckinghamshire County Council  
  - Oxfordshire County Council  
  - Runnymede Borough Council  
  - South Bucks District Council  
  - Spelthorne Borough Council  
  - Surrey County Council  
  - Surrey Heath Borough Council  
  - Wycombe District Council |
| Minerals and Waste provision                                         | **Core partners:**  
  - Bracknell Forest Council  
  - Reading Borough Council  
  - Slough Borough Council  
  - West Berkshire Council  
  - Wokingham Borough Council  
  **Other partners:**  
  - Buckinghamshire County Council  
  - North London Waste Authorities |
### Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure provision, including healthcare and education</th>
<th>Suggested Partner Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oxfordshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Surrey County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cumbria N Waste stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Devon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Waste transfer and incineration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Core partners:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bracknell Forest Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Buckinghamshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oxfordshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reading Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Runnymede Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slough Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• South Bucks District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• South Central Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Spelthorne Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Surrey County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Surrey Heath Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thames Valley Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• West Berkshire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wokingham Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wycombe District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Partners for healthcare issue only:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bracknell and Ascot CCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Windsor, Ascot and Maidenhead CCG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood relief infrastructure</th>
<th>Suggested Partner Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Runnymede Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Spelthorne Borough Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Duty to Co-operate Plan - 2015

RBWM Borough Local Plan

Duty to Co-operate Plan, Outline of Approach

Introduction

Section 110 of the Localism Act (link below) sets out the 'duty to co-operate'. This applies to all local planning authorities, national park authorities and county councils in England. It informs the plan-making process. The duty:

• relates to sustainable development or use of land that would have a significant impact on at least two local planning areas or on a planning matter that falls within the remit of a county council

• requires that councils set out planning policies to address such issues

• requires that councils and public bodies 'engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis' to develop strategic policies

• requires councils to consider joint approaches to plan making.

The NPPF (Paragraph 156) sets out the strategic issues where co-operation might be appropriate. Paragraphs 178-181 give further guidance on 'planning strategically across local boundaries', and highlight the importance of joint working to meet development requirements that cannot be wholly met within a single local planning area, through either joint planning policies or informal strategies such as infrastructure and investment plans. Further guidance on how the duty to co-operate should be applied in local planning is included in the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).

The Duty to Co-operate is an on going and evolving process for strategic policy areas and will involve several interactive steps, work has already taken place which contributes to the process, such as joint working on the SHMA, FEMA, retail study work, The Special Protection Area joint working, major highway schemes such as on the M4, and other transport issues such as Cross Rail.

This table outlines the proposed approach to Duty to Co-operate until February 2016, but the Duty to Co-operate will be ongoing. Following these initial steps further work will be identified and new engagement and co-operation arrangements will have to be made after February.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duty to Co-operate Strategic Policy or Topic Area</th>
<th>Councils and Bodies involved</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing need and demographics</td>
<td>Berkshire Councils</td>
<td>Formal meeting of Planning Officers to consider and agree strategic cross boundary issues, how they will be dealt with. Formal invitation and clarity what the meetings are intended to achieve. Key strategic issues to be raised and discussed at Heads of Planning Meetings at the same time, to reinforce the process. Reporting to elected members with further involvement as required with other councils.</td>
<td>Dec 2015, Jan 16</td>
<td>Identification of issues where we can agree and where we are unlikely to agree. By end Jan 16 an outline of the general approach we will have to the distribution of housing and the numbers involved across Berkshire (for RBWM Local Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing need and demographics</td>
<td>Neighbouring Councils outside Berkshire Wider strategic stakeholders</td>
<td>Meeting of Planning Officers to consider and agree strategic cross boundary issues, how they will be dealt with. Formal invitation and clarity what the</td>
<td>Dec 2015, Jan 16</td>
<td>Identification of issues where we can agree and where we are unlikely to agree. By end Jan 16 an outline of the general approach other councils and strategic stakeholders will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty to Co-operate Strategic Policy or Topic Area</td>
<td>Councils and Bodies involved</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>When</td>
<td>Intended Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implications of SHMA and the resultant housing numbers and their distribution</td>
<td>RBWM, Slough, S Bucks and Chiltern DC</td>
<td>meetings are intended to achieve. If officers cannot attend have bipartisan discussions and formal exchange of correspondence. Strategic issues to be raised and discussed at Heads of Planning Meetings at the same time. Reporting to elected members with further involvement as required with other councils.</td>
<td>A series of dates have been proposed in December 15</td>
<td>Identification of issues and potential policies where we can agree and where we are unlikely to agree. How this will be dealt with at member level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty to Co-operate Strategic Policy or Topic Area</td>
<td>Councils and Bodies involved</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>When</td>
<td>Intended Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy and Traveller</td>
<td>Berkshire Councils and the Homes and Communities Agency</td>
<td>Reporting to elected members with further involvement as required with other councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA &amp; resultant employment land requirement, allocations and policies</td>
<td>Berkshire Councils</td>
<td>The needs study is being updated and should indicate where there is a need for cross border working. Meetings may need to be arranged in 2016</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Appropriate policy approach for the Borough Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berkshire Councils</td>
<td>The Councils along with the LEP are working jointly on the study and this will result in evidence that will help inform policy development. Meetings have occurred and will continue as a steering group. Later this has the potential to evolve as a means to deal with strategic cross border policy issues. Issues to be raised and discussed at</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Provide evidence for policy development and form the sound basis for resolving cross border issues. No final reports available yet so full outcomes are uncertain at present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty to Co-operate Strategic Policy or Topic Area</td>
<td>Councils and Bodies involved</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>When</td>
<td>Intended Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA &amp; resultant employment land requirement, allocations and policies</td>
<td>Councils and other strategic partners outside Berkshire</td>
<td>Heads of Planning Meetings where necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail study and policy issues</td>
<td>Neighbouring councils within and outside Berkshire</td>
<td>The FEMA study should help identify the partners where we need to pursue more detailed duty to co-operate issues. In the first instance this should be dealt with by formal correspondence and informal discussion, it may be appropriate if needed to have an officer level meeting to resolve any outstanding matters.</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Identification of issues and potential policies where we can agree and where we are unlikely to agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Policy</td>
<td>Berkshire Councils, adjoining</td>
<td>There are normally no strategic cross border policy issues on this topic. However it is proposed to send a formal letter to ask the neighbouring councils to confirm this.</td>
<td>Dec 15 and 16</td>
<td>Joint agreements on a way forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty to Co-operate Strategic Policy or Topic Area</td>
<td>Councils and Bodies involved</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>When</td>
<td>Intended Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Councils, London Boroughs and TFL</td>
<td>this needs to be done before useful co-operation can take place, A range of issues need to be resolved on a bi-party basis as well as across all these authorities. Initially this may be by formal correspondence, but formal meetings will also be needed.</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Joint agreement on a way forward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Policy</td>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>The transport model needs updating and this needs to be completed before useful co-operation can take place, Following this a formal meeting will take place</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Development of an agreed scheme to form the basis of a Local Growth Deal Funding bid to the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail proposals and policy</td>
<td>Network Rail, Crossrail, Great Western Railway</td>
<td>Discussions are on-going in relation to the development of proposals for a multi-modal transport interchange at Maidenhead Station, which affect the Maidenhead Station Opportunity Area identified in</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 January 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duty to Co-operate Strategic Policy or Topic Area</th>
<th>Councils and Bodies involved</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Transport Schemes and Policies / Major transport scheme funding</td>
<td>Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), neighbouring local authorities, Highways England, Network Rail</td>
<td>The Berkshire Strategic Transport (Officer) Forum (BST(O)F) meets every 6 weeks. This discusses: funding bids for major transport schemes; progress on funded schemes; relevant projects and policies affecting strategic transport, and consultations on policies and proposals that affect the strategic network or which have a cross-boundary impact.</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td>Securing funding for local major transport schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow</td>
<td>A range of councils affected and the LEP</td>
<td>There are regular meetings at officer level for the Heathrow planning sub region.</td>
<td>On going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply and Sewerage</td>
<td>Thames Water, Environment Agency</td>
<td>A meeting has already taken place. Further meetings are planned when we know more of the detail of</td>
<td>Dec 15 and Jan 16</td>
<td>An agreed way forward which may include information in the supporting text to the policies, some wording in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty to Co-operate Strategic Policy or Topic Area</td>
<td>Councils and Bodies involved</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>When</td>
<td>Intended Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>Other Water Companies, Environment Agency</td>
<td>Initially formal letter correspondence asking for any issues that need considering.</td>
<td>Dec 15 and Jan 16</td>
<td>An agreed way forward which may include information in the supporting text to the policies, some wording in policies or in an SPD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood relief infrastructure</td>
<td>Environment Agency, Natural England Runnymede BC Spelthorne BC</td>
<td>Correspondence with parties to agree how we will deal with the issue in the Local Plan. Initially by letter/email, a formal meeting may be necessary.</td>
<td>Dec 15 and Jan 16</td>
<td>An agreed wording for the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Basin Heaths SPA</td>
<td>Relevant Councils and Natural England</td>
<td>This is an ongoing working partnership and feeds in to planning policy and development management decisions</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Appropriate wording in the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Duty to Cooperate meeting 17 October 2017 - Facilitator’s Note.

Attendance

Facilitator
Keith Holland (KH)

Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM)
Helen Murch
Ian Church
Phillipa Silcock
Jennifer Jackson
Hillary Oliver

Chiltern DC and South Bucks DC (CSB)
Graham Winwright
Alison Bailey

Slough Borough (SB)
Paul Stimpson
Pippa Hopkins

Outcomes being sought

RBWM seeking agreement on a table of contents and timing of a Duty to Cooperate (DtC) statement. Seeking an effective working arrangement that deals with the issue of unmet housing need in the sub-region. Hopes to satisfy other authorities that objections to the RBWM can be withdrawn.

CSB looking for a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and identification of matters that can be referred back to members. Not anxious to sustain objections to the RBWM plan but concerned that over a number of years efforts by CSB to reach collective agreement with the Berkshire authorities on the HMA geography have proved to be fruitless.

SB looking for changes to the way RBWM is approaching affordable housing (particularly for rent) and would like to get to a position where SB and CSB could have a joint examination two years from now. The time scale relates to the position with Heathrow. The unmet need from Slough has not been finally quantified but it will be between 5,000 and 10,000 homes and the DtC will need to address this issue along with other strategic issues including the need to accommodate commercial development arising from expansion of Heathrow.

Ideal approach

SB favours a strategic growth study involving all three (possible more) authorities – points to Bed/Luton example.
RBWM also agree that a strategic growth study is needed. Believe that the study is likely to have to cover a wider area possibly including adjacent HMAs.

CSB. Agree and say they have been promoting such a study but believe that it should include all of the Berkshire authorities and should as a priority clarify the extent of the relevant Housing Market Area (HMA).

**Short term/Long Term**

Agreement that it is important for RBWM and CSB to progress their plans quickly. RBWM intends to submit by end of January 2018. CSB will not meet the 31 March 2018 deadline currently proposed by the government but are looking to submit in 2018. SB’s plan delayed by Heathrow complications.

General agreement that it is sensible to give priority to getting plans in place in the short term and to deal with the long term on the basis of sub-regional strategic work.

**Discussion Points**

**Housing**

No dispute regarding the housing OAN (Objectively Assessed Need) as currently calculated. Agreement that Slough is a heavily constrained borough that is unable to meet its need for housing.

SB considers that expansion of Slough to the north east is the logical and sustainable way to partly address its housing need – notably the need for family accommodation which is not being adequately addressed by the high density development that is occurring in and around the Slough town centre. Expansion of Slough to the north east would involve land within South Bucks District. CSB argue that the Green Belt study done for Buckinghamshire has considered this area and has concluded that it should at present remain in the Green Belt. CSB do not accept that it is self-evident that the logical location for Slough expansion is to the north east. CSB argue that more evidence is needed and that other Berkshire wide options for accommodating Slough’s unmet need should be explored.

At the heart of this unresolved dispute is the definition of the HMA. RBWM and SB accept the conclusion of the work done by GL Hearn in 2016 that there are two relevant HMAs - the Western Berkshire HMA comprising Bracknell Forest, Wokingham Borough, Reading Borough and West Berkshire and the East Berkshire HMA comprising Slough Borough, the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead and South Bucks. CSB accepts that providing homes for people is directly related to the functional HMA but argues that there is effectively one HMA comprising all of the Berkshire authorities and South Bucks. On this basis CSB believes that Slough should look to the wider HMA to assist with meeting its unmet housing need. SB argue that there is little point is looking at the wider area when there is an overwhelming case for the expansion of Slough to the north east into South Bucks. SB consider that the joint CSB plan currently being prepared should contain a clear
and unequivocal commitment to incorporating the expansion of Slough to the north east in the first review of the CSB Local Plan. SB also accepted that the M4, Heathrow and waterway systems provide barriers to expanding Slough to the East or south.

SB and CBS agree that RBWM has achieved a milestone in getting to the point of meeting their OAHN and accept that this has been a difficult journey given the constraints including European designations and green belt. The RBWM plan also includes a very significant change in the character of Maidenhead where the density will be increased to provide more homes. Notwithstanding this, RBWM accept that more work is required before it could be demonstrated that there has been “no stone unturned” in accommodating more growth in Windsor and Maidenhead than that which is required to meet its own needs. This is acknowledged as a weakness which could cause problems at the local plan examination and could potentially result in the RBWM plan being found unsound. The RBWM are alert to the issue and further work is being commissioned to explore this matter before the plan is examined. The RBWM believe that it may be necessary to look to adjoining HMAs to meet the needs arising in the East Berkshire HMA.

A major concern for SB is the way affordable housing for rent is not being adequately catered for, particularly in RBWM. As a consequence, this element of housing need is being pushed into Slough. SB contends that it is already building all that it can in the centre of the town and there is concern that the need to increase the supply of housing is potentially prejudicing the quality of the homes being built. Furthermore, the need for family housing cannot be adequately provided for in Slough. SB will maintain an objection to the RBWM plan unless there is a change in the affordable housing policy that recognises the need for affordable housing for rent. A supplementary planning document dealing with this issue will not be regarded as adequate by SB. RBWM have agreed to re-consider its affordable housing policy and it may be possible that the concerns of SB can be addressed.

**Green Belt/Growth Study**

There is agreement that unmet housing need may represent an exceptional circumstance justifying a Green Belt review. There is also agreement that any long-term strategic growth study will need to consider the extent of the Green Belt in the area. SB is critical of the Green Belt work that has been done to date in Buckinghamshire on the grounds that it has not been strategic. Slough contend that the work to date has been “bottom up” in the sense that it has been based on a field by field assessment as opposed to a strategic approach which should involve firstly assessing the overall long term need for land for development and then, based on this assessment, decide how much land needs to be taken out of the Green Belt. CSB do not accept this point and contend that the Part 2 Green Belt work done for the Buckinghamshire authorities has been based on broad strategic zones. CSB believe that the work already done in Buckinghamshire could therefore feed into any long term Green Belt review. SB accepts that the Green belt review work done by RBWM is adequate for the purposes of the local plan currently being prepared (i.e. the short term) but CSB do not consider that the work by RBWM has been exhaustive enough. CSB believe that a more comprehensive Green Belt study could show that RBWM has some capacity to assist with meeting unmet need from Slough. CSB agreed to supply RBWM with details of which parcels of land it believes have been unjustifiably disregarded.

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT
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For the longer term RBWM consider that the authorities should consider jointly commissioning a strategic Green Belt review which would feed into a strategic growth study. SB feels strongly that there needs to be a commitment to undertaking a growth study and that the Green Belt review, as well as other elements of the growth study, need to be progressed as a matter of urgency in the next two years. SB says that the aim should be to have made significant progress before an anticipated decision on the expansion of Heathrow. As a starting point the scope of the work needs to be agreed as soon as possible. SB point out that it would be helpful if the RBWM joined the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group.

Conclusions

As facilitator KH has drawn the following broad conclusions from the discussion:

1) Although a significant amount of discussion has taken place as evidenced by the RBWM Duty to Co-operate Compliance Statement, there are critical matters that have not been resolved.

2) The lack of effective cooperation in relation to important considerations, such as the options for meeting the anticipated unmet housing need in Slough, has put all of the authorities at a significant disadvantage and has made them vulnerable to challenge at examination.

3) While there is at present some scope for a Statement of Common Ground to be agreed by the four authorities, fundamental difficulties remain. These difficulties have the potential to undermine the soundness of the plans being prepared on the grounds of inadequate cooperation and a failure to plan positively for the needs of the area.

4) The RBWM is alert to the need to address two issues that could cause significant problems at their local plan examination – whether there is capacity in the Borough to accommodate more housing growth than is currently planned for and whether the affordable housing policy adequately deals with the issue of affordable housing for rent. The additional work being done by the RBWM in relation to these matters may result in changes to the Borough Plan. Such changes could be introduced and consulted on before the local plan examination but, given the anticipated timing of the submission of the Borough Plan, it is probable that the Council would request the inspector to include the changes, if any, as main modifications to the Plan. Main modifications introduced in this way by the examining inspector would need to be subject to consultation.

5) There is now inadequate time for long term strategic planning to take place before RBWM submit their plan for examination. Nevertheless, the need for strategic planning is clear, not least because of the economic growth potential arising from Heathrow. RBWM should formally acknowledge the need for a longer term strategic plan but seek to argue at the examination that their approach is to get the Borough
Local Plan adopted as soon as possible in order to address short term problems with the longer term strategic issues being incorporated as an integral part of the plan review. The RBWM should commit to undertaking the review as soon as possible and consider the advantages of joining the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group. Joining this group would help to convince the inspector examining the Borough Local Plan that the RBWM is actively seeking to meet the DtC requirements.

6) RBWM in conjunction with the other three authorities should commit to actively pursuing a sub-regional growth study as a matter of urgency as soon as possible after the Borough Local Plan is adopted. This study should initially consider as a priority, the geography of the study area and could possibly include authorities other than RBWM, SB and CSB.

7) An integral part of the growth study should be a strategic review of the Green Belt in the area. In line with the NPPF this review should aim to produce a defined area of Green Belt that will endure in the long term i.e. well beyond the plan period of the plans currently being prepared.

8) It should be possible to eliminate at least some of the current objections to the RBWM plan if details are provided to RBWM by the objecting authorities of specific sites/areas of concern. The provision of such details should enable the RBWM to respond more effectively to the points currently being raised against the Borough Plan.

9) Although CSB are now included in the Buckinghamshire HMA it would be unwise for these authorities to ignore the unmet housing needs of Slough given that South Bucks is part of the functional Berkshire HMA and the close geographical relationship between Slough and South Bucks.

At the present time, it would be possible for the authorities to agree a Statement of Common Ground. However, the statement should be more comprehensive and convincing once the additional work currently being done by the RBWM has been completed. Accordingly, it is recommended that the Statement of Common ground could be started by recording where there is agreement and, as a living document, subsequently modified to record progress as RBWM explore the matters set out in this advice note. Longer term commitments to strategic planning could similarly be recorded.

There are two significant related matters where there is evidently no common ground at present. These are the HMA geography and the possibility of expanding Slough to the north east. Both of these are unlikely to be resolved in the short term, but there is an incentive to identify and commit to longer term strategies whereby these can be properly considered. Authorities should reflect on the danger to the soundness of plan making in the area if the failure to agree on these points continues. In the event of the disagreement continuing there is no reason why parts of the Statement of Common Ground cannot include agreement between some but not all of the participating authorities.

Keith Holland

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (JPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

Registered in England and Wales, Company Reg. No. 10100118, VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

30 January 2018
Duty to Co-operate Compliance Statement
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Appendix 5: Proposed draft SoCG between RBWM, Slough and South Bucks prepared by RBWM, Dec 2017

Draft
Statement of Common Ground

1. Constituent parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.1 The primary parties to this Statement of Common Ground are:
- The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead (hereafter referred to as RBWM)
- Slough Borough Council (hereafter referred to as Slough)
- South Buckinghamshire District Council (hereafter referred to as South Bucks)

1.2 There are no other signatories to this Statement.

(Should Chiltern be included as a signatory?)

2. Geographical area covered by Statement

2.1 The geographical area covered by this Statement of Common Ground is set out in Map 1, attached as Appendix 1 to this Statement.

2.2 The area is based on the best fit HMA as set out in the 2016 Berkshire (with South Bucks) SHMA

2.3 The justification for this geographical area, and the involvement of the above 3 primary parties in this Statement of Common Ground is based on the following:

The 2016 Berkshire SHMA identifies the three authorities as comprising a best fit HMA indicating that there are close cross boundary relationships between the 3 local authority areas.

Furthermore, the basic geography of the area indicates the three authorities have close links. They adjoin each other and together form much of the western edge to London. All three have close connections with London and lie in close proximity to Heathrow. A cross boundary network of roads (including the M4 and north/south and east/west A roads) and blue and green spaces tie the area together. Public transport links (including the London to Bristol rail-line with stations in each authority) run through the 3 parties. Crossrail stations lie in two of the authorities.

VERSION 1 - RBWM suggested SoCG.
28 December 2017
3. Key strategic cross boundary matters between the authorities

3.1 All 3 parties acknowledge that, by virtue of their close cross boundary geography, they are required by the NPPF to work together to plan positively and on a proactive and on-going basis for the development and infrastructure required in the area.

3.2 The 3 primary parties agree that the following represent the key strategic cross boundary matters between them:

- Housing – level of housing need in the area, unmet need and housing distribution
- Affordable housing – need, distribution and tenure type
- Green Belt
- Strategic cross boundary infrastructure
- Air quality impacts on human health and national and international nature conservation designations arising from cumulative development proposals in the area.
- Employment

3.3 The agreements the 3 authorities have reached on each of these matters is set out in the following sections:

Housing

3.4 The three primary authorities agree that the level of housing need in the geographical area for the period 2013 to 2033 has been defined in the Berkshire (including South Bucks) SHMA 2016. This identifies the Full Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) within the jurisdictions of each of the individual parties, and across the whole HMA as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>OAN (dwellings per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBWM</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Berks and South Bucks HMA</td>
<td>2,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 The 3 parties agree that:
- Each of the authorities is heavily constrained, creating challenges for each of them to meet their individual identified housing needs.
• Slough has particular difficulties in meeting its need given its confined geographical nature.
• The currently assessed level of unmet need arising in the geographical area is based on the following:

Table 1: Currently assessed level of unmet housing need in the geographic area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Anticipated amount of unmet need in 2013-2033 period (based on Berks SHMA OAHN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBWM</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>5,000 – 10,0003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| South Bucks  | c 5,000 4  
(is this just South Bucks, or is it South Bucks and Chiltern?) |
| Geographical area | ?                                             |
| Chiltern     | ?3                                                                               |

3.6 The three primary authorities agree that they should work together using their full endeavours to try and ensure that the identified housing need set out in Table 1 above is met within the Map 1 geographical area.

3.7 It is further agreed that a strategic growth study will be commissioned by the three primary parties to help them identify how any future identified housing need could be best distributed across the geographic area in a sustainable manner.

3.8 However, on a geographic basis, all three authorities acknowledge that Slough is a small, tightly constrained, largely urban borough. In contrast, South Bucks and RBWM, which largely surround Slough, are far more extensive in area and contain large areas of countryside, all of which is Green Belt. Leaving aside considerations relating to Green Belt, the eastern half RBWM is heavily constrained by multiple layers of significant national and international designations including Flood Zones, Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation and historic parks (Map 2 – Appendix 2), limiting the potential for any southern expansion of Slough. The M4 motorway and The Thames also act as a further significant barriers to any direct southern extension of Slough into RBWM. The three authorities acknowledge that the areas to the north of Slough in South Bucks are less constrained.

---

1 As calculated by each authority at December 2017 based on evidence and emerging policy
2 Based on policies in emerging draft Local Plan – Borough Local Plan 2013-2033: Submission version.
3 Based on
4 Based on
5 Based on

VERSION 1 - RBWM suggested SoCG.
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3.9 The three authorities also agree that if they cannot meet the identified need within the geographical area despite using their best endeavours to do so, they will jointly approach surrounding HMA areas. Given the links with the Western Berks HMA, and the rest of Buckinghamshire, it is expected that the joint approach would first be made to these areas, rather than HMA’s in Surrey, Oxfordshire or London.

Affordable housing

3.10 All three Councils agree that there is a very high level of affordable housing need across the area defined in Map 1.

3.11 All three Councils are committed to increasing the number of affordable homes delivered across each of the constituent areas in the next 15 years to address unaffordability issues.

3.12 Each of the 3 parties agree that they will seek to deliver policy commitments in their emerging Local Plans which require new development to deliver an affordable housing tenure mix that includes social rent and affordable rent properties.

Green Belt

3.13 It is recognised that unmet housing need in the geographical area may represent an exceptional circumstance justifying a strategic Green Belt Review covering all authorities to this agreement.

Key cross boundary infrastructure delivery

3.14 The three authorities recognise that any future Heathrow growth and expansion has the potential to significantly impact on the geographic area covered by this Statement. The benefits of jointly undertaking detailed work in relation to Heathrow expansion as part of a wider growth study are accepted by the 3 authorities.

3.15 Other key cross boundary infrastructure between the 3 authorities includes the Elizabeth line (Cross rail), sustainable transport services including, local rail lines, buses and pedestrian and cycle routes. The three authorities agree to move towards joint planning and working in relation to the retention and, where possible, enhancement of these cross boundary services.
Air quality

3.16 The three authorities recognise the importance of air quality issues in relation to both human health and nature conservation interests. As many of the generators of air pollution have wider than local areas of influence (including emissions from roads and air transport) the three authorities recognise the need for co-operation and joint working on this.

3.17 The authorities agree that air quality will be one of the matters considered in a wider strategic growth study. In the meantime, air quality modelling work is being done by RBWM in response to Natural England’s representation on the Regulation 19 Borough Local Plan publication. This work is looking at an extensive modelling area which includes South Bucks and Slough. As part of the joint working and co-operation, RBWM will share this work in detail with Slough and South Bucks once it is completed.

Employment

3.18 Employment is recognised by the three authorities as a wider than local issue affected by significant market and technological changes. Furthermore, the three authorities recognise Heathrow as an employment hub with satellite employment generation that affects all of the geographic area covered by this Statement.

3.19 It is agreed that the provision of land to accommodate future strategic employment needs in the geographic area will be addressed jointly through a wider growth study.

4. Strategic Planning

4.1 The 3 authorities agree that they need to work together to undertake strategic planning in the geographical area covered by this Statement.

4.2 The Elizabeth Line (Crossrail), Brexit, potential expansion of Heathrow and London’s outward growth needs are acknowledged by the three authorities as potential medium to long term drivers of significant macro-scale change in the geographic area. The scale, impact, timing and certainty of these changes is not yet fully understood.

4.3 In view of this, as part of this strategic joint working, the 3 primary parties agree to jointly commission a strategic growth study to look at how identified housing and economic growth in the area can be met sustainably. The brief and scope of the study will be jointly established in 2018 but such a study would be expected to incorporate a
strategic Green Belt review, take into account the economic growth potential arising from Heathrow, London expansion and the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail) and address infrastructure needs and air quality issues. The 3 authorities agree to jointly seek and bid for external funding for the study and accommodate its recommendations into their emerging and future Plan policy-making.

4.4 The 3 authorities acknowledge that there is inadequate time for long term strategic planning to take place before the submission of the RBWM and South Bucks/Chiltern Local Plans. There is a need for these plans to be adopted as soon as possible to address short term problems but both authorities will commit to incorporating longer term strategic issues in subsequent plan reviews.

4.5 The three Council’s agree that the potential major drivers of change identified in Paragraph 4.2 may necessitate the need for early review of their plans and open up a need for synchronising plan making timetables. In the longer term, it is acknowledged that joint plan making by the three authorities may be the soundest way to address the macro-scale changes and forces likely to significantly affect the geographic area in the future.

5. Governance

Primary authorities responsible for the statement

5.1 The primary authorities responsible for this Statement of Common Ground are RBWM, Slough and South Bucks.

Additional signatories

5.2 None at this stage.

Responsibilities for maintenance and updating

5.3 This document will be reviewed annually by the 3 primary authorities at a joint Duty to Co-operate meeting held in December each year. This meeting will involve both officers and Members. Until agreed otherwise, RBWM will act as the chair and secretariat for this meeting.

5.4 Where any one of the primary parties is undertaking a Regulation 18 consultation, Regulation 19 publication or submitting a plan it will be the responsibility of that party

VERSION 1 - RBWM suggested SoCG.
28 December 2017
to co-ordinate the review and updating of this Statement of Common Ground for that event.

6. Signatories

____________________
Cllr XXXXX on behalf of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

____________________
Cllr XXXXX on behalf of Slough Borough Council

____________________
Cllr XXXXX on behalf of South Buckinghamshire District Council

Dated: ____________ January 2018
Appendix 1 - Map 1: Geographical area covered by this Statement of Common Ground
Appendix 2 - Map 2: RBWM constraints
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Appendix 6: Proposed draft SoCG between RBWM, Slough, South Bucks and Chiltern prepared by RBWM, 16 Jan 2018

Draft
Statement of Common Ground

1. Constituent parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.1 The primary parties to this Statement of Common Ground are:
   • The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead (hereafter referred to as RBWM)
   • Slough Borough Council (hereafter referred to as Slough)
   • South Buckinghamshire District Council (hereafter referred to as South Bucks)

1.2 There are no other signatories to this Statement.
   (Should Chiltern be included as a signatory?)

2. Geographical area covered by Statement

2.1 The geographical area covered by this Statement of Common Ground is set out in Map 1, attached as Appendix 1 to this Statement.

2.2 The justification for this geographical area, and the involvement of the above 3 primary parties in this Statement of Common Ground is based on the following:
   • The basic geography of the area indicates the three authorities have close links. They adjoin each other and together form much of the western edge to London. All three have close connections with London and lie in close proximity to Heathrow. A cross boundary network of roads (including the M4 and north/south and east/west A roads) and blue and green spaces tie the area together. Public transport links (including the London to Bristol rail-line with stations in each authority) run through the 3 parties. Crossrail stations lie in two of the authorities.
   • Recent evidence base work by the authorities indicates that there are cross boundary links between the authorities:
     o The Central Buckinghamshire HEDNA (2015) updated in 2016 identifies the majority of South Bucks (61%) falling within the Reading & Slough functional
housing market area (See Map 2 in Appendix 2). The pragmatic “best fit” for South Bucks is identified as the Reading and Slough HMA.

- The 2016 Berkshire SHMA identifies RBWM, Slough and South Bucks as comprising a best fit HMA.

- The closely inter-related area identified in Map 1 has a large amount of unmet housing need and some of the least affordable housing areas in the country. Tri-partite working is needed to address this wider than local issue.

2.3 Chiltern is included as a signatory to this Statement.

The reason for this is based on administrative working arrangements. South Bucks and Chiltern determined in November 2015 to undertake a joint Local Plan to cover both districts. Although Chiltern is identified as falling in the functional and best fit Central Buckinghamshire HMA and has limited cross boundary links with RBWM and Slough, this joint working arrangement ties them to any joint decision making by RBWM, Slough and South Bucks.

3. Key strategic cross boundary matters between the authorities

3.1 The 3 primary parties acknowledge that, by virtue of their close cross boundary geography, they are required by the NPPF to work together to plan positively and on a proactive and on-going basis for the development and infrastructure required in the area.

3.2 The 3 primary parties agree that the following represent the key strategic cross boundary matters between them:

- Housing – level of housing need in the area, unmet need and housing distribution
- Affordable housing – need, distribution and tenure type
- Erosion of metropolitan Green Belt
- Strategic cross boundary infrastructure
- Employment
- Air quality impacts on human health and national and international nature conservation designations arising from cumulative development proposals in the area.

1 The consultants ORS identify this as the local authorities of Bracknell, Reading, Slough, West Berkshire, Windsor & Maldenhead and Wokingham, as well as South Bucks.

2 VERSION 2 - RBWM suggested SoCG.
16 January 2018
4. Strategic Planning

4.1 The 3 primary parties agree that they need to work together to undertake strategic planning in the geographical area covered by this Statement.

4.2 The primary parties agree to commission a Joint Growth Study for the RBWM, Slough and South Bucks area which would look at how identified housing and economic growth in the area can be met sustainably. The full brief and scope of the study will be jointly established in 2018 at the project set up phase but is expected to incorporate the following:

- Review of functional and best fit HMA & FEMA boundaries for the area;
- Establish expected future housing and economic growth needs in the area;
- Economic growth potential arising from Heathrow, London expansion, Elizabeth Line (Crossrail), Brexit and technological and market changes;
- Identify strategic infrastructure needed to support growth;
- Strategic Green Belt review;
- Address air quality and other wider environmental impacts arising from future growth across the wider area, including flooding
- Generate and test a range of strategic options to sustainably accommodate future growth across the geographic area.

4.3 The authorities agree to jointly seek and bid for external funding for the study and accommodate its recommendations into their emerging and future Plan policy-making.

4.4 The authorities acknowledge that there is inadequate time for any outcome of the strategic Growth Study to be incorporated into the emerging RBWM and South Bucks/Chiltern Local Plans before submission. Both RBWM & South Bucks/Chiltern will commit to early reviews of their Plans if the Growth Study recommended significant new development in their areas, necessitating changes to their spatial strategy.

5. Agreement on specific cross boundary matters

Housing

5.1 The 3 parties agree that:
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• Each party is constrained, creating challenges for each of them to meet their individual identified housing needs.
• Slough is a small, tightly constrained, largely urban borough and has particular difficulties in meeting its need given its confined geographical nature.
• South Bucks and RBWM, which largely surround Slough, are far more extensive in area and contain large areas of countryside, all of which is part of the Metropolitan Green Belt.
• Leaving aside considerations relating to Green Belt, the eastern half RBWM is heavily constrained by multiple layers of significant national and international designations including Flood Zones, Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation and historic parks (Map 3 – Appendix 3), limiting the potential for any southern expansion of Slough. The M4 motorway and The Thames also act as a further significant barriers to any direct southern extension of Slough into RBWM.
• The areas to the north of Slough in South Bucks are less constrained.

5.2 The three primary authorities agree that they should work together using their full endeavours to try and ensure that the identified housing need arising from the geographical area is met.

Affordable housing

5.3 All three Councils agree that there is a very high level of affordable housing need across the area defined in Map 1.

5.4 All three Councils are committed to increasing the number of affordable homes delivered across each of the constituent areas in the next 15 years to address unaffordability issues.

5.5 Each of the 3 parties agree that they will seek to delivery policy commitments in their emerging Local Plans which require new development to deliver an affordable housing tenure mix that includes social rent and affordable rent properties.

Green Belt

5.6 It is recognised that development growth in the 3 primary parties places pressure on the openness and integrity of the Metropolitan Green Belt. The three primary parties agree to work together when considering the long term boundaries of the Green Belt. It is also agreed that the joint working will enable the boundaries across the whole area to be considered, rather than working only at individual district level.
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Key cross boundary infrastructure delivery

5.7 The three authorities agree to move towards joint planning and working in relation to the retention and, where possible, enhancement of the cross boundary sustainable transport services, including local rail lines, buses and pedestrian and cycle routes.

Air quality

5.8 The three authorities recognise the importance of air quality issues in relation to both human health and nature conservation interests. As many of the generators of air pollution have wider than local areas of influence (including emissions from roads and air transport) the three authorities recognise the need for co-operation and joint working on this.

5.9 The authorities agree to share air quality modelling work.

5.10 In response to Natural England’s representation on the Regulation 19 Borough Local Plan publication, RBWM has commissioned air quality work that looks at an extensive modelling area which includes South Bucks and Slough. As part of the joint working and co-operation, RBWM will share this work in detail with Slough and South Bucks.

6. Governance

Primary authorities responsible for the statement

6.1 The primary authorities responsible for this Statement of Common Ground are RBWM, Slough and South Bucks.

Additional signatories

6.2 Chiltern

Responsibilities for maintenance and updating

6.3 This document will be reviewed annually by the 3 primary authorities at a joint Duty to Co-operate meeting held in December each year. This meeting will involve both
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6.4 Where any one of the primary parties is undertaking a Regulation 18 consultation, Regulation 19 publication or submitting a plan it will be the responsibility of that party to co-ordinate the review and updating of this Statement of Common Ground for that event.

7. Signatories

___________________________
Cllr Coppinger on behalf of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

___________________________
Cllr XXXXX on behalf of Slough Borough Council

___________________________
Cllr XXXXX on behalf of South Buckinghamshire District Council

___________________________
Cllr XXXXX on behalf of Chiltern District Council

Dated: _____________ January 2018
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Appendix 1 - Map 1: Geographical area covered by this Statement of Common Ground
Appendix 2 - Map 2: Functional HMA’s in the sub regional area, as defined by Central Buckingham HEDNA update 2016

Figure 7: Functional Housing Market Areas (updated using lower level geography data for commuting zones, 2011 based migration zones and taking account of house prices) with Local Authority Boundaries
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Appendix 3 - Map 3: RBWM constraints
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30 January 2018
Facilitated Duty to Co-operate Meeting

22 January 2018
St Martin’s Place, Slough
3 pm

RBWM, Slough, South Bucks and Chiltern

AGENDA:

Invitees:
Facilitator:
Keith Holland, IPE

Members:
• Cllr Carter, Slough
• Cllr Coppinger, RBWM
• Cllr Martin, Chiltern
• Cllr Read, South Bucks

Officers:
• Jennifer Jackson, Head of Planning Service, RBWM
• Helen Murch, Planning Policy Manager, RBWM
• Paul Stimpson, Planning Policy Lead Officer, Slough Borough Council
• Pippa Hopkins, Principal Planning Policy Officer, Slough Borough Council
• Graham Winwright, Planning Policy Manager, South Bucks & Chiltern

Agenda items

1 Introductions
2 Explanation of Keith Holland’s role
3 Purpose of the meeting:
   Focus on Duty to Co-operate and supporting RBWM at Examination with goal of
   preparing SoCG which can act as a live document for all to use in plan making

   Discussion on draft SoCG’s proposed by RBWM & South Bucks
4 Discussion on proposed propositions to form basis of agreed draft SoCG. (set out in
   attached doc 1)
5 Agreement on way forward
6 Agreement on meeting outcomes
7 Governance for future joint working
8 Berkshire MOU
9 Any other business

Status: FINAL
17 January 2018
Document 1:
Proposed propositions for draft SoCG between RBWM, Slough, South Bucks/Chiltern

1. All authorities represented wish to work together to deal with strategic cross boundary matters between us;

2. All authorities acknowledge there are problems agreeing on the justification for the geographical area

3. The following are agreed as the strategic cross boundary matters between us:
   o Unmet need in the area
   o Green Belt
   o Strategic cross boundary infrastructure
   o Transport & air quality impacts

4. All authorities acknowledge that Slough has a unmet housing need issue

5. All authorities agree that Slough’s ability to expand southwards is constrained. Constraints illustrated in Map 1

6. Agree that RBWM draft Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033: Submission version will not add to Slough’s difficulties in meeting need

7. As part of strategic joint working, the authorities agree to jointly commission a strategic growth study to look at how identified housing and economic growth in the wider area can be met sustainably. The brief and scope of the study will be jointly established in late spring 2018 but such a study would be expected to incorporate a strategic Green Belt review, take into account the economic growth potential arising from Heathrow, London expansion and the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail) and address infrastructure needs and air quality issues.

8. The authorities agree to jointly seek and bid for external funding for the study and accommodate its recommendations into their emerging and future Plans. RBWM and South Bucks agree to explore how they can write commitments into their emerging plans to enable the findings and outcomes of the Wider Growth Study to act as triggers for early plan reviews.
Duty to Co-operate Compliance Statement
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Map 1: Constraints to the south of Slough

Status: FINAL
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Appendix 8:

Matters agreed from 22 January 2018 meeting between RBWM, Slough, South Bucks and Chiltern, as understood by RBWM

- All 4 authorities agree we need and want to work together.

- The parties share existing cross boundary strategic matters. It was agreed that there was no agreement relating to what these matters were.

- The parties have differences in relation to defining geographies within which cross boundary working should take place.

- Slough has physical constraints to growth and is expected to have unmet housing need.

- The Wider Growth Study would be in two parts with the first part being to establish the Study geography.

- All parties would move forward in their plan making with the findings of the Wider Growth Study

- The parties should set up a framework of regular Member/Officer meetings. The first of these could centre around the PID approval and commissioning of work on the Wider Growth Study (see c below).
Appendix 9:

SoCG between RBWM, Runnymede, Surrey Heath and Surrey County Council

Statement of Common Ground

1. Constituent parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.1 The primary parties to this Statement of Common Ground are:
   - The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead (hereafter referred to as RBWM)
   - Surrey Heath Borough Council (hereafter referred to as SHBC)
   - Runnymede Borough Council (hereafter referred to as RBC)

1.2 The following organisations are also signatories to this Statement:
   - Surrey County Council (hereafter referred to as SCC)

2. Geographical area covered by Statement

2.1 This is a topic specific Statement of Common Ground focussed on the specific geographical area set out in Map 1, attached as Appendix 1 to this Statement. The area covers parts of RBWM, RBC and SHBC including Ascot, Sunningdale, Sunninghill, Longcross, Virginia Water, Englefield Green, Chobham and Windlesham

2.2 The 3 primary parties agree that the area defined on Map 1 represents a sound geographical basis for co-operation on strategic cross boundary matters. This area contains large areas of heathland which have been designated as internationally important wildlife sites. The principle of these is the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBH SPA). It also contains a number of affluent settlement areas, the strategic A30 road corridor as well as Sunningdale station and the rail level crossing on the A30. The strategic allocations of Longcross Garden village lies within the area.

Justification for this area

2.3 The 3 primary parties agree that the extent of the area set out in Map 1 is justified by the geographical extent of influence arising from the strategic cross boundary matters between the 3 primary parties.
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2.4 Although each of the three parties to this Statement agree that they lie in different Housing Market Areas, all accept that it would be beneficial to prepare a Statement of Common Ground to deal with the strategic assets lying in this area and the significant and locally specific cross boundary matters affecting the parts of their boroughs identified in Map 1 and in Paragraph 2.1 above.

3. Key strategic cross boundary matters between the authorities

3.1 The 3 primary parties agree that the following represent the key specific strategic cross boundary matters for the limited geographic area identified in Map 1:

- Cumulative impacts of development – especially housing
- Cross boundary infrastructure – A30 and Sunningdale Station
- SANG provision
- Air quality impacts on human health and national and international nature conservation designations (especially Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area TBH SPA) arising from cumulative development proposals in the area.

3.2 The agreements the 3 primary parties have reached on these matters are set out below:

Cumulative impacts of development

3.3 The three primary parties have identified that around 3,000 net new dwellings and 850,000 sq ft of employment floorspace could potentially be delivered over the next 15 years in the geographical area covered by this Statement of Common Ground.

3.4 In light of this level of cumulative development, and the infrastructure assets in the area, the 3 primary parties agree to work closely together to undertake joint longer term strategic planning for the Map 1 area.

Key cross boundary infrastructure

3.5 The three primary parties agree that the A30 road corridor (including Sunningdale station) is a key infrastructure asset in the geographical area. They also agree that the function and performance of this asset needs to be maintained and, where possible, improved, particularly in light of the development proposed through emerging Local plans.
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3.6 The 4 authorities (including SCC) have agreed to work towards jointly commissioning and funding an A30 corridor study in the next 3 years, focussed on the Map 1 area to inform future Plan making.

3.7 The 4 authorities (including SCC) agree to maintain a watching brief in relation to the cumulative impacts of development along the A30. All 4 authorities (including SCC) are committed to exploring possibilities and mechanisms for improving cycle access along the route, including to Sunningdale station and other key transport interchanges.

SANG

4.6 The 3 primary parties agree to work together wherever possible to ensure that there is sufficient SANG capacity in the area to enable the delivery of the development proposed for the geographic area and wider boroughs.

Transport & air quality

3.8 The 3 primary parties recognise the importance of air quality issues in relation to both human health and nature conservation interests. The presence of extensive tracts of internationally important nature conservation sites in the geographic area make this a particularly relevant cross boundary issue for the 3 primary parties. The 3 primary parties agree to share information and to work jointly in relation to transport and air quality impacts.

3.9 The 3 primary parties agree that air quality will be one of the matters considered in the jointly commissioned A30 Corridor Study. In the meantime, air quality modelling work is being undertaken by RBWM in response to Natural England’s representation on the Regulation 19 Borough Local Plan publication. This work is looking at an extensive modelling area which includes parts of RBC and SHBC. As part of the joint working and co-operation, RBWM will share this work in detail with Runnymede and Surrey Heath. Runnymede has also commissioned Borough wide air quality modelling to support its emerging Local Plan. As part of the joint working and co-operation, Runnymede will share this work in detail with RBWM and Surrey Heath at the draft stage.
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4. Long term strategic planning

4.1 The 4 authorities (including SCC) agree that they need to work together to undertake strategic planning in the geographical area covered by this Statement. The jointly commissioned A30 corridor study will be a major focus of future strategic cooperation and working between the parties to this agreement.

4.2 RBWM and RBC are looking to submit their plans in January and March 2018 respectively. Both of these authorities have pre 2004 adopted plans and need to put adopted plans in place quickly in order to address short term issues. It is agreed that longer term strategic issues identified as part of future strategic planning for the geographic area would be incorporated as an integral part of any subsequent plan reviews.

5. Governance

Primary authorities responsible for the statement

5.1 The primary authorities responsible for this Statement of Common Ground are RBWM, SHBC and RBC.

Additional signatories

5.2 Surrey County Council

Responsibilities for maintenance and updating

5.3 This document will be reviewed annually by the 3 primary parties at a joint Duty to Co-operate meeting held in June each year. This meeting will involve both officers and Members. Until agreed otherwise, RBWM will act as the chair and secretariat for this meeting.

5.4 Where any one of the primary parties to this Statement is undertaking a Regulation 18 consultation, Regulation 19 publication or submitting a plan it will be the responsibility of that party to co-ordinate the review and updating of this Statement of Common Ground for that event.

23 January 2018

30 January 2018
Signatories

Cllr Coppinger on behalf of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

Cllr Prescot on behalf of Runnymede Borough Council

Jenny Rickard, Head of Planning on behalf of Surrey Heath Borough Council

Dominic Forbes, Planning Group Manager on behalf of Surrey County Council
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Appendix 1 - Map 1: Geographical area covered by this Statement of Common Ground
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Appendix 10:

Formal RBWM responses to Slough and Surrey Heath’s requests for assistance in helping them accommodate their unmet housing need.
Dear Sanjay,

Duty to Co-operate – meeting unmet housing need

I refer to your email of 20 February 2017 enquiring whether the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) would be in a position to accommodate any un-met objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) arising in Slough. Please accept our apologies for the delay in responding to you.

RBWM recognises that Slough is subject to a number of constraints which limit its ability to meet its full objectively assessed housing need, as set out in the Berkshire SHMA 2016. This Council recognises and welcomes Slough’s intention to adopt a best endeavours and no stone unturned approach to meeting housing need in the Borough.

RBWM is committed to meeting its own growth needs. The Regulation 19 Submission Borough Local Plan states that it would provide for at least 14,240 new dwellings (712 dpa) over the 2013 to 2033 plan period. This represents the Borough’s full OAHN as set out in the Berkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2016.

As I am sure you are aware, RBWM is severely constrained in terms of land availability, green belt designations, international nature conservation designations (including the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area), nationally significant heritage assets, and flooding. The housing target set out in the Regulation 19 Borough Local Plan is ambitious and challenging in light of these constraints and RBWM had to adopt a ‘no stone unturned’ approach to enable it to meet its identified housing need in full. This involved the Council significantly increasing densities in a number of sustainable locations, using brownfield and public sector land and releasing Green Belt.

As a consequence of the challenges in meeting its own target, RBWM is very unlikely to be in a position to meet any demonstrated unmet housing need arising in Slough. That
said, RBWM recognises that Slough is at an earlier stage in the plan making process and this Council would welcome the opportunity to continue the dialogue in respect of cross boundary strategic matters.

Yours sincerely

J. Jackson
Head of Planning Services

Cllr Derek Wilson
Lead Member - Planning
Duty to Co-operate – meeting unmet housing need

I refer to your letter of 19 January 2017 enquiring whether the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) would be in a position to meet any unmet objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) arising in Surrey Heath. Please accept our apologies for the delay in responding to you.

RBWM recognises the severe constraints on Surrey Heath in terms of meeting its housing need and welcomes your Council’s intention to adopt a best endeavours and no stone unturned approach to meeting housing need in the Borough.

This Council is committed to meeting in full its housing & employment growth needs. The Regulation 18 Borough Local Plan states that it would provide for up to 14,298 new dwellings (712 dpa) over the 2013 to 2033 plan period. This represents the Borough’s full OAHN as set out in the Berkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2016.

As I am sure you are aware, RBWM is severely constrained in terms of land availability, green belt designations, international nature conservation designations (including the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area), nationally significant heritage assets, and flooding. The housing target set out in the Regulation 18 Borough Local Plan is ambitious in light of this and RBWM has adopted a ‘no stone unturned’ approach to enable it to meet its identified housing need in full. This has involved the Council significantly increasing densities in a number of sustainable locations and releasing Green Belt. The Council is also aware that there is potential unmet need elsewhere in the housing market area that RBWM sits within.

As a consequence, RBWM is very unlikely to be in a position to meet any demonstrated unmet housing need arising in Surrey Heath. That said, RBWM would welcome the opportunity to continue the dialogue in respect of cross boundary strategic matters.

Yours sincerely

[Signatures]
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RBWM letter to Slough confirming policy approach to affordable housing
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Cllr David Copinger
Lead Member for Planning, Health and Sustainability
The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
Town Hall
St Ives Road
Maidenhead, SL6 1RF

Cllr Martin Carter
Cabinet Member for Planning & Transport
Slough Borough Council
St Martins Place
51 Bath Road
Slough, SL1 3UF

18 January 2018

Dear Martin,

Duty to Co-operate – response to Slough’s concerns regarding emerging RBWM affordable housing policy

As you are aware, RBWM published its draft Borough Local Plan 2013-2033: Submission version ("BLP") over the summer of 2017 under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

In response to Regulation 19 publication, the Council has received a number of Regulation 20 representations about BLP Policy HO3 concerning affordable housing. As you are aware, the Regulation 20 representation made by Slough Borough Council objected to Policy HO3 and its supporting text disputing its soundness and compliance with the duty to co-operate on the basis that Policy did not define an appropriate tenure mix or make provision for the delivery of social rented and affordable rented affordable homes. We have noted from that Regulation 20 representation and from other conversations that Slough Borough Council is particularly concerned by the BLP’s apparently exclusive reference to affordable home ownership.

We are grateful for Slough Borough Council’s helpful representations, which I confirm RBWM Officers and Members have considered very carefully, together with the representations made by other interested persons. Having reflected upon the concerns expressed about the BLP’s approach to tenure mix, we acknowledge that it would be helpful for RBWM to clarify its approach to affordable housing, which we accept could be better expressed in the BLP.

Further to our recent the constructive discussions, I confirm that our submission documents supporting the BLP will clarify RBWM’s position by proposing an affordable housing tenure split based on 80% social/affordable rent and 20% intermediate housing. At this stage we anticipate proposing a 45/35% split between affordable and social rent (based on the findings of the SHMA and local need) in Policy HO3 as a starting point for discussions with developers.
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When submitting the BLP to the Secretary of State for independent examination, we confirm that RBWM will invite the inspector to recommend that Policy HO3 and its supporting text be amplified to achieve the following:

- Specifically refer to the need for social rent and affordable rent in the Borough;
- Detail what social and affordable rent represents in the Borough;
- Set out the tenure split the Council will be seeking from future development, and the basis for this;
- Include a specific description of the affordable tenure split that the Council will be seeking from qualifying sites.

These measures will demonstrate that the BLP is positively prepared and consistent with current national policy by making provision to meet the objectively assessed needs for affordable housing arising in the Borough over the Plan period.

By clarifying RBWM’s position on affordable housing and by confirming these proposals, I trust you can agree that we have worked constructively with you on this important cross boundary matter and have addressed Slough Borough Council’s objections on soundness and duty to co-operate.

Yours sincerely

Cllr D. Copinger

Deputy Chair of Cabinet
Lead Member for Planning, Health and Sustainability
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