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1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the work is to provide a joint evidence base for strategic planning across the Study Area for use by the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group (HSPG) Members and Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL). The study seeks to:

- Summarise the future growth scenarios for employment, labour market, population, and housing growth identified (included in Stage 1 to 4 reports).
- Research and articulate the level of current* and planned future infrastructure provision in each relevant sector across the timeframe 2018 to 2041 (analysed in five year increments), relating to the background growth for which the authorities are already planning. The infrastructure sectors covered include:
  - Transport
  - Utilities (including digital)
  - Waste
  - Green infrastructure
  - Social infrastructure
- Provide “strategic need” insights that arise from a review of infrastructure that is currently available and planned* in relation to what additional needs may arise to serve the future growth scenarios associated with Heathrow’s expansion, by understanding:
  - How significant the needs are within each sector;
  - If needs are being appropriately planned for; and
  - If projects are deliverable.
- Identify potential additional infrastructure requirements that need to be considered to fill additional growth needs arising from Heathrow’s expansion, together with some suggestions as to how these might be funded.
- Explore a series of potential ‘approaches’ to considering the relationship between strategic growth arising from the HEP, projected background growth and infrastructure provision in a way that maximises wider sustainable planning benefits and mitigates impacts. This will enable HAL and the HSPG to identify potential spatial strategies that align local plan ambitions with the implications of airport expansion.

This report is accompanied by a detailed database (in excel format) that provides HSPG Members and HAL with a dynamic model that can be refreshed and updated based on new policy priorities and projects in the future.

The findings of Stage 5 provide an outline of the scale of infrastructure that may be required as a result of growth forecasts developed by Quod in Stage 1-4.

* as at the time of the JEBIS Stage 5 Report publication (10th October 2018)
1. Introduction

1.2 Background

The construction of a third runway would increase the capacity of Heathrow Airport by approximately 50%. The Heathrow Expansion Project (HEP) will generate a requirement for more infrastructure within the expanded airport boundary, the immediate area surrounding the airport and the wider sub-region.

HAL has been working closely with the HSPG of local authorities to analyse the implications of expansion. The purpose of HSPG is to work collaboratively to ensure a co-ordinated planning approach across the HSPG membership area in relation to expansion of Heathrow airport. This enables authorities to efficiently progress Duty to Co-operate obligations in relation to Heathrow and related matters through their Local Plans.

As part of this wider approach to planning collaboration, the HSPG members and Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) have commissioned Arup and Quod to prepare a Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study (JEBIS) that looks to the wider area of influence of the airport (in terms of employment supply chain and work accessibility, for example) to provide a common dataset and analytical framework to help provide a coordinated approach to strategic planning.

It seeks to combine both ‘background growth’ and HEP growth to identify the total growth and strategic infrastructure considerations.

This study has been prepared in parallel with work commissioned by HAL in preparation of a Development Consent Order (DCO) application. In due course, the implications of Heathrow expansion will need to be reflected in the DCO application and, where necessary, in Local Plans across the Study Area.

Planning and design work in support of the DCO is ongoing, together with the associated transport strategy and other assessments. Once further developed, it would be beneficial for DCO proposals and the wider strategic scope of JEBIS (together with the statistical growth projections that it draws upon) to be synchronised.

Current HSPG Membership

- London Borough of Hounslow
- London Borough of Ealing
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- South Bucks District Council
- Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
- Slough Borough Council
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership
- Buckinghamshire Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership
- Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership
- Surrey County Council
- Buckinghamshire County Council
- Colne Valley CIC

In addition, the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames has been invited to join HSPG. The London Borough of Hillingdon, the Greater London Authority and Transport for London each has an open invitation to join the Group.

HSPG Observer Members

- MHCLG/BEIS (coordinating representative)
- DfT (aviation policy)
- Highways England
1. Introduction

1.3 Approach

The JEBIS work has involved five stages which build upon one another:

**Stage 1** defined the Study Area, comprising a core area, covering the HSPG invited authorities (as summarised in Chapter 1.4 of this Stage 5 Report), together with a wider sub-regional area and bespoke areas for considering different market issues (e.g., labour, property). This Stage also involved understanding the projected growth arising from the Heathrow proposals (involving a detailed review of the eight assessments that have been undertaken to-date) and how they related to background growth already assumed and/or planned for in the area.

**Stage 2** brought together the spatial scales, the baseline and the forecasts established in Stage 1 to create a methodology for combining employment growth forecasts in a way that enabled the ‘additionality’ as a result of Heathrow’s expansion above and beyond the expected baseline growth. Two core ‘scenarios’ were agreed with HSPG to input to Oxford Economics model of the area to test wider economic and demographic impacts.

**Stage 3** assesses the implications of employment growth as a result of Heathrow expansion on labour markets and employment property markets, applying the combined employment growth forecasts developed in Stage 2. This involved the consideration of the demand and supply of labour and premises, now and in the future, and identified the implications for future employment land supply.

**Stage 4** examined how employment growth as a result of Heathrow expansion will affect housing need and local housing markets in the JEBIS Study Area.

**Stage 5** identified what infrastructure is already planned and considers what additional infrastructure may be required to support employment and housing growth. The employment forecasts produced for Stage 2 and the findings of Stages 3 and 4 provided the basis of this assessment. Stage 5 involved the following tasks:

- Task 1 identified the scale of opportunity of the Study Area, based on the economic growth scenarios from Quod.
- Task 2 involved a literature review of local authority infrastructure plans, regulated infrastructure providers’ plans, policy documents and research relating to the Study Area. This was undertaken on an infrastructure-specific sectorial basis. It involved analysis of existing data sets (related to committed and future planned infrastructure) to derive high level analysis of strategic growth issues and potential infrastructure planning considerations to address these.
- Task 3 involved an infrastructure needs assessment, derived through analysis of the infrastructure provision against growth forecasts and sector-specific defined criteria.
- Task 4 assessed the scale and nature of further infrastructure investment requirements in the Study Area, and identified delivery challenges, opportunities and possible funding options.

Analysis of infrastructure issues and opportunities has been informed by consultation with HSPG Members and other stakeholders involved in infrastructure planning within the Study Area.
1. Introduction

1.4 Study Area

The Study Area (see Figure 1) includes the following Local Planning Authorities (LPAs):

- London Borough of Hounslow
- London Borough of Ealing
- London Borough of Hillingdon
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- South Bucks District Council
- Slough Borough Council
- Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

The rationale for this area is provided in the JEBIS Stage One report, combining both administrative and economic boundaries and providing a good fit with the Heathrow Travel To Work Area (TTWA).

Figure 1: Map showing JEBIS area, existing Heathrow airport boundary and HSPG member boundaries.
There is a series of limitations to the report and the data that it draws upon, namely:

- This study reflects policy positions formulated prior to the development of the HEP. As such, the JEBIS is a “point-in-time” analysis that will need to be updated as and when political and economic circumstances change.

- This study is by its nature strategic. More detail is expected to be provided in follow-on studies, focused on particular findings or outcomes, as required. This study aims to focus on the main strategic projects, issues, opportunities and challenges related to infrastructure across the Study Area. It defines ‘strategic’ both in terms of cost and impact, particularly where a cross-boundary joint approach is required. A minimum project value threshold of £1 million is often applied to focus on projects of greatest significance.

- This study is not intended as a means of defining any new housing market or economic areas, nor to allocate housing or employment uses between authorities. It is instead intended to provide a baseline for discussion which builds on the Authorities’ existing Local Plan evidence bases, which will allow the authorities at an appropriate time to respond in an informed manner.

- This study is not intended to provide a planning framework for the authorities. It will be up to each authority to individually and collectively determine as to how they wish to use the evidence base. The work is intended to be ‘non-spatial’ in that it will not make any specific recommendations on the distribution of any growth – this will again be a choice for the authorities arising from the evidence, their own evidence and local plans and any future joint working.

- This study does not seek to apportion infrastructure between areas or consider demand against existing local capacity. This could provide a starting point for future more detailed work on infrastructure planning as part of separate land use strategy development.

- This study has been prepared in parallel with the Heathrow Expansion Project by HAL. At this juncture the form of the HEP has yet to be determined and the implications for wider strategic planning cannot be confirmed. The JEBIS is envisaged as a dynamic process. The stage reports and associated databases will be periodically reviewed and updated as necessary.

- The infrastructure need assessment is only as good as the data that it uses. One clear finding of the infrastructure study is that local authorities require a better understanding of infrastructure supply and demand. This could be better facilitated through the sharing of open data between the private and public sectors.
2. Growth Forecasts

2.1 Overview

The JEBIS is a five-stage study. The approach and findings of growth forecasts are explained in the Stages 1 to 4 reports. Stages 1 and 2 defined the economic development scenarios for the Study Area, bringing together current projections with those for Heathrow to produce combined scenarios, which enabled potential labour and property demand to be identified. Stages 3 and 4 involved testing the implications of these scenarios for their economic impacts and the planning of the local area. Findings are summarised here briefly.

2.2 Employment Growth

The model outputs are ‘policy off’ and do not assume any policies which may seek to change the location of jobs, such as efforts by local planning authorities to capture employment uplift. It also refers to workforce jobs, rather than the origin of employees. Overall, the model predicts that employment uplift from Heathrow will consist of approximately 48,000 jobs within the JEBIS Core Area. This is predominately likely to fall within Hillingdon and Hounslow, which are predicted to accommodate 29,370 and 17,255 jobs respectively (see Figure 2).

![Figure 2: Oxford Economics – modelled employment growth (background and additional, central case scenario).]
2. Growth Forecasts

The forecast employment growth for the Study Area to 2041, including growth generated by the expansion of Heathrow Airport, varies substantially across the boroughs from around 4% in Spelthorne to 18% in Hounslow (see Figure 3).

Although, Ealing has significantly lower forecast employment growth than Hounslow, in absolute terms the three London Boroughs are ranked highest number of in terms of forecast employment growth to 2041.

The graph (Figure 3) illustrates the existing employment (2018) for each Local Authority in blue with the forecast employment growth, including that resulting from the expansion of Heathrow, in orange. It is important to recognise that in this instance ‘employment’ refers to the number of jobs within the borough, and not the number of workers within the resident population of the borough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area Borough</th>
<th>Number of jobs 2018 (000’s)</th>
<th>Forecast number of jobs 2041 (000’s) *</th>
<th>Employment growth (000’s)</th>
<th>Employment growth (%)</th>
<th>Rank (by absolute growth)</th>
<th>Rank (by % growth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Combined baseline and HEP growth
2. Growth Forecasts

2.3 Population and Household Growth

Over the study period to 2041, there will be baseline growth in the population and number of households within the Study Area regardless of Heathrow expansion. The Oxford Economics model has forecast this baseline growth based on a variety of measures, including Office for National Statistics (ONS) data. It forecasts baseline population growth of around 15% in the Study Area between 2018 and 2041, rising by around 250,000 - from 1.63 million residents in 2018 to 1.88 million residents in 2041 (see Figure 4).

In the central employment case scenario, the Oxford Economics model ‘central case’ suggests that Heathrow’s expansion and impacts on labour demand will have a negligible impact on population growth, and consequently on the number of households. The additional growth as a result of Heathrow expansion will only lead to a relatively small additional uplift in population growth over this period, amounting to approximately 7,500 residents. The reason for the relatively small impacts is that the model assumes higher levels of economic activity, reduced out-commuting and increased in-commuting.

In terms of annual population growth, the difference between the baseline and the “with Heathrow expansion” scenarios is also small, and in both cases annual population growth is expected to peak in 2019 and gradually fall, with Heathrow expansion leading to a small uplift following the opening of the expanded airport (see Figure 5).

![Figure 4: Projected Population Growth 2018 – 2041](Source: Oxford Economics)

![Figure 5: Projected Annual Population Growth 2018 – 2039 – with and without Heathrow Expansion](Source: Oxford Economics)
2. Growth Forecasts

The forecast population growth for the Study Area to 2041, combining baseline growth and the growth generated by the expansion of Heathrow Airport, varies across the boroughs from around 9% in Spelthorne to 20% in Hounslow (see Figure 6).

The three London boroughs to the north east of the airport demonstrate the highest forecast population growth for the Study Area (ranging from 16% to 20%).

Figure 6 illustrates 2018-2041 population growth for each Local Authority, and the additional forecast population growth resulting from the expansion of Heathrow, applying the Oxford Economics ‘central’ scenario. The detailed figures are set out in the JEBIS Stage 4 report and accompanying dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area Borough</th>
<th>Existing Population 2018 (000’s)</th>
<th>Forecast population 2041 (000’s) *</th>
<th>Population growth* (000’s)</th>
<th>Population growth* (%)</th>
<th>Rank (by absolute growth)*</th>
<th>Rank (by % growth)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Combined baseline and HEP growth

Figure 6: Oxford Economics and Quod – Population Forecasts.
2. Growth Forecasts

Population growth is mirrored in projected household growth, which is projected to rise by 22% by 2041, an increase of 162,000 to 795,000 households in the baseline scenario. Heathrow growth could add an extra 3,000 households, resulting a combined total of 798,000 new households by 2041.

The rates of household growth across the nine Local Authorities are comparable to those for population, with the highest growth forecast for Hounslow (34%) and the lowest growth expected in Spelthorne (15%) (see Figure 7).

The three London boroughs also demonstrate the highest forecast household growth for the Study Area (ranging from 26% to 34%). However, even within these boroughs this additional Heathrow-related growth represents a very small fraction of projected baseline annual average household growth.

Figure 7 illustrates the 2018 household figures for each Local Authority, the forecast baseline household growth, and the additional households resulting from the expansion of Heathrow.

Population and household growth forecasts have been used to help inform infrastructure needs assessments, such as those relating to social, green and utility infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area Borough</th>
<th>Number of households 2018 (000's)</th>
<th>Forecast number of households 2041 (000's)*</th>
<th>Additional homes to 2041 (000's)*</th>
<th>Homes growth (%)*</th>
<th>Rank (by absolute growth)*</th>
<th>Rank (by % growth)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Combined baseline and HEP growth

Figure 7 illustrates the 2018 household figures for each Local Authority, the forecast baseline household growth, and the additional households resulting from the expansion of Heathrow.

Population and household growth forecasts have been used to help inform infrastructure needs assessments, such as those relating to social, green and utility infrastructure.
2. Growth Forecasts

2.4 Implications for the Study Area

Implications for employment floorspace

Employment growth as a result of Heathrow expansion will entail an increase in demand for employment floorspace (see Figure 8). Its location and the extent of land required varies based on the use. As shown below, much of this employment growth will be concentrated in the Transportation and Storage sector (with an additional 26,000 jobs over the baseline), as well as other sectors which serve the airport’s operation and users, such as the Administrative and Support Services sector (an additional 5,000 jobs) and the Accommodation and Food Services sector (an additional 4,000 jobs). Much of this floorspace will therefore be in B-use classes (particularly B8 but also B1 and B2). This will also have particular locational requirements, depending on the sub-sector it falls within.

Figure 8: Employment Growth as a result of Heathrow by sector
(Source: Oxford Economics)
## Growth Forecasts

Employment growth as a result of HEP will result in an increase in demand for employment floorspace. An analysis of future employment floorspace demand was produced by Lichfields in 2018 on behalf of HAL and is summarised in the JEBIS Stage 3 report (see Figure 9). This study divided 'Direct', 'Indirect' and 'Induced' future jobs into different types of employment use and assessed how much floorspace would be required and whether it would be on or near to the airport or within the wider sub-region. The study demonstrated that a large share of demand for employment floorspace would be in the Transportation and Storage sector. Sectors that serve the airport's operation and users are also expected to generate significant employment floorspace demand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel Type</th>
<th>Floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>GIA/NIA</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Sub-Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4* and over</td>
<td>5,249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>5,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3* and under</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>2,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>7,738</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>7,738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry and Warehousing</th>
<th>Floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>GIA/NIA</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Sub-Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cargo Handling</td>
<td>648,296</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,419</td>
<td>648,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Forwarding</td>
<td>112,671</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>112,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Catering</td>
<td>67,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>67,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>27,908</td>
<td>22,536</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>27,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other airport-related logistics</td>
<td>513,871</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>513,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light industrial</td>
<td>25,686</td>
<td>20,741</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>25,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy industrial</td>
<td>23,959</td>
<td>22,761</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>23,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,922</td>
<td>856,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offices (B1)</th>
<th>Floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>GIA/NIA</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Sub-Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-airport offices</td>
<td>53,440</td>
<td>43,153</td>
<td>3,596</td>
<td>53,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices in airport supply chain</td>
<td>108,966</td>
<td>87,990</td>
<td>7,333</td>
<td>108,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale local offices</td>
<td>37,935</td>
<td>30,633</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>37,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale corporate</td>
<td>184,639</td>
<td>149,096</td>
<td>12,429</td>
<td>184,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>420,453</td>
<td>339,516</td>
<td>28,293</td>
<td>200,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Lichfields analysis of employment floorspace requirements, developed by Quod (see JEBIS Stage 3 Report)
2. Growth Forecasts

**Accommodating employment – direct jobs**

The JEBIS Stage 3 report indicated how the locational requirements for increased employment floorspace depend on their relationship to the airport, applying the Lichfields categories. Those that are ‘on’ or ‘adjacent’ to the airport equate to the ‘Direct’ employment. Direct jobs require proximity to the airport - on and off site either within, or a short distance from the airport boundary. For example, airport-related hotels require quick and convenient access to terminals in order to serve airport users, as do directly airport-related offices (such as those supporting airline activity).

Businesses that fall within the ‘Indirect’ employment category potentially have a wider operational catchment. ‘Catalytic’ type uses tend to have even looser proximity needs in relation to the airport (such as HQ offices and strategic Logistics) and could be attracted to the area but equally could locate elsewhere in the sub-region/region.

Figure 10 seeks to reconcile the ‘top down’ employment forecasts (Direct, Indirect, Induced and Catalytic) against the types and amounts of employment floorspace identified by the Lichfields study. As indicated, each category is not mutually exclusive and there will be significant overlaps.

A pro-active approach potentially offers the opportunity for HSPG Members individually and collectively to enhance the ‘do as now’ employment effects described on the preceding pages and pursue means to provide the strategic capacity for Direct and Indirect employment on and adjacent to the Airport to flourish and to secure ‘Catalytic’ employment. This Stage 5 report examines infrastructure needs and opportunities for consideration in order to promote employment growth and maximise the positive impacts of new jobs and businesses.

![Figure 10: Indicative sectoral employment floorspace breakdown](image-url)
2. Growth Forecasts

The Stage 3 report gives more detail on the industrial and commercial property markets in the relevant authorities and where relevant beyond the Core Study Area.

This concludes that in relation to office provision there is significant capacity and planned capacity in the area and in the context of uptake the quantum identified by Lichfields is manageable. The more critical issue therefore is about quality (including the setting/image as well as buildings) and securing occupiers.

The logistics sector is more challenging. There is very limited capacity in the current local market, and pressure on existing stock from competing land uses. It will therefore be important for HSPG to consider what is essential to be provided, in the context of the emerging HAL masterplan, and the extent to which it would be preferable/acceptable for growth to be planned for within the wider HSPG Study Area, together with the infrastructure needs and consequences of this.

Implications for housing provision

What population and household growth forecasts demonstrate is that while Heathrow expansion will lead to some increased housing need within the Study Area, this is a small proportion on top of the baseline housing need that will arise regardless. Furthermore, HSPG authorities will already need to plan for higher housing need under the Single Methodology or the London Plan regardless of Heathrow expansion. The Oxford Economics modelling suggests that the airport does not give rise to a need to increase housebuilding targets beyond levels already likely to be required.

The Stage 4 report considers the long-term implications on housing provision, and notes the importance of acknowledging that the scale of development and the phasing of the construction period may have local implications for how housing markets operate.

The predictions also rely on the Local Plans meeting their housing need in full, which is also proving challenging for LPAs in the Study area.

Commuting

Changing commuting patterns represent one way in which local labour markets would respond to employment growth at Heathrow. They also have important housing market impacts, as jobs filled by workers commuting from elsewhere would not lead to increased housing demand within the Study Area. Depending on the mode of commuting, this may exacerbate existing transport issues; hence the Development Consent Order (DCO) and National Policy Statement (NPS) will be essential in enabling a modal shift to reduce dependence on the private car, alongside LPA measures.

Currently, the Study Area has net in-commuting. The Oxford Economics model forecasts that under future baseline conditions, net in-commuting levels will steadily fall, as net out-commuting from Ealing and Spelthorne in particular grows. However, Heathrow expansion would stabilise or reverse this trend to some degree, as net in-commuting to Hillingdon and Hounslow would grow as a consequence of changes to the Heathrow Travel to Work Area.

The Stage 4 report emphasises the importance of in-commuting in filling new jobs associated with Heathrow’s expansion, and the necessary infrastructure provision to support this, as the future airport draws on a wider regional labour market.
The Infrastructure Needs Assessment has been carried out for the following infrastructure sectors:

**Transport**
- Road transport
- Public transport
- Active transport (walking and cycling)

**Utilities**
- Energy (electricity and gas)
- Water
- Digital

**Waste**
- Household waste
- Commercial and industrial waste (C&I)
- Construction, demolition and excavation waste (CDEW)

**Green Infrastructure**
- Amenity greenspace
- Natural & semi-natural greenspace
- Parks and gardens
- Outdoor sports facilities

**Social Infrastructure**
- Community
- Education
- Healthcare

The Needs Assessment includes:

1. Review of the planned infrastructure portfolio
2. Identification of key strategic projects
3. Identification of the potential future infrastructure demand
4. Assessment of the infrastructure need in comparison to baseline planning
5. Discussion of priorities and challenges for delivery

A database of planned projects has been compiled using publicly available planning documents and information provided by HSPG members and other infrastructure providers through consultation. From this database, infrastructure portfolios containing projects over £1m in value planned for the next 20+ years have been identified for each of the five sectors.

Identification of the forecast infrastructure demands have been informed by sector specialists, who have reviewed existing capacity for each of the five infrastructure sectors, against forecast population, employment and household growth in the context of the expansion of Heathrow Airport.

From this, an assessment of the potential for the existing planned infrastructure portfolio to meet forecast demand is ascertained through understanding:

- If there is a significant need generated by the growth forecast including the expansion of Heathrow Airport,
- If these needs are currently planned for, and
- If so, if the projects planned are currently able to be delivered to meet that demand.

The metrics used in undertaking the needs assessment have been developed individually for each infrastructure sector.

The outcomes of the needs assessment are then discussed in the context of the strategic priorities identified during the review of planned infrastructure, and any perceived challenges for delivery uncovered during the assessment and engagement with stakeholders.
Within this study, a series of definitions have been applied for analysis. These are listed below.

**Planning Status**
Existing planned projects identified have been allocated a ‘planning status’ using the definitions below:

- **Planning Permission Granted**: Planning permission has been granted for the project. This may include projects currently under construction.
- **Planning Application Submitted**: At time of writing, a planning application had been submitted for the project and was awaiting a decision.
- **Identified Project**: A specific project, with clear location, delivery dates and sponsor.
- **Conceptual Project**: A project identified with broad location.
- **Identified Requirement**: Need for a project has been identified by an appropriate public body or regulated private infrastructure provider, but no further information such as location, delivery dates and sponsor is available.
- **Development Consent Order**: The planning procedure used for nationally significant infrastructure projects as opposed to planning permission under the Planning Act 2008. All applications are centrally submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.
- **Hybrid Bill**: A bill which combines aspects of public and private bills due to its influence on both the general public and specific groups or individuals. They are often used for works of national importance.

**Funding Status**
Existing planned projects identified have been provided a funding status using the definitions below:

- **Secured**: A policy basis is established, a sponsor has been confirmed and funding has been committed.
- **Speculative**: A policy basis is established, a potential sponsor has been identified but delivery arrangements and funding have not been confirmed.
- **Uncertain**: A policy basis is established but no sponsor or confirmed funding source has been identified.

**Project Growth Status**

- **Drivers**: Major infrastructure projects which can be considered as facilitators of growth.
- **Enablers**: Smaller projects and incremental improvements, without which growth would not be viable. Projects that support or enable growth without which housing and/or commercial property delivery would not be viable.

**Assessment**
The “need assessment”, reviews committed and planned infrastructure provision against the scale of growth forecast. Within this assessment ‘need’ is defined as:

- **Need**: The potential future infrastructure requirements identified at a strategic level arising from total projected growth (that combines background growth and Heathrow Expansion Project growth).
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.1.3 Other Airport Expansion-related Infrastructure Projects

The JEBIS infrastructure needs assessment focuses in particular on strategic infrastructure needs arising across the Study Area as a consequence of employment and housing growth forecast to be generated as a result of Heathrow’s expansion. However, this needs to be viewed in conjunction with infrastructure proposals being developed by HAL in support of the HEP. Whereas these have yet to be finalised, the Airport Expansion Consultation Document (January 2018), prepared by HAL, provides an indication of the suite of potential projects currently being considered.

As summarised on of the Airport Expansion Consultation Document, proposals include the intention to:

- Re-position and build over part of the M25 and improve junctions to handle the altered traffic flows
- Re-position part of the A4 and A3044 as well as making improvements to other local roads which access the airport
- Divert local rivers and create new areas of flood storage
- Provide new areas for landscaping
- Protecting habitats and wildlife corridors
- Provide new space for hotels, offices, car parks, freight forwarding and flight catering facilities
- Replace some facilities and infrastructure that need to be moved to allow expansion such as the Immigration Removal Centres and utilities
- Use temporary construction areas to build the new runway and expanded airport

Other key proposals contained in the Airport Expansion Consultation Document are summarised above.

As referenced in Chapter 2.4 (and explained in the JEBIS Stage 3 report), in addition to these potential projects being considered by HAL for inclusion in the DCO, analysis indicates that expansion is expected to generate demand for in excess of 500,000sqm of logistics floorspace in the wider sub-region, with associated highway and utility infrastructure needs.
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.1.4 The JEBIS Project Database

The JEBIS Project Database accompanies this report. 285 infrastructure projects have been captured within the database, of which the majority are transport projects (see Figure 11a). In terms of project scale, most fall within the £1-10m cost band, although a substantial number of mega projects are planned or are being implemented within the Study Area, with 6 costed at over £1 billion (see Figure 11b). In aggregate £36.1bn of infrastructure projects are in the pipeline, though there is a significant funding gap of £9.6bn, with 92 projects (32%) classified as ‘speculative’ and 146 projects (51%) classified as ‘uncertain’ (see Figure 11c). Whilst only 16% have secured funding, a note of caution is encouraged in interpreting this as a proxy for the likelihood of implementation given the wide variety of ways that funding occurs within regulatory statutory and commercial delivery frameworks.
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

As indicated in Figure 12, in terms of planning status, most projects are either an ‘Identified Project’ (a specific project, with location, delivery dates and sponsor) or reflect an ‘Identified Requirement’ (i.e. the need for a project has been identified in, for example, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, but no further information such as location, delivery dates and sponsor is available). Most have yet to be granted planning permission.

Given that much of the infrastructure project cost data is derived from Infrastructure Delivery Plans geared to the respective Local Plan periods (typically extending to approximately 2030), it is no surprise to see, in Figure 13, most projects are planned to be delivered by 2030, in advance of the planned date for the expanded airport of 2026, and that very few projects are geared to the longer term time horizon of 2041 and beyond.
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.2 Transport

3.2.1 Methodology

**Definition**

Transport infrastructure has been broken down into three sub-sectors:

- **Public Transport** – including bus, rail and park & ride projects.
- **Road Transport** – including new roads, major highway improvements, junction upgrades, bridge widenings, and private car park developments.
- **Active Transport** – including new walking and cycling infrastructure and facilities.

**Data Source**

In this assessment, the Infrastructure Delivery Plans, Transport Strategies and Assessments prepared by each Local Authority within the Study Area were used to extract data on planned transport infrastructure projects and strategic transport priorities for the future.

---

**Transport Infrastructure at a Glance**

**PROJECT PORTFOLIO**

- 149 transport projects – 59 road, 61 public transport, 29 active transport (pedestrian/cycle)
- £27.7bn of transport infrastructure investment in the pipeline. Majority projects (109) in £1-10m band projects, with 22 £11-50m and five £1bn+ mega projects
- Peak project delivery period is 2026-2030
- Projects are specified to address current issues such as rail capacity and overcrowding and in relation to background growth. None takes account of Heathrow’s expansion
- In addition, a major portfolio of transport projects is being considered by HAL to support the HEP’s accessibility requirements, promote sustainable transportation and mitigate impacts (Re; Consultation 1 documents). None of these projects is included within the JEBIS as they have yet to be confirmed.

**SUMMARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

- The preponderance of relatively small projects (£1-10m) indicates a planned reliance on the existing network to accommodate growth in many parts of the Study Area to 2041. Given the scale of background growth, this could indicate a substantial gap between growth demands and the ability of the existing network to cope. A strategic transport assessment would be required to determine this.
- At a strategic level, the additional employment and housing growth generated by Heathrow’s expansion is considered to be of a scale that can be accommodated within the transport network as currently planned. However, the 563,516sqm of additional logistics and industrial floorspace required in the wider sub-region to meet projected demands arising as a result of airport expansion*, could place significant demands on the highway network, depending on how this is spatially distributed. Spatial planning to accommodate this growth should be undertaken in conjunction with a strategic transport assessment, undertaken with the emerging HEP surface access strategy.
- The majority of transport projects (60%) are well defined in plans, but many (89%) have yet to obtain full planning approval. Given the scale of projected background growth (and potential HEP additionality), there is a risk that this is not being adequately planned for on an HSPG-wide strategic basis. An HSPG-wide transport study should be considered to assess the implications for growth on the transport network, and the interface between HEP transport proposals and the wider network.
- Of the projects that are in the earlier stages of planning, several are particularly significant for airport expansion (such as Western and Southern Rail) and have the potential to drive and direct growth, and promote catalytic benefits.
- Only 18% of projects have both a sponsor and secure funding. This signals the existence of a major funding gap. Whilst this is not unusual when viewed in combination with the number of projects lacking planning certainty, it is clear that significantly more work is required to ensure deliverability. It will be important for the HSPG and HAL to work together on monitoring, prioritisation and delivery.

---

*see Chapter 3 of the JEBIS Stage 3 Report for further details.
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.2 Transport (continued)

Assessment

As forecasting future transport demand is based on complex strategic modelling not included as part of the JEBIS work scope, the baseline infrastructure project portfolio was used as an indication of the forecast transport infrastructure need. This was deemed appropriate as the identification of new strategic transport infrastructure projects is underpinned by comprehensive demand forecasting. This was then considered in relation to the quantum of additional housing and employment growth generated as a result of Heathrow expansion as summarised in the JEBIS Stages 1-4 reports explaining the forecasts and analysis.

3.2.2 Existing Context

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights promoting sustainable transport as one of the key goals. A strong emphasis is placed in favour of development that reduces the need for significant transport movements. It states that planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths.

Local Transport Authorities (LTAs) are required to produce a five-year Local Transport Plan (LTP), covering transportation objectives and service provision. All of the LTAs across the Study Area identify a need to expand existing transport services and facilities. However, the modes of transport which are highlighted with projected growing demand vary across the area and hence the transport infrastructure objectives differ by LTA.

The Mayor of London's Transport Strategy (2018) sets out the vision for progressing transport services and facilities across the capital. A strong emphasis is placed on health and active travel, with schemes such as Healthy Streets, which aims to reduce car-dependency and encourage walking and cycling as viable and efficient alternatives. This approach sits within a broader goal to improve quality of life across London. The Transport Strategy acknowledges the positive impact on journey times to Heathrow Airport from the arrival of the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail).

Further to this the strategy highlights the importance of public transport in this urban context. It is vital to provide public transport options that are efficient and affordable. Importantly rail travel is outlined with an aspiration to be the most efficient way for people to travel longer distances. The rail capacity in London will need to increase by 80% by 2041.

The Surrey Transport Plan (2018) indicates that road traffic is a principal concern and action is needed to tackle congestion. It has been estimated that the cost of congestion in Surrey is in excess of £550m per annum. It is important to note that road traffic issues in Surrey are exacerbated by higher than average car ownership; 86% of households in Surrey own at least one car, compared to 73% across England. There are also growing public transport concerns in Surrey, with capacity issues and overcrowding of trains identified in the Surrey Rail Strategy (2016).

In South Bucks, a growing transport concern is the mobility of the ageing population and those living in deprivation, as outlined in the South Bucks Local Development Framework: Transport Paper (2010). This paper acknowledges the potential for a transport ‘Heathrow Hub’ in the southern part of the borough to provide a connection between the Great Western Rail Line and Heathrow Airport.

Slough’s Third Local Transport Plan (2012) identifies transport service and network improvements as a key to unlocking wider goals across the Borough, such as helping local people take advantage of education and training opportunities. Slough recognises the need to work jointly across LTA boundaries to ensure a strategic and efficient approach to transport provision.

The LTP acknowledges the impact of Heathrow Airport on the local road network in Slough and supports the reduction of car trips to the airport. Measures will drive modal shift towards public and active transport as well as reducing travel times in these modes. The railhead in Colnbrook forms an important part of the sustainable transport policy and will be protected through Heathrow related uses; it will be needed to support the construction phase but may form part of the DCO.
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.2 Transport (continued)

3.2.3 Planned Infrastructure Portfolio

There were 149 transport projects identified over the minimum cost threshold of £1m within the Study Area (see Figure 14a). The total cost of these projects equates to £27.7bn, of which 56% have uncertain funding and 26% are classified as speculative and 18% have secured funding (see Figure 14b).

The majority of the projects identified fall within the road sub-sector (41%). Many of the road projects identified included junction and highway upgrades rather than new infrastructure developments.

Of the 149 transport projects identified, only 11% have planning permission, and 7% have a planning application submitted. This is a low percentage considering that most of the projects were extracted from Infrastructure Delivery Plans. However, this is reflective of the nature in which these project will tend to be delivered, through the Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (S106) process. The delivery forecast for the transport portfolio is expected to peak around 2020-2030 (see Figure 14c).

The nature of transport projects mean that they are not necessarily located within a single Local Authority and many traverse borough boundaries. Figure 14d illustrates where projects are located, including double counting for those which cross boundaries; e.g. Great Western Mainline rail electrification is included in counts for Ealing, Hillingdon and Hounslow.
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.2 Transport (continued)

3.2.4 Summary of Strategic Transport Projects

**Strategic project definition**

Road and public transport projects are defined as strategic if they are identified within policy or strategic planning documents, are considered to be a growth driver and are costed over £100m. Active transport projects, on the other hand, are defined as strategic if they are identified within policy or strategic planning documents and are considered ‘large’ in scale or cross boundary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Driver/Enabler</th>
<th>Cost band (£m)</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Funding status</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>2018-2020</th>
<th>2021-2025</th>
<th>2026-2030</th>
<th>2031-2035</th>
<th>2036-2040</th>
<th>2041-2045</th>
<th>2046-2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Crossrail 1</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>£1bn+</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Permission Granted</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T52</td>
<td>HS2 Old Oak Common</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>£1bn+</td>
<td>HS2</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Permission Granted</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Great Western Mainline Rail Electrification</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>£1bn+</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Application Submitted</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Southern Rail Access Options to Heathrow</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>£1bn+</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Conceptual Project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T121</td>
<td>Metro-isolation of suburban South-eastern &amp; Southern rail</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£1bn+</td>
<td>TfL / Network Rail</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Requirement</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T123</td>
<td>Healthy Streets</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£1bn+</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>M4 Smart Motorway</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£501m-1bn</td>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Permission Granted</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T122</td>
<td>Cycling Vision Programme</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£501m-1bn</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T124</td>
<td>Transforming Streets and Places</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£501m-1bn</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Application Submitted</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Western Rail Link to Heathrow Airport</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>£251-500m</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

#### 3.2 Transport (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Driver / Enabler</th>
<th>Cost band (£m)</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Funding status</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T125</td>
<td>M25 improvements: Junction 10-16 Smart Motorway</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£251-500m</td>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T191</td>
<td>Southern Light Rail to Heathrow</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>£251-500m</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td>X 2021-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T53</td>
<td>West London Orbital Rail Line*</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>£251-500m</td>
<td>West London Alliance</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>2026-2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T30</td>
<td>Two new stations on London Overground - North London Line and West London Line</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>£251-500m</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td>X 2026-2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T115</td>
<td>A3/M25 Junction to Wisley Interchange</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£101-250m</td>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>2031-2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T188</td>
<td>Electrification of North Downs Railway Line</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£101-250m</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>2035-2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T187</td>
<td>M3 Junction 9 Improvements</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£101-250m</td>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>2035-2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T127</td>
<td>Surface ITS</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£51-100m</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T98</td>
<td>A320 Improvements</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>£51-100m</td>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X 2041-2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T82</td>
<td>A4 corridor cycle scheme</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£1-10m</td>
<td>South Bucks and Slough</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Permission Granted</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T149</td>
<td>A3 Strategic Corridor</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T96</td>
<td>Crossrail 2</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X 2041-2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T153</td>
<td>Piccadilly Line Upgrade**</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X 2041-2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T51</td>
<td>A312 Improvements*</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>West London Alliance</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Conceptual Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Timeline unknown at present
* * Programme containing multiple projects
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3.2 Transport (continued)

This plan provides a composite illustration of the existing infrastructure and planned strategic infrastructure projects.

The following projects are indicated on the adjacent plan and summary details are provided in the database:

- T01 Great Western Mainline Rail Electrification
- T02 Crossrail 1
- T03 Western Rail Link to Heathrow Airport
- T04 Southern Rail Access Options to Heathrow
- T05 M4 Smart Motorway
- T30 Two new stations on London Overground - on the North London Line and the West London Line
- T52 HS2 Old Oak Common
- T53 West London Orbital Rail Line
- T82 A4 corridor cycle scheme
- T96 Crossrail 2
- T98 A320 Improvements
- T115 A3/M25 Junction to Wisley Interchange
- T153 Piccadilly Line Upgrade
- T188 Electrification of North Downs Railway Line

The following projects are not indicated on the adjacent plan but summary details are provided in the database:

- T51 A312 Improvements
- T121 Metro-isation of suburban South-eastern & Southern rail
- T123 Healthy Streets
- T124 Transforming Streets and Places
- T125 M25 improvements: Junction 10-16 Smart Motorway
- T127 Surface ITS
- T149 A3 Strategic Corridor
- T187 M3 Junction 9 Improvements

Figure 15: Map showing existing and proposed transport infrastructure
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3.2 Transport (continued)

3.2.5 Other AEP-related Potential Transport Projects

In addition to the transport projects currently planned in relation to background growth, a series of transport projects are being defined by HAL in support of the DCO process. A summary of these projects is provided opposite, drawn from the ‘Our Approach to Developing a Surface Access Strategy’ document that was consulted on as part of the Consultation 1 exercise.

Projects specifically relating to mitigating the impact of airport expansion and encouraging sustainable travel patterns have been excluded from the JEBIS database. The scope of these projects has yet to be confirmed and will be specified as part of the DCO process.

Projects included in this list have only been incorporated into the JEBIS database where they are already identified in adopted strategic planning documents and are currently being promoted by other stakeholders (such as the Elizabeth line, Western Rail Link and Southern Rail Link).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport Proposals Contained in ‘Our Approach to Developing a Surface Access Strategy’ (Heathrow Airport Limited, January 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.2 Transport (continued)

3.2.6 Assessment

**Assessment Criteria**

National and Local planning documents have been reviewed, including the Mayor’s Transport Strategy, the Road Investment Strategy and local Infrastructure Delivery Plans and Transport Strategies to understand the challenges and priorities within the Study Area and to identify planned transport projects. In addition, JEBIS workshops held with HSPG members, who provided further insights.

The scoring approach is presented in the table opposite. It concentrates both on the needs and deliverability of projects by analysing:

- The cost of planned infrastructure projects as an indication of need in relation to background growth;
- Whether the background growth needs are being planned for, represented by the planning status of the projects; and
- The deliverability of the identified projects represented by the certainty of sponsorship and funding.

There is a broad range of transport projects in terms of scale and typology within the pipeline, which are planned for implementation via a variety of delivery and funding mechanisms. Each project has been subject to individual assessment by the relevant government entities, with feasibility studies and business cases prepared accordingly. These individual assessments have not been validated as part of the JEBIS.

Assessing these projects in aggregate across the Study Area is challenging. Forecasting future transport capacity assessments and demand would require complex strategic modelling, which is beyond the scope of JEBIS. The JEBIS database provides an evidence base of planned transport infrastructure activity. The scale of the existing pipeline of planned transport infrastructure is used as a broad indication of need in relation to background growth, with a large number of high value projects proving a proxy indication of high need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is there a significant need?</strong></td>
<td>Majority of projects identified are under £10m in cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of projects identified are over £10m but under £100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of projects identified are over £100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are needs planned for?</strong></td>
<td>Majority of projects have submitted a planning application or secured planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of projects are identified in IDPs/OAPF/Local Plans but planning permission has not been secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of projects not identified in formal planning documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are projects deliverable?</strong></td>
<td>Project sponsor in place and funding secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project sponsor identified but funding is uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No project sponsor and no funding identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.2 Transport (continued)

Is there a significant need?

The majority of transport infrastructure projects are costed at under £10 million. Whilst there are large strategic transport projects planned (as summarised in 3.2.4), the vast majority of planned schemes are small to medium scale and specified to address local challenges. All of these projects have been specified in relation to ‘background growth’, taking no account of additional demands arising from Heathrow’s expansion.

As a strategic proxy this finding indicates that the forecast need for transport infrastructure is currently not expected to be significant, with a substantial reliance on the existing network to accommodate growth in many parts of the Study Area over the years ahead. Given the scale of background growth over the study period to 2041 (as summarised in the JEBIS Stage 4 Report), this could indicate a substantive gap between the additional demands that will arise from growth and the ability of the existing network to cope. A more in-depth strategic transport study would be required to determine this.

In relation to the additional employment and housing growth identified for the Study Area generated by Heathrow’s expansion, at a strategic level viewed within the context of the Study Area as a whole, this is considered to be of a scale that can be accommodated within the existing transport infrastructure network.

However, the 563,516sqm of additional logistics and industrial floorspace required in the wider sub-region to meet projected demands arising as a result of airport expansion*, could place significant demands on the highway network, depending on how this is spatially distributed. Spatial planning to accommodate this growth should be undertaken in conjunction with a strategic transport assessment, undertaken with the emerging HEP surface access strategy.

Moreover, the HEP and associated growth around the airport will need to be accompanied by a range of major transport measures that are specified to meet NPS modal targets, air quality targets and HAL pledges related to traffic generation (as summarised in 3.2.5). As these have yet to be confirmed, they have not been included within the JEBIS.

Are the needs planned for?

The majority of transport projects (67%) are well defined in plans and strategies but have yet to obtain full planning approval. Currently only 18% of transport projects have secured planning permission or have submitted a planning application.

Given the scale of projected background growth to 2041, there is a risk that this is not being adequately planned for on an HSPG-wide strategic basis. Pressures within West London in particular are projected to intensify and whereas strategic projects, such as the Elizabeth Line, are set to deliver additional capacity, major additional projects are likely to be required to cater to medium-longer-term needs.

---

*see Chapter 3 of the JEBIS Stage 3 Report for further details.
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3.2 Transport (continued)

Of the projects that are in the earlier stages of planning, several of the major transport projects (such as Western and Southern Rail) are particularly significant for airport expansion and have the potential to drive and direct growth, as well as promote catalytic benefits that help achieve other strategic planning objectives (such as town centre enhancement).

3.2.7 Considerations for Delivery

Considerations

- An HSPG Study Area-wide transport study should be considered to assess in further detail the implications for projected background growth on the transport network (existing and planned pipeline), as well as the additional demands resulting from Heathrow’s expansion for the wider area (particularly in relation to logistics), as well as the interface between the HEP transport proposals and the wider network.
- As identified in 3.2.5, a wide range of transport proposals is being considered in support of the HEP to mitigate expansion impacts and promote sustainable travel patterns. These may form part of the DCO and as they have yet to be confirmed they are excluded from the JEBIS database and associated analysis. Some of these constitute major infrastructure projects (such as M25 realignment) and need to be planned in relation to wider proposed changes to transport networks.
- Public transport projects make up a high proportion of the transport portfolio spend. These have the ability, in the case of larger fixed infrastructure schemes such as new rail lines, to direct and transform growth.
- Given the need assessment has identified the vast majority of projects (82%) not having secure funding, a key priority for HSPG and HAL to work together to identify which of these transport projects would deliver maximum benefits and should be prioritised in relation to transport functionality and catalytic growth potential.
- To support improved access to sustainable travel modes across the Study Area, public and active transport projects will become increasingly important into the future.
- To further consolidate and enhance key logistics, industrial and office/business clusters – and explore opportunities for new employment hubs that capitalise on new and improved transport facilities.
- Brownfield sites around new and expanded stations offer scope for mixed-use Transport Oriented Development.
- Sites within or close to town centres have the potential for redevelopment for a range of potential uses, catalysing Heathrow Airport’s capacity to drive economic growth within the Study Area and supporting reduced need to travel outside the region for work.
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3.2 Transport (continued)

- The Elizabeth Line and Piccadilly Line upgrade projects are set to deliver substantial increases in east-west rail capacity. Both projects have been planned in relation to background growth. Additional service demands placed on the rail network resulting for the HEP will need to be considered further.
- Early delivery of Southern Rail to Staines to increase Crossrail connectivity.
- Additional improvements in rail and road links to the airport required to support the expansion may open up access for a wider catchment to more sustainable travel options. Surface access proposals relating to the HEP should be coordinated with wider transport network planning.
- There is the opportunity to support improved transport provision in line with identified growth to ensure future infrastructure provision supports wider policy objectives for improved access to sustainable and active travel modes, particularly given that the majority of projects have not yet reached a delivery phase.

Challenges for delivery

- Funding – securing major capital investment for Crossrail2 will be a significant challenge and although well advanced as a project, HS2 also has major funding and programming challenges.
- Capacity constraint - It is already anticipated by Transport for London that on the day Crossrail1 opens its additional capacity will already be largely serving existing/latent demand. Whereas other planned rail projects will add significant extra capacity, it is unclear whether these will be sufficient to meet increases in demand predicted for the 2030s.
- Balancing infrastructure investments across the Study Area in line with growth aspirations.
- Balancing the need for investment in road projects with the opportunity to support improved access to public and active transport options.

Potential funding sources

In addition to conventional funding mechanisms related to Government agency transport investment programmes and S106 / Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) mechanisms linked to development proposals, potential funding sources include:

- New value capture mechanisms to link infrastructure investment with property development and value increases (particularly in relation to new rail infrastructure).
- Fiscal devolution, as proposed by the London Finance Commission’s recent report “Devolution: A Capital Idea” (January 2017) is required to support London’s infrastructure ambitions.
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#### 3.2 Transport (continued)

#### 3.2.8 Opportunities for innovation

Potential opportunities for innovation are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-functional Infrastructure</th>
<th>• rail corridors that also contain electricity networks, digital infrastructure or act as flood defences could be a way of increasing synergies and reducing the cost of infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail Automation</td>
<td>• Trains controlled by digital signalling systems are likely to be normal by the 2030s, which makes closer headways between trains possible, enabling extra capacity to be provided when compared to the last 30 or so years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bus Timetabling               | • Extending bus timetables and increasing servicing frequencies along key corridors  
• Matching bus timetables to employee requirements – e.g. shift start/end times |
| Bus Services                  | • Providing fast and direct services between centres  
• Provision of improved bus services to local LU/Crossrail stations, supported by seamless ticketing  
• Using the bus network to connect between north, south, east and west corridors  
• Opening up public transport accessibility south and west of the airport through improved bus service provisions  
• Consideration of demand responsive bus services for locations away from key transport corridors |
| Bus Infrastructure            | • Implementation of bus priority on approaches to key centres and Heathrow  
• Investigate the potential of a Southern Road Tunnel to link N-S bus routes through the Airport (possibly part of HEP) |
| Highway Efficiency            | • The emphasis will need to be on doing more with the same highway network. Smart technology solutions such as TfL’s Surface Intelligent Transport System (SITS) will play an important role |
| Autonomous Vehicles           | • Connected and autonomous vehicles (CAVs) could add to road capacity, since they enable shorter driving and stopping distances between vehicles. However, there are also significant safety risks and perceptions of risks that will need to be overcome to support market penetration of these technologies |
| Zero Emissions Networks       | • ZENs are being pioneered in Shoreditch, which includes: free trials of electric cars and cargo bikes |
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3.3 Utilities

3.3.1 Methodology

**Definition**

Utilities infrastructure includes three sub-sectors:

- **Water**, which includes:
  - Potable
  - Wastewater
  - Flood management

- **Energy**, which includes:
  - Electricity
  - Gas

- **Digital**, which includes:
  - Optical fibre and or copper cable
  - Radio communications for mobile, cellular and wireless (wifi)
  - Switching and transmission equipment
  - Data Centres for co-location, internet exchange and peering facilities

**UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE AT A GLANCE**

**PROJECT PORTFOLIO**

- 49 utility projects – 10 energy, 37 water and 2 digital.
- £6.6bn of utility infrastructure investment in the pipeline. In addition, to these individual projects, private utility providers are rolling out a multi-million pound upgrading programme across the Study Area.
- Most currently planned projects (89%) will be delivered by 2030, reflecting the short-term nature of utility infrastructure provision within regulatory frameworks. None of the frameworks take account of Heathrow’s expansion.
- Utility companies tend to react to new development as and when it comes forward. The water and wastewater companies are the exception in preparing rolling 25 year Water Resources Management Plans for government approval.
- A major portfolio of utility projects is being considered by HAL to support the HEP requirements, promote sustainable development and mitigate impacts (Re; Consultation 1 documents). None of these projects is included within the JEBIS as they have yet to be confirmed.

**SUMMARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

- Background growth will continue to significantly increase the demand for utility services. Given regulatory requirements, it is expected that new capacity will keep step with demand as and when it comes forward. Whilst no current major capacity constraints have been identified, the Environment Agency has identified the South East as a region of serious water stress, requiring major supply and demand management.
- Growth in the wider sub-region triggered as a result of Heathrow’s expansion is anticipated to result in a manageable increase in utility services demand. Projected Heathrow-related employment growth is moderate and insignificant for residential.
- Location-specific implications of industrial and logistics development on utility services will require closer investigation during the next planning stages in relation to timing and local demands. Further engagement with utility companies is recommended to ensure the scale of new development is considered within future business plans.
- The connectivity and quality of digital performance is variable across the Study Area, requiring a focus on ‘getting the basics right’ as well as encouraging innovations.
- With planned major investment programmes across all utility sectors, it is reasonable to expect adequate funding will be in place to support growth. However, the lack of medium-long term business planning presents risks that should be monitored and mitigated where possible.
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

3.3.1 Methodology

**Data Sources**

**Water**
The main water utility providers that were contacted comprise:
- Thames Water
- Affinity Water
- South East Water
- Sutton and East Surrey Water

The Water Resource Management Plan for each of these providers was reviewed to extract data and planned projects.

**Energy**
The main energy utility providers that were contacted comprise:
- SSE
- UKPN
- Cadent

**Digital**
Fixed line broadband sampling was conducted across the postcodes within the Study Area, with mapping information for quality of broadband access derived from OFCOM.

**Assessment**

Arup utilities specialists have assessed existing utility consumption figures, using national statistics at a Local Authority level to understand potential forecast consumption figures for each LPA.

These trends were then used to forecast the growth in new utility connections based on the change in household numbers forecast to 2041.

3.3.2 Existing Context

Reliable and efficient utility supplies are essential to support a growing economy. Utility companies must actively plan to provide services to support economic growth and an increasing population. Utility companies tend to react to new development as and when it comes forward. The water and wastewater companies are the exception, since they are required to publish very long-term plans, identifying projects that will meet future supply.

Whereas growth forecasts and the associated increased demands on utilities creates long terms pressures, a shortfall in planned utility capacity is unlikely given the regulatory framework, which includes forecast monitoring and regulated incentives for utility companies to deliver connections and capacity. The local utility companies are obliged to plan and connect new development as and when they become available for connection.
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**Water**

Water Companies are under a legal duty to develop and maintain an efficient and economical system of water supply and must produce a Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) every five years. These plans are approved by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and set out how the company plans to maintain the balance between supply and demand for water over a 25 year period.

Alongside this, companies must submit their Business Plans to Ofwat, the UK water regulator. The Business Plan will set out the strategy for a five year period. The first five years of the WRMP normally informs these proposals. Ofwat will then determine the price limits for this five year period, which will confirm the funding for the water resources programme the company seeks to deliver.

The current WRMP for Thames Water is the WRMP14 which covers the 25-year period from 2015 to 2040. A new WRMP19 is currently under consultation and drafting which goes beyond the minimum 25-year statutory period to provide for inter-generational resilience, planning for an 80 year period to 2100.

The priority of this plan is to focus on demand management to meet water resource management requirements as efficiently as possible.

As part of this, Thames Water has set a target to achieve a 15% leakage reduction in the 2020-2025 period. This includes a number of leakage projects evident in the Baseline Data Collection.

Affinity Water is also updating their WRMP in drafting the WMRP19 for the period 2020-2080. This draft plan has a series of objectives including working collaboratively with other water companies, increasing drought resilience, maintaining water quality and reducing leakage.

Affinity Water is also focusing on demand measures by aiming for a metering penetration of 90% by 2025 and re-assessing its Water Saving Programme.

Water networks managed by Thames Water and Affinity Water are continuing to evolve in response to customer demand and known supply constraints within the South East. Both Water Resource Management Plans identify a suite of proposed initiatives.

Climate Change is a key factor of consideration for water companies. The WaterUK publication, Water Resources Long Term Planning Framework 2015-2065 (published 2016) highlighted a significant risk of drought in England and Wales. Thames Water have recognised a need to strengthen resilience to a 1 in 200 year drought event from 2030.

**Energy**

The Long Term Development Statement from Southern Electric has been produced in accordance with the direction given by the regulator, OFGEM.

This reflects a drive to transition to a low carbon economy and meet the UK’s commitment to reduce carbon emissions by at least 80% of 1990 levels by 2050.

These targets may change the role and source of gas and electric in the future. As a result, companies such as Cadent are exploring alternative options such as Biomethane connections and renewable gas through gasification (BioSNG).

Cadent’s latest peak gas demand forecast reduces by around 0.5% per year on average over the next 10 years.
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Digital

The availability, affordability and performance of digital infrastructures is ever more important – directly influencing the productivity, efficiency and profitability of commercial enterprises. National policy is being shaped to provide competitive, affordable and high performance digital infrastructures. The ambition is to position the UK as one of the most advanced digital economies in the world.

Over the years, London and the surrounding counties have benefitted from such policy initiatives and investments, enabling the public to access high speed broadband at increasingly affordable prices. For example, the use of 4G/LTE mobile broadband is now widespread, with many of us using the technology as the primary means of accessing online digital services using mobile phones and tablet devices. Increasing affordability of access to online services has been instrumental in reducing the digital divide. There is now a greater disparity in the user experience as a result of a multi-tiered broadband access (e.g. varying classes of speed of connection), where higher performance comes with a cost premium. Thus in the last few years there has been less focus on closing the divide between the digital haves and have-nots, and a greater focus on ensuring a minimum performance standard for access to broadband services.

Digital infrastructure has two focus areas; residential access and commercial access. Fixed line connections for residential access has been the focus in the last few years as the government has set targets for minimum threshold of connectivity speeds to each and every household and pursued a drive to reduce not-spots for fixed line residential access. However, digital infrastructure supporting fixed line connections for commercial access has matured at a faster pace, due to market economics and the commercial drivers that enables greater and often faster return on investment to the telecommunications operators. This is because digital services to commercial organisations are priced higher to achieve higher reliability, performance and the quality of service compared to residential users.

In the West London Boroughs and the Buckinghamshire and Berkshire Districts that fall within the Study Area, residents and businesses have benefitted from targeted investments on improving the availability and quality of access to digital infrastructure. Much of this investment continues to be driven by competing operators regulated by OFCOM. In addition, local authorities have also shaped and nuanced policy initiatives to accelerate the roll out of digital infrastructure. Several local authorities have developed their own digital strategies and priorities to meet and respond to local needs.

Key over-arching policy documents include:

- **UK Digital Strategy (March 2017)**, a policy paper citing new initiatives to improve digital infrastructure.
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

3.3.3 Planned Infrastructure Portfolio

Utility infrastructure portfolio

Engagement with the utility companies has indicated that the majority of infrastructure planning is undertaken using a reactive approach – i.e. aligning with new development as and when it comes onboard - and that individual projects are delivered via the roll-out of major investments programmes. Few individual major digital projects have been identified as programmes tend to comprise a portfolio of relatively small-scale projects that follow growth, rather than constitute a predictor of growth through longer term planning processes.

The exception to this more short/medium – term focused approach to utility planning is in relation to water. Wastewater companies are required to publish longer term plans on water supply and resource management, and identify projects that will meet these future demand requirements.

Of the 49 utilities projects identified in the baseline data collection, 76% were water projects (see Figure 16a). The total cost of the planned infrastructure portfolio equates to £6.6bn, distributed across the Study Area (see Figure 16d). However, only 14% have secured funding, whereas the majority of projects are in the uncertain / speculative funding categories (see Figure 16b).

* Projects that cross borough boundaries have been recorded in each of the Boroughs that they are located within.
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

3.3.4 Summary of Strategic Utility Projects

**Strategic project definition**
Strategic utilities projects are defined as strategic if they are identified within policy or strategic planning documents, are costed over £1m and are required to support future growth in demand and supply on a network, as opposed to ‘business as usual’ maintenance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Driver / Enabler</th>
<th>Cost band (£m)</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Funding status</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2026-2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2031-2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2036-2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2041-2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2046-2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2</td>
<td>Southhall Decentralised Heating Network</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Energy services company's</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U22</td>
<td>Thames Tideway Tunnel</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>1000+</td>
<td>Bazalgette Tunnel Limited/Tideway (BTL)</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Planning Permission Granted</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U16</td>
<td>The River Thames Scheme</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>251-500</td>
<td>Environment Agency and nine partner organisations.</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U35</td>
<td>Weybridge to Guildford 123kV cable</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>UKPN</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U53</td>
<td>EGHS to Surrey Hills Reduction (10Ml/d)</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>101-250</td>
<td>Affinity Water</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U58</td>
<td>Groundwater Southfleet/ Greenhithe</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U59</td>
<td>Groundwater London confined chalk</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3.3 Utilities (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Driver / Enabler</th>
<th>Cost band (£m)</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Funding status</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U24</td>
<td>Thames Estuary Asset Management Programme (TEAM2100)</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£300m</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U25</td>
<td>Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) Construction Programme - London</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£100m</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U23</td>
<td>5G connectivity</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£25m</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U17</td>
<td>The Maidenhead Waterway Project</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>£12m</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U14</td>
<td>Connected Counties</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td></td>
<td>Connected Counties</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U36</td>
<td>Broadband ‘not spots’</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td></td>
<td>West London Alliance</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U60</td>
<td>Thames Water Treatment works at SUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U61</td>
<td>Thames Water Expansion of Kempton WTW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U31</td>
<td>Superfast Berkshire</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td></td>
<td>SFB, BT, Gigaclear</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.3 Utilities (continued)

This plan provides a composite illustration of the existing infrastructure and planned strategic infrastructure projects.

The following projects are indicated on the adjacent plan and summary details are provided in the database:

- U02 Southall Decentralised Heating Network
- U09 Thames Tideway Tunnel
- U16 The River Thames Scheme
- U31 Superfast Berkshire
- U61 Thames Water Expansion of Kempton WTW

The following projects are not indicated on the adjacent plan but summary details are provided in the database:

- U14 Connected Counties
- U17 The Maidenhead Waterway Project
- U18 Widening of Desborough Cut
- U23 5G connectivity
- U24 Thames Estuary Asset Management Programme (TEAM2100)
- U35 Weybridge to Guildford 123kV cables
- U36 Broadband ‘not spots’
- U53 EGHS to Surrey Hills Reduction
- U58 Groundwater Southfleet/ Greenhithe
- U59 Groundwater London confined chalk
- U60 Thames Water Treatment works at SUND

Figure 17: Map showing existing and proposed strategic Utilities infrastructure
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

In addition to the utility projects currently planned in relation to background growth, a series of major utility infrastructure proposals are being considered by HAL in support of the DCO process. A summary of these projects is provided opposite, drawn from the ‘Airport Expansion Consultation Document’ and ‘Our Emerging Plans’ document (January 2018), which was consulted on as part of the Consultation 1 exercise.

The scope of these projects has yet to be confirmed and will be specified as part of the DCO process. Given the scale of these proposals, further consideration to the relationships to wider utility network planning will need to be given as the work of the HSPG moves forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Utility Proposals Contained in the ‘Airport Expansion Consultation Document’ and ‘Our Emerging Plans’ (Heathrow Airport Limited, January 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Networks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Electrical power, including power line diversions (National Grid and SSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potable water (Affinity Water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Raw water (Affinity Water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Foul water (Thames Water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sludge mains (Thames Water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gas (National Grid: high, intermediate and low pressure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Telecoms (BT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater Treatment, Drainage and Pollution Control</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sustainable Urban Drainage Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drainage pipelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Storm Water Outfall Tunnels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Balancing lagoons / ponds (capturing surface runoff from the airport and help manage control of pollutants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Storm attenuation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water Treatment Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other treatment facilities, including settlement tanks, sludge tanks and pumping stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aviation Fuel Facilities</strong> (storage and pipelines managed by BPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>River Diversions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Longford River and Duke of Northumberland’s River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Colne River and Wraysbury River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Colne Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Storage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- On-airport storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New upstream storage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

3.3.5 Current capacity

Current management, maintenance and new investment is undertaken by the utility companies in relation to demand requirements, as regulated by the relevant market regulators. Consultations with utility providers have not identified any significant issues in relation to current capacity constraints across the Study Area.

That said, in 2007 the Environment Agency published the document Areas of Water Stress: Final Classification, which formally classified the South-East of England as constituting an area of “Serious Water Stress”, which forms the context for the wide range of current and planned water efficiency measures.

3.3.6 Projected Growth

The level of electricity, gas and water demand associated with projected growth has been estimated based on the forecasts summarised in the JEBIS Stage 1 – 4 reports. This establishes the level and nature of ‘background growth’ envisaged to 2041, and separately identifies the additionality arising from the HEP in terms of employment, floor space and household growth.

A summary of the household and employment growth forecasts to 2041, with corresponding floorspace development estimates, is provided on the next page. This analysis is based on estimates of new development that could take place, though the timing, delivery and location are at this point unknown. The objective of this exercise is to understand the scale of new demand and report its potential impact.

The demand for utility services is linked to how much and when new development will take place. The analysis was undertaken in stages. The first stage was to quantify the background development which is forecast in addition to growth arising from the HEP. Following this, appropriate benchmark metrics were applied. The following summarises the growth forecast plus assumption made:

• An increase in non-residential ‘gross’ floor areas equal to 748,155 by 2041. With an associated increase in jobs equal to 871.

• A marginal increase in new households equal to 3,000 by 2041.

• The analysis assumes that roll-out will take place at equal increments across the forecast period. For example, it is estimated that 513,871sq.m floorspace and 290 new jobs will be delivered with the ‘other airport related logistics’ development. Therefore the analysis assumes 1,117sq.m and 13 jobs per annum are delivered. Assuming equal incremental growth is a simplified assumption, however at this juncture this has been used as a benchmark.

• Once the delivery rate of floorspace was established, energy consumption benchmarks were applied to estimate energy demand for the next 23 years. These utilised CIBSE ‘best practice’ benchmarks on a per sq.m basis which include latest energy efficiency standards.

• For water, demand benchmarks are normally reported on a litre per person per day basis. For the analysis, the benchmark has therefore been applied to the number of people associated with ‘households’ and jobs, multiplying by an annualisation factor of 365 and 260 respectively, applying British Water published benchmarks.
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

The following provides a summary of the assumptions used in relation to projected 2041 forecasts arising from Heathrow’s expansion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-residential</th>
<th>Gross sq.m</th>
<th>Electricity kWh/sq.m</th>
<th>Thermal kWh/sq.m</th>
<th>Water l/day/per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Other airport related logistics’</td>
<td>513,871</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Light’ industrial</td>
<td>25,686</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Heavy’ industrial</td>
<td>23,959</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Large-scale’ corporate</td>
<td>184,639</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: thermal demand is converted to gas assuming a standard boiler efficiency factor of 80%.
Non-residential demand factors are based on CIBSE, Guide F, Table 20.1. Household demand assumptions are from Arup internal sources.
Water demand factors have been adapted from: British Water, ‘Table of Loadings for Sewage Treatment Systems’
Please note, estimates for the consumption multipliers have been applied to a gross floor area. These would normally be applied to net floor areas. Therefore, the utility demand figures estimated here will be marginally overestimated.

Figure 18a and 18b provide a summary of the expected increase in demand for electricity, gas and water for non-residential development. Overall, electricity and gas demand is expected to reach 162,100MWh and 175,600MWh of annual demand respectively. For water, it is 421Mlres per annum. For households, electricity and gas demand is forecast to be 12,750MWh and 16,065MWh respectively. Annual water demand is 361Ml.

Figure 18a: Graph showing water demand relative to employment.
Figure 18b: Graph showing electricity and gas demand relative to employment.
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

3.3.7 Impact of growth

The scale of Heathrow-related growth across the Study Area has been compared to other major developments using Equivalent Domestic Unit (‘EDUs’). This calculation adds residential units to non-residential sq.m, converted using an assumed domestic unit factor of 85sq.m. For the Study Area the EDU figure is 11,800, approximately half the scale of the Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea (VNEB) development (21,900 EDUs) and one quarter the scale of the Olympic Park and surroundings (47,500 EDUs). Additional demand could pose some challenges for the existing utility networks, taking into account baseline growth and existing constraints within the area, but this will depend on how growth is distributed across the area, and the increments of growth that this is delivered in.

At this stage it is unknown how and when development will be delivered, making it difficult to comment on the local utility impact with precision. For example, the ‘other airport logistics category’ represents around 70% of non-residential development and therefore the majority of electricity, gas and water demand. Understanding when this is delivered (for example, the number and scale of logistics parks envisaged) will be critical for planning future utilities development.

Although the forecast of new water demand is small compared to Thames Water’s daily supply (2.6 bn litres per day), given that Heathrow falls within a designated area of “serious water stress”, further engagement with the water utility companies to understand how the development could impact is recommended.

As proposals for spatial distribution of growth arising from Heathrow’s expansion are further developed, the potential for alternative forms of energy supply, such as district heating, should be explored with the GLA, Surrey and Bucks Counties and other relevant stakeholders. The GLA, for example, has historically supported new heat networks through its DEPDU programme, which promotes low carbon sources of energy.

It is reasonable to expect that new buildings will be built to good practice standards, with associated improvements in building efficiency. Demand estimates should be refined as the process moves forward with this in mind.

From a local planning perspective it is recommended that further engagement with the relevant utilities companies takes place once spatial plans are further developed.
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

3.3.8 Assessment

The assessment criteria applied are summarised opposite, relating to the quantum of likely additional utility requirements arising from growth projections, whether existing utility plans are geared to addressing the scale of projected growth arising and the degree to which delivery mechanisms are in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is there a significant need to 2041?</strong></td>
<td>Utility supplies required to service the combination of background growth and additional Heathrow-related growth requirements across the Study Area are not expected to trigger additional major additional utility supply requirements.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate levels of additional utility supplies required to service the combination of background growth and additional Heathrow-related growth requirements across the Study Area beyond that currently being planned for.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major additional utility supplies required to service the combination of background growth and Heathrow-related growth requirements across the Study Area beyond that currently being planned for.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Are needs planned for?** | There are both short term and long term utility plans which include identified projects to meet identified need.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | G   |
|                          | There are sufficient short term utility plans which include projects to meet identified need, but no longer term planning.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | A   |
|                          | There is not sufficient short term plans and associated projects to meet identified existing need.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | R   |

| **Are projects deliverable?** | There are projects identified within current business planning cycles to meet need, the majority of which have secured funding and a more certain planning stage.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | G   |
|                            | There are projects identified within current business planning cycles to meet need, but funding and planning status is uncertain.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | A   |
|                            | The projects identified are not within current business planning cycles and are too vague to be relied upon.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | R   |
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

Is there significant need?
The background growth forecast of new residential housing, employment and population growth (i.e. not attributed directly to Heathrow’s expansion) is expected to significantly increase the demand for utility services.

Although there will be additional utility requirements arising from Heathrow’s expansion, at a strategic level, when looking across the Study Area as a whole, these are considered to be of a moderate scale for new employment development and insignificant for residential development.

Therefore, based on the forecasts summarised in JEBIS Stages 1-4, under present conditions need has been assessed to be ‘amber’. Utility companies can be expected to engage with developers and local authorities to meet new demand growth at Heathrow and the surrounding area. However, further engagement with utility providers is recommended to ensure that the utility companies’ expectations of demand growth is consistent with JEBIS projections.

Our analysis of sampling post codes in the Study Area to ascertain digital infrastructure needs suggests the following are required in the short term:
• Achieving consistency and uniformity in the quality of mobile signal across the Study Area, for outdoor and indoor coverage;
• Achieving consistency and uniformity in the quality of broadband access across the Study Area; and
• Acceleration of ultrafast broadband access to post codes considered to be high growth areas.

The study suggests that it may be entirely viable to seek collaboration with investing operators to target opportunistically early investments in specific post codes that may not otherwise be of interest to the operators viz a viz Heathrow expansion.

Assessing needs arising from housing growth
The requirement for new utility infrastructure has been forecast across the Study Area for the period 2016 to 2041. This includes the following types of utility infrastructure:
• New gas connections;
• New electricity connections;
• Water and wastewater connections;
• Digital connections; and
• Strategic utility projects.

An annual forecast of new utility connections and spend was carried out for the nine local authority areas. For each utility three sources of information were drawn upon:
• Long-term development forecasts contained within business plans;
• Published pricing information; and
• Engagement with stakeholder representatives.

Projected population and housing growth data has allowed the number of new connections and costs to be estimated at a high-level. An annual cost estimate for delivering each type of utility infrastructure was produced for each districts and then combined to arrive at a final cost.

The growth in new utility connections was forecast based on the change in dwelling stock incorporated in growth forecast data. Total annual connections were then multiplied by a published cost to arrive at future spend.
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

The cost assumptions used were as follows:
- Gas connection £1,900 (internal due diligence project)
- Electricity connection £2,000 (SSE’ online calculator);
- Water and wastewater connection* is £4,400 for Thames Water and £3,000 for Affinity water zones.
- Digital infrastructure £500 BT Openreach (FTTP on Demand Connection)

Assessing needs arising from employment growth

The demand for electricity, gas and water demand associated with new employment growth across the Study Area has been assessed based on the jobs and employment floorspace growth forecasts generated as a result of Heathrow’s expansion summarised in the JEBIS Stage 3 Report.

The demand for utility services is linked to how much and when new development will take place. The first step was to quantify the amount of development forecast and assign utility benchmarks to estimate demand.

By 2041 annual demand is expected to reach 162,100MWh and 175,600MWh for electricity and gas respectively. For water it is 421M/litres per annum.

The timing and location of new development delivery is currently uncertain and therefore unlikely to be factored into the utility network plans.

The needs assessment has been assessed to be amber. The key reason is that although the additional development appears to be of a medium scale, its timing and location are currently uncertain. Therefore, although it is expected that the utility companies will be able to provide new infrastructure to support this growth, they will need to take account of additional requirements generated from the HEP. The amount of projected logistics space in particular is substantial and could create locally-specific pressures on existing networks, depending on the spatial strategy for accommodating these additional demands.

From a local planning perspective it is recommended that further engagement with the relevant utilities companies takes place as part of a future planning strategy.
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

Are needs planned for?
Utility companies continue to monitor new development, engage with developers and public sector entities and plan for new infrastructure where it is required.

Growth generated as a result of Heathrow’s expansion will result in a manageable increase in utility services demand. Given regulatory requirements, it is expected that new utility capacity will be provided to meet demand within the Study Area. Given the moderate additional employment development, and insignificant levels of residential growth forecast as a result of the HEP, it is expected that at a strategic level Heathrow-related requirements will be ‘absorbed’ into delivery programmes. That said, logistics-related growth is substantial and locationally-specific utility requirements for this sector should be given careful consideration as part of further spatial planning.

Whereas it is our assessment that at a strategic level needs are being planned for, this is happening within business planning timeframes that tend to be medium term in nature (often based on 5-year cycles, save for water which applies a longer term look-ahead). Given the inherent limitations of short term focused utility planning timeframes, this has been assessed to be ‘amber’.

Digital infrastructure
The sampling of the presence and quality of digital infrastructure shows that the connectivity and quality of performance is variable across the Study Area postcodes. However, access to public domain information is not readily available for the Study Area as a whole and has therefore not been subject to qualitative assessment. This information maps commercial-grade digital connectivity, which is usually made available at a specific project level in order to ascertain the magnitude of performance improvement requirements. Infrastructure presence can be obtained by particular location/postcode rather than by region or area of interest. This needs an approach to each operator, which can be a time and labour intensive process for building a mapping database. However, if it were to be assumed there was a degree of correlation between ‘not-spots’ for ultrafast residential broadband and availability of commercial grade services than some postcodes become areas of interest.

As part of an initiative to “getting the basics right” it is recommended that there is a focus on reducing underperforming postcodes, compared with highly served postcodes where the full complement of connectivity services are on offer and which are also physically made available to the customer with least friction and delay.

The cost of improving mobile signals for indoor access can be an impediment to many SMEs. Thus a focus on improving the quality of indoor mobile signal coverage will be a structural value-add to the Study Area. OFCOM has enabled commercial and residential users to deploy passive signal boosting technology to overcome poor quality of signal in dense urban areas and in weak signal areas. However, there is a cost premium to such solutions and often they can be operator-specific, which is a constraint in commercial environments where users are subscribing to different cellular operators.
Are projects deliverable?

Given the scale of ‘background’ (ie. non-Heathrow specific) future population and housing growth requirements, the cost of supplying new utility networks is expected to be very significant. The relative scale of employment growth arising from Heathrow’s expansion is moderate and insignificant in relation to residential development. However, this should be given further consideration once plans for spatially distributing growth and associated infrastructure are further developed.

For the utility companies, all future major strategic projects (that extend beyond upgrade programmes) will need to be justified to the respective market regulators. Projects that are ‘justified’ will be funded via consumer charges. It is reasonable to expect that adequate funding will be in place to support this, though given the lack of medium-long term certainty (beyond current business plan timeframes), overall deliverability has been assessed to be ‘amber’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities Infrastructure Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a significant need?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are needs planned for?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are projects deliverable?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

3.3.9 Considerations for Delivery

Planning for Heathrow’s expansion needs to undertaken in the context of wider ‘background growth’ and the opportunities and challenges this this brings.

Considerations
- Further consideration of locationally-specific implications of Heathrow-related growth on utility services, in consultation with utility service providers, during the next planning stages.
- Achieving consistency and uniformity in the quality of mobile signal across the Study Area, for outdoor and indoor coverage
- Achieving consistency and uniformity in the quality of broadband access across the Study Area
- Acceleration of ultrafast broadband access to post codes considered to be high growth areas
- Next generation wired access network and 5G cellular access

Challenges for delivery
- The commercial nature of utilities planning and delivery can restrict the impetus and possibility of strategic, cross boundary projects.
- Councils currently have little autonomy over utility network forecasting and planning.
- The reactive, short-term nature of much utility planning reduces potential for strategic direction.

Potential funding sources
Most utility infrastructure investments will be delivered via private utility companies operating within the regulatory framework. To augment this, certain authorities (such as the West London Alliance) are either funding or proposing to fund initiatives geared to achieve enhanced levels of provision (for example, the WLA’s focus on digital ‘not spots’). The GLA is also funding energy and digital infrastructure – related initiatives.

In addition, conventional S106 / CIL funding mechanisms related to development proposals will continue to play a role for certain utility infrastructure items.
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3.3 Utilities (continued)

### 3.3.10 Opportunities for innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Water Management</td>
<td>• IWM Strategies for major developments could be a way of ensuring the water supply and management is planned in an integrated way across a number of developments within a growth corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Management and Resources</td>
<td>• Actively promote demand management measures to reduce leakages and improve efficiency across the Study Area – e.g. smart meters and recycling wastewater for non-potable supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• After demand management and leakages are maximised, all water companies in the South-East are required to coordinate to guarantee an efficient utilisation of resources and agree the most suitable supply source for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sector Competition</td>
<td>• Since 2017 non-residential water users have been allowed to sell water surpluses and become small providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential for multi-utility companies that could add competition and innovation to the market.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Energy Strategies</td>
<td>• Develop a framework and implement integrated energy strategies in all new major developments in order to reduce demand on the grid and create a more sustainable and self-sufficient system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Grid</td>
<td>• Move towards a zero carbon and ‘smart’ electricity grid able to accommodate decentralised electricity generation at all scales and in coordination with national and regional energy policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Heating</td>
<td>• Explore potential for district heating in major development projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting the Basics Right</td>
<td>• Making it as transparent as possible for the private sector to invest in the Study Area – articulating priorities, focussing on under-performing postcodes and having information on which assets are available for the private sector to install their infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Future Access</td>
<td>• Innovative approaches to planning for street works and street furniture e.g. supporting fibre provision by ensuring that ducts are installed that enable fibre to be installed by various providers at a later date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities Coordination</td>
<td>• Opportunities around cross-sector utilities coordination to increase cost-efficiency and reduce road disruptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.4 Waste

3.4.1 Methodology

**Definition**

Waste infrastructure is considered in relation to the following waste generation categories:

- Household waste
- Commercial and Industrial waste (C&I)
- Construction, demolition and excavation waste (CDEW)

The assessment undertaken also looked at the various types of waste facilities existing within the Study Area, including:

- Landfill
- Metal recycling sites
- Transfer
- Treatment*, and
- Incineration.

*includes recycling sites as per Environment Agency Categorisation.

## WASTE INFRASTRUCTURE AT A GLANCE

### PROJECT PORTFOLIO

- 7 waste projects, with a combined cost of £138 million.
- Five waste planning authorities have responsibilities across the Study Area, namely: Surrey County Council; West London Waste Authority; Central & Eastern Berkshire Authorities; Slough Borough Council and Buckinghamshire County Council. Waste operations may extend much further than the Study Area.
- Waste policy is increasingly driven by encouraging resource efficiency and recycling, whilst the Landfill Tax is driving the market towards alternative and more sustainable waste management methods. Emissions from landfill represents a significant source of Greenhouse Gases and therefore measures that divert waste from landfill are being encouraged.
- The number of waste projects planned for delivery drops significantly after 2035, reflecting the planning period for Waste and Minerals Plans.
- None of the planned projects take account of Heathrow's expansion, which is likely to generate significant increased waste demands, including construction, demolition and excavation waste. A range of measures is being considered by HAL to address this (Re; Consultation 1 documents), which, due to its scale, will have wider implications for waste management across the sub-region. None of these projects are included within the JEBIS as they have yet to be confirmed.

### SUMMARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- Waste capacity currently exceeds waste generation related to background growth and is projected to continue to be the case to 2041. Capacity is expected to increase faster than waste generation if planned projects come on line and if the growth in capacity continues according to the historic trend.
- Growth in the wider sub-region triggered as a result of Heathrow’s expansion is anticipated to result in manageable additional demands. Location-specific implications of industrial and logistics development on waste services will require closer investigation during the next planning stages.
- Waste capacity in the Study Area is highly diverse in nature which, when combined with the current and planned amount of headroom between capacity and demand projections makes for a resilient picture. However, the operational context involving Waste Authorities and commercial operators is complex and strategic planning needs to be considered in relation to a wider geographic area.
- None of the waste projects have an identified sponsor or funding. A degree of uncertainty therefore exists as to whether these projects will be delivered and therefore caution needs to be exercised.
- The HEP would require displacement of the Lakeside Energy from Waste facility, which involves both energy recovery and materials recycling. Para. 5.144 of the Airports NPS states: “The applicant should make reasonable endeavours to ensure that sufficient provision is made to address the reduction in waste treatment capacity caused by the loss of the Lakeside Energy from Waste plant.” Given current operational demands, waste treatment capacity will be assessed as part of the HEP planning.
- There are challenges for authorities to meet growth with non-landfill solutions as well as opportunities for innovations, including the application of Circular Economy principles in re-use.
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3.4 Waste (continued)

Data Source

**Waste generation**

To permit a consistent approach across the Study Area and across the three waste categories, waste generation growth rates were developed based on information found in the respective local authority waste plans, with linear change assumed in each five-year period. The following plans were reviewed:

- West London Waste Plan 2015
- Draft Surrey Waste Plan 2018-2033
- Central and Eastern Berkshire Authorities, Joint Minerals and Waste Plan 2017 (draft)
- Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) SLR Consulting Model 2014

**Waste capacity**

The Environment Agency’s Waste Data Interrogator (WDI) tool was used to obtain information on the quantities of waste received at different waste operative facilities across the Study Area.

Incineration facilities were assessed using the Environment Agency’s annual waste management report for England.

Assessment

In order to conduct a needs assessment for waste infrastructure, it is necessary to assess the types and quantities of waste generated in the Study Area and how this may increase alongside an assessment of the existing waste facilities and their capacity.

As the waste generation data was taken from the local Waste Plans, they include waste data for the entirety of the waste local planning authority area which includes LPAs from outside the Study Area boundary. Therefore in order to assess only those LPAs inside the Study Area boundary, the waste generation data was proportioned according to LPA population.

*Includes recycling sites as per Environment Agency Categorisation.
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3.4 Waste (continued)

3.4.2 Existing context

Waste management can make a positive contribution to the development of sustainable communities. Resource efficiency by driving waste up the waste hierarchy is promoted for the delivery of sustainable development. Nationally, the increase in Landfill Tax is driving the market towards alternative, and more sustainable waste management methods. In addition, emissions from landfill represent a significant source of Greenhouse Gases and therefore an effort to divert waste from landfill is encouraged.

**European Waste Policy**


**National Waste Policy**

The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 implement recycling standards to be met through commingling or through source segregated collections.

The NPPF 2018 identifies waste management as a strategic policy requirement for which an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development should be developed (Para 20).

The National Planning Policy for Waste 2014 sits alongside the NPPF and implements a drive toward a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management. The policy provides a number of directions in relation to Waste Planning Authorities and seeks to create an approach in which communities and businesses take responsibility for waste and that waste management is considered alongside other spatial and planning concerns.

There are four waste planning authorities in the Study Area, these include:
- Surrey County Council
- West London Waste Authority
- Unitary Authorities in Berkshire
- Buckinghamshire County Council

Each waste planning authority is required to produce a waste local plan to show how and where the waste facilities and infrastructure will be provided.

Not all the waste generated in a waste planning authority area will be managed within that area, waste can be both exported and imported between borough boundaries.

It is important that waste in the Study Area is managed sustainably and that sufficient land is available for the waste facilities required.

**Surrey County Council**

Surrey County Council is currently preparing a new waste local plan to replace the existing Surrey Waste Plan 2008. This plan will address the introduction of new national policy, cater for more advanced waste management technology and will account for changes to the amount and type of waste needed as a result of housing and employment growth. As part of this plan development, the Council is also in the process of identifying new sites to be allocated for waste facilities.
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3.4 Waste (continued)

West London Waste Authority (WLWA)
The WLWA is the statutory Waste Disposal Authority for the London Boroughs of Brent, Ealing, Harrow, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Richmond upon Thames and Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation.
The West London Waste Plan 2015 is a joint plan prepared by the boroughs in the WLWA. A key aim of the London Plan 2011 was to ensure that as much of London’s waste is managed within London as possible, working towards managing the equivalent of 100% of London’s waste by 2031. The London Plan 2011 allocated each borough an amount of London’s waste that was required to positively plan for and manage, ensuring that sufficient capacity was identified to meet the apportioned targets in the London Plan (2011). The West London Waste Plan was prepared to be consistent with this objective.

Unitary Authorities in Berkshire
The Central and Eastern Berkshire Authorities include Bracknell Forest Council, Reading Borough Council, RBWM and Wokingham Borough Council are working in partnership to produce a Joint Minerals and Waste Plan, which will guide decision making up to 2036. At present, the focus of the Vision of this plan is to recognise the area as a source of minerals and to ensure the maintenance of a steady and adequate supply in a sustainable way. In addition, waste is to be managed in a sustainable way, according with the waste hierarchy.

Due to the urban nature and small size of Slough it is not currently pursuing its own Minerals and Waste Plan. However, the Lakeside Energy from Waste facility (incorporating the Materials Recovery Facility) is a key resource for Slough and neighbouring authorities, and the Authority is supporting their re-provision within the Borough.

Buckinghamshire County Council
Buckinghamshire County Council is currently working to replace the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2006 and the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 2012 with a new Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2016-2036. This plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in June 2018.

The vision for the new Minerals and Waste Local Plan focuses upon ensuring a network of waste management facilities are available to support sustainable economic growth and deliver social and environmental benefits.
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.4 Waste (continued)

3.4.3 Planned Infrastructure Portfolio

The baseline data collection identified seven projects across the Study Area at a total cost of £0.14 billion. Of the waste projects identified, 100% had an uncertain funding status (see Figure 19a) and 86% had an unidentified delivery sponsor.

There were no identified waste projects planned in South Bucks, Slough or RBWM. Hounslow has the largest number of planned waste facility projects (see Figure 19c). This pattern may be due to the variance in the stages of waste planning across the authorities, or due to natural or logistical conditions influencing site planning.

The number of waste projects being planned for delivery drops significantly after 2035 (see Figure 19b), which is reflective of the planning period for waste plans.

The HEP would require displacement of the Lakeside Energy from Waste facility, which involves both energy recovery and materials recycling. Para. 5.144 of the Airports NPS states: “The applicant should make reasonable endeavours to ensure that sufficient provision is made to address the reduction in waste treatment capacity caused by the loss of the Lakeside Energy from Waste plant.” Given current operational demands for the facility, waste treatment capacity will be assessed as part of the HEP planning. Due to the unconfirmed status, this project, it has not been identified in the JEBIS database. This will considered further at the next review of JEBIS in the light of emerging preferred masterplan arrangements and ongoing investigations.
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3.4 Waste (continued)

3.4.4 Summary of Strategic Waste Projects

**Strategic project definition**
Inert and non-hazardous waste projects are classified as strategic if they have a management capacity of 66,000 tonnes per annum and over.
Hazardous waste projects are considered strategic if they have a management capacity of 1,100 tonnes per annum and over.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Driver / Enabler</th>
<th>Cost band (£m)</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Funding status</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>Greenford Reuse and Recycling Depot</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>Western International Market</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>LBH/R360</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Planning Application Submitted</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5</td>
<td>Former Weylands Treatment Works</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6</td>
<td>Land Adjacent to Lyne Lane Sewage Treatment Works</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7</td>
<td>Land Adjacent to Trumps Farm</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W8</td>
<td>Oakleaf Farm, Stanwell Moor (expansion)</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14</td>
<td>Expansion of SSE Powerstation, Slough</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td></td>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Planning Permission Granted</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Appendix G for definition and calculation of thresholds.
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3.4 Waste (continued)

This plan provides a composite illustration of the existing infrastructure and planned strategic infrastructure projects.

The following projects are indicated on the adjacent plan and summary details are provided in the database:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W01</td>
<td>Greenford Reuse &amp; Recycling Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W04</td>
<td>Western International Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W05</td>
<td>Former Weylands Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W06</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Lyne Lane Sewage Treatment Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W07</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Trumps Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W08</td>
<td>Oakleaf Farm, Stanwell Moor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14</td>
<td>SSE Powerstation Expansion, Slough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existing location of the Lakeside Energy from Waste facility in Colnbrook is indicated in the map. As referenced in Chapter 3.4.8, it is likely that the HEP would require this to be displaced.

Figure 20: Map showing existing and proposed strategic waste infrastructure
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3.4 Waste (continued)

3.4.5 Existing capacity

Waste Infrastructure in the Study Area

Actual waste capacities for the period 2006-2015 are available via the Environment Agency’s Waste Data Interrogator (WDI) tool. This data was analysed to determine the likely future trend of waste capacity projections.

The changes in throughputs reflected in the graph opposite reflect genuine trends rather than operational changes at single facilities. For example, the drop in landfill throughputs in 2010, reflects a drop in waste accepted at seven of the eight active landfill sites, on the previous years quantities (see Figure 21).

Analysis shows that currently, there are landfill sites within the Study Area that have reached the end of their lifetime such as Park Lodge Landfill Site and Home Farm Extension Landfill Site.

Figure 21: Waste Capacity in the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group area, 2006-2015
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3.4 Waste (continued)

3.4.6 Projected growth

Projected Waste Generation

Analysis of background growth waste generation projections for the Study Area was undertaken using data extracted from projections in each of the local waste plans (see Figure 22). This indicates generation growth does not increase dramatically between 2016-2041*. There is a steady growth across the Study Area in all three waste types, with CDEW anticipated to grow at a faster rate than household waste and C&I waste. As the density of CDEW is typically higher than household waste and C&I waste, this accounts for the high quantities of CDEW in the projections. It is likely that the faster growth in CDEW results from an anticipated increase in development across the Study Area.

The growth scenario presented in the JEBIS Stage 4 Report predicts an additional 10,000 residents in 2041. Assuming that municipal waste generation is directly proportional to the residential population, this would comprise a modest 0.5% increase in municipal waste generation in 2041 above the baseline waste generation growth projections shown.

This analysis suggests that the expansion of Heathrow is unlikely to have a significant impact on waste generation trends within the wider Study Area. However, some caution needs to be exercised given the level of uncertainty in the future forecasts.

Based on the rates published in BS5906:2005, it is forecast that this would lead to an additional 30,560 tonnes of commercial and industrial waste each year. This would comprise a 2% increase in waste generation in 2041 above the baseline waste generation growth projections shown.

The most significant impact to consider will be from construction of Heathrow’s expansion and the likelihood this will to generate significant increased waste demands, including construction, demolition and excavation waste. A range of measures is being considered by HAL to address this in support of the DCO process (see Consultation 1 documents). However, as these have yet to be confirmed, none of these projects is included within the JEBIS.

*Data period 2016-2041 to align with local waste plans.

Figure 22: Waste generation projections for the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group area, 2016-2041

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Waste generation (tonnes/annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Household waste
- C&I waste
- CDEW

Data period 2016-2041 to align with local waste plans.
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**Projected Capacity of Waste Infrastructure in the Study Area**

The capacity growth projections are based on the premise that existing waste facilities will grow in capacity, and new facilities will be developed in accordance with the historic trends in the Study Area (see Figure 23). For this growth to be sustained, it will be necessary for waste facilities to be planned effectively by the relevant waste planning authorities.

Waste capacity for all facility types in the Study Area is expected to show an increasing trend up to 2041. However, this increase is expected to be more rapid for waste treatment and incineration facilities, compared to waste transfer and MRSs.

Analysis indicates that the years remaining before existing landfill sites are filled is limited. This is in line with the predictions of the new Draft London Plan, which states that the capacity of landfills accepting London’s waste is expected to run out by 2026.

However, the abundance of mineral sites within the Study Area, means that additional void space is likely to be created as mineral deposits are exploited, and environmental permits are sought to use the void space for landfill.

![Figure 23: Waste capacity provision in the Study Area for the period 2016-2041, relative to actual waste capacity for the period 2006-2015](image-url)
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3.4 Waste (continued)

3.4.7 Impact of growth

**Waste Infrastructure Requirement in the HSPG to 2041**

- Figure 24 indicates that waste capacity in the Study Area is 86% greater than the quantity of waste generated in the area in relation to background growth in the first year of projections (2016). This is to be expected, as the waste facilities also accept and handle waste that is generated in regions outside of the Study Area.

- The analysis indicates that waste capacity in the Study Area is expected to increase at a faster rate than background growth waste generation during the period 2016-2041*. This trend indicates that:
  - Waste generation in the areas from which the imported waste managed in the Study Area originates, is growing faster than in the Study Area; and/or
  - A greater proportion of the waste generated in neighbouring areas will be managed in the Study Area.

- As previously referenced, additional waste generation arising from growth in the wider HSPG Study Area resulting from Heathrow’s expansion are of a very modest nature.

*Data period 2016-2041 to align with local waste plans.

Figure 24: A comparison between the waste generation and waste capacity projections for the Study Area area, 2016-2041*
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3.4 Waste (continued)

3.4.8 Assessment

**Assessment criteria**

The assessment criteria are presented in the table opposite, which seeks to determine at a strategic level the needs of the Study Area based on the amount of waste forecasted to be accepted and permitted. The number of new waste projects identified in the Baseline Data Collection has been interpreted to establish if the needs are planned for and the status of these projects is utilised to assess if they are deliverable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is there a significant need to 2041?</strong></td>
<td>The quantity of waste accepted at permitted waste management facilities in the Study Area is more than 150% of the quantity of waste generated in the area over the study period and continues to be the case once Heathrow expansion-related growth in the wider Study Area is considered.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The quantity of waste accepted at permitted waste management facilities in the Study Area is between 100% and 150% of the quantity of waste generated in the same area over the study period, and continues to be the case once Heathrow expansion-related growth in the wider Study Area is considered.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failing to meet net self-sufficiency; the quantity of waste accepted at permitted waste management facilities in the Study Area is less than the quantity of waste generated in the same area over the study period, and continues to be the case once Heathrow expansion-related growth in the wider Study Area is considered.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Are needs planned for?** | Strategically significant waste facilities are protected, and/or sufficient new waste projects of strategic significance are planned to be provided for in order to remain within the ‘Green’ criteria for strategic need in the future. | G   |
|                           | Strategically significant waste facilities are protected; however insufficient new waste projects of strategic significance are planned to be provided to address significant need in the future. | A   |
|                           | Strategically significant waste facilities are protected; however insufficient new waste projects of strategic significance are planned to be provided in order to remain within the ‘Green’ criteria for significant need in the future. | R   |

| **Are projects deliverable?** | No projects are required to be delivered, or if projects are required, sites have been allocated in the respective local plans, funding has been secured and planning permission has been granted. | G   |
|                            | Projects are required to be delivered, and project sites are allocated in the respective local plan. No interested parties have applied for funding or planning permission has not been confirmed. | A   |
|                            | Projects are required to be delivered; however, no project sites are allocated for strategic waste infrastructure in the respective local plans, and no funding has been secured. | R   |
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3.4 Waste (continued)

Is there a significant need?
The increase in waste generation related to background growth in the Study Area is projected to be generated at a sufficiently slow rate that if no additional capacity was brought online from 2015 (the last year for which waste capacity data is available), it would be 2041 before the area slipped to ‘Amber’. Additional waste arising from Heathrow expansion-related growth in the wider HSPG Study Area will be relatively modest.

In addition, the waste capacity in the Study Area is sufficiently diverse, such that the closure of any single facility in the area would not reduce the capacity enough to push the area out of the ‘Green’ position.

Are the needs planned for?
The combined sum of the planned strategic waste projects identified in the local waste plans would be sufficient to remain within the ‘Green’ criteria for strategic need within the future (i.e. waste accepted at permitted waste management facilities in the Study Area is more than 150% of the quantity of waste generated in the area over the study period).

However, there is significant variation in the progress in developing capacity at allocated sites and the implications of both confirmed and potential major waste management infrastructure proposals in the planning pipeline require close ongoing monitoring and assessment.

The HEP would require displacement of the Lakeside Energy from Waste facility in Colnbrook. Whilst it is likely that the capacity will be re-provided, there are currently no assurances that the capacity will be provided within the Study Area. In addition, three of the top four most active landfill sites in 2015, are due to fill their remaining void space within the next 5 years. All three sites are permitted to accept inert waste only. Considerable landfill capacity for this material stream remains in the Study Area, in particular at the Jayflex site in Slough, and the Ingrebourne Valley site in South Bucks. However, the remaining capacity will be rapidly exhausted (in five years or less) if waste currently sent to the three largest inert waste landfill sites is diverted to the remaining sites in the area. There is potential to mitigate the projected capacity gap given the forthcoming expansion of the SSE Power station and the potential use of expended mineral sites as new inert waste landfill capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Infrastructure Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a significant need?</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are needs planned for?</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are projects deliverable?</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.4 Waste (continued)

Are the projects deliverable?
Currently no projects are required to be delivered; however planning permission has been submitted for a large (150,000 tpa) waste treatment facility on the Western International Market / Southall Lane site. This has been allocated for waste capacity in the West London Waste Plan and a project sponsor identified (Quattro Ltd), though the planning application has yet to be determined.

In addition, an outline planning application has been approved for the expansion of the SSE Power Station in Slough. This will be a 50MW plant which could burn 480,000 tonnes of waste derived fuel a year.

Given that none of the waste projects identified in the JEBIS database have an identified sponsor or funding, the deliverability of planned projects related to developing capacity at allocated sites should be monitored.

3.4.9 Considerations for Delivery

Considerations
- Implement a waste hierarchy by focusing on prevention and zero waste to landfill policies.
- Support sustainable development of existing site allocations, encourage development of existing allocations.
- Promote a Circular Economy through policies, targets and promotions.
- Monitor waste arising in area against capacity of existing facilities.
- The HEP would require displacement of the Lakeside Energy from Waste facility, which involves both energy recovery and materials recycling. Para. 5.144 of the Airports NPS states: “The applicant should make reasonable endeavours to ensure that sufficient provision is made to address the reduction in waste treatment capacity caused by the loss of the Lakeside Energy from Waste plant.” Given current operational demands for the facility, waste treatment capacity will be assessed as part of the HEP planning. This will considered further at the next review of JEBIS in the light of emerging preferred masterplan arrangements and ongoing investigations.
- Ensure a sufficient programme is in place to manage the CDEW waste expected from the Heathrow Expansion.
- Periodical review of strategic needs assessment for waste to account for changes in waste generation patterns and to reflect the loss or growth in waste capacity.

Challenges for delivery
- Balancing development pressures from economic and housing growth with development of waste management facilities.
- Regional nature of waste planning and management means that it can be difficult to coordinate shortfalls in capacity and planning for future facilities.
- The variety of waste management facilities and capacities requires a more detailed study into the status and future of current facilities and the potential for new facilities in the context of allocated sites in a more granular manner.
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#### 3.4 Waste (continued)

**Potential funding sources**

Most waste infrastructure investments will be delivered via private companies operating within the regulatory framework. Increases to user fees, a levy on Council tax, or a levy on business rates are all potential contributors towards funding of major new waste infrastructure projects.

New waste facilities will sometimes be funded via developer charges and other local improvement or S106 monies.

In terms of recycling funding streams, increases in user fees for waste often promotes recycling, and incentivises businesses and individuals to recycle through measures such as the Cap & Trade program for carbon emissions. Similar measures for large waste contributors could be considered.

The London Waste Authority Support Programme helps London Waste Authorities in the implementation of more consistent and efficient waste management services, aiming to divert materials from landfill, increase recycling rates and maximise the income generated. It has a £7.5 million budget to 2020.

The London Waste and Recycling Board’s Advance London programme supports circular economy by investing –alongside private sector partners –in businesses looking to develop and maximise impact of circular business models. It has a budget of £39 million for the period 2017-2020 (£20.7 million from non-GLA partners).

#### 3.4.10 Opportunities for innovation

The management of waste is a fundamental component of future development, effective management is important to reduce negative impacts on communities and the environment, enhance efficiency and productivity and has the potential to produce energy. Employment and housing growth has a direct impact upon waste produced, of all types – this in turn impacts the number of facilities required to treat, process and transfer waste both within the Study Area boundary and the wider region. Therefore, innovative opportunities to manage waste in a sustainable and resilient way should be explored. Potential initiatives that could be considered are identified below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Waste Planning Study</th>
<th>• A joint waste planning study, to ensure that the needs of the area are met, and to provide positive guidance to the respective waste planning authorities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Circular Economy Plans and Targets | • Opportunities for waste reduction though accelerating a circular economy approach identified in waste plans.  
• Engage financial institutions on circular economy investment opportunities.  
• Work with infrastructure providers on how they will contribution a more circular economy.  
• Explore potential re-use of Heathrow’s sludge. For example, at the Beckton Sewage Works sewage sludge is treated to produce biogas which is combusted to generate electricity. |
| Zero Waste to Landfill Movement | • Implement the waste hierarchy to encourage sustainable waste management. |
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3.5 Green Infrastructure

3.5.1 Methodology

Definition

This assessment will utilise the definition of Green Infrastructure and Open Space as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF):

Green Infrastructure: A network of multifunctional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality benefits for local communities.

Open Space: All open space of public value, including not just land but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity.

These definitions reflect the multifunctional nature of Green Infrastructure and Open Space and its importance beyond environmental value, to public value.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AT A GLANCE

PROJECT PORTFOLIO

- 11 Green Infrastructure projects, with a combined cost of £120 million.
- Green Infrastructure is critical to the quality of life and the local environment. The Study Area includes a range of major Green and Blue infrastructure assets, including rivers, canals, lakes and parks, the most significant of which is the Colne Valley Regional Park, managed by the Colne Valley Park Community Interest Company (CIC). The Crane Valley also contains important Green Infrastructure assets, some of which fall within the Study Area, with management overseen by the Crane Valley Partnership. Each of the HSPG local authorities managing a major public open space portfolio.
- Most projects (91%) have yet to secure funding and only 27% have planning approval for delivery.
- Projected project delivery peaks between 2021-2030 before falling to 2041, reflecting local plan-making periods and the lack of longer term planning and funding timeframes in this sector.
- None of the planned projects take account of Heathrow’s expansion, which is likely to generate a range of green and blue infrastructure impacts and mitigation opportunities (Re; Consultation 1 documents). None of these projects is included within the JEBIS as they have yet to be confirmed.

SUMMARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- Generally, there is a good supply of Green Infrastructure and Open Space across the Study Area, though there are marked disparities in public open space provision between authorities.
- Applying public open space quantitative metrics as ‘rules of thumb’ to demands arising from combined background residential growth and additional growth triggered by Heathrow’s expansion, four Boroughs would require relatively modest amounts (<200ha) of open space to satisfy requirements, with the remaining three Boroughs each requiring substantially higher levels of open space (200 – 400ha) to satisfy needs. Within this, the amount of the increase in population growth associated with Heathrow’s Expansion is a modest 16.85ha across the whole Study Area.
- Whereas competing pressures on land use may create challenges for planning for these growth needs, more local-level assessments that take account of quantity, quality and accessibility of open space provision will need to be undertaken to ensure an adequate supply pipeline.
- Colne Valley Regional Park improvements, coordinated with improvements to Crane Catchment Area represents most significant Green Infrastructure project for the HSPG, which should be considered in relation to HEP-related proposals as these evolve.
- Joint planning opportunities to integrate green and blue infrastructure improvements with other planning objectives and infrastructure investment should be explored, such as active transport and town centre renewal. Given the potential scale of green and blue infrastructure impacts and mitigation opportunities associated with HEP, there are substantial opportunities for HSPG and HAL to work together on joint strategic proposals.
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Data Source
In this assessment the Green and Open Space Strategies and Assessments prepared by each respective local authority were used to derive existing provision and local standards (Appendices H & I). These documents provide the most up to date, detailed data on green infrastructure and open space provision.

The London Borough of Hounslow and Slough Borough Council are yet to publish their full Green/Open Space Assessments/Strategies*. Therefore, there is insufficient numerical data (existing capacity and local standards) available to assess these LPAs within this study.

As they are assessments produced by the planning authority to support Local Plan Preparation, the document dates range from 2005 to 2018. This must be considered in interpreting the data extracted.

Assessment
The Open Space Assessments carried out by individual Local Planning Authorities include a range of ‘categories’ of green infrastructure and open space.

In order to provide a consistent approach across the three HSPG sub-regional areas (GLA, Surrey, Buckinghamshire / Berkshire), the following types of open space were assessed for the purposes of this study:

- Parks and gardens
- Natural and semi-natural greenspace
- Amenity greenspace
- Outdoor sports

These categories of open space are included as they are all publicly accessible, and data is available for the seven authorities included in the assessment.

For the purpose of this study, these categories will be collectively referred to as ‘Public Open Space’.

*It is recognised that both councils have begun the development of these assessments through the following documents which were requested from the relevant LPAs:

Hounslow Open Space Background Paper 2013
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3.5 Green Infrastructure (continued)

3.5.2 Existing Context

**Green Infrastructure in the Study Area**

Across the Study Area, there are a number of key Green Infrastructure and Open Space assets including:

- Colne Valley Regional Park
- The Rivers Thames, Colne, Jubilee, Brent, Duke of Northumberland and others
- The Crane Valley Catchment
- Grand Union Canal and additional canals flowing through Ealing and Hillingdon
- St Ann’s, Manor and Fleet Lakes
- Bedfont Lakes and Country Park
- Windsor Great Park

The Colne Valley Regional Park is the most significant Green Infrastructure asset in the Study Area. The 43 square mile park includes 200 miles of river and canal network as well as over 60 lakes. It is managed by the Colne Valley Park Community Interest Company (CIC), of which Slough, South Bucks, the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead and both Surrey and Buckinghamshire County Councils are members. The CIC seeks to maintain, safeguard and conserve the park and its related biodiversity.

The Crane Valley also contains important Green Infrastructure assets, some of which fall within the Study Area. Examples include Cranford Country Park, Crane Park and Crane Park Island nature reserve. The Crane Valley Partnership, (comprising of HAL and the London Boroughs of Ealing, Hounslow, Hillingdon, Harrow and Richmond-upon-Thames) works with stakeholders to coordinate the management of the valley’s green infrastructure assets.

**National Policy**

The National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF) requires LPAs to set out a strategic approach for Green Infrastructure and should protect Open Space in their Local Plans (paragraphs 96-101 and 181).

To this end, LPAs are required to undertake assessment of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and identify opportunities for new provision. The majority of the LPAs in the Study Area have undertaken such an assessment, through which many LPAs have adopted their own specific local standards for Green Infrastructure and Open Space to reflect the variability in the nature of open space provision.

**London Plan**

The current London Plan promotes a strategic network of green infrastructure and requires development proposals to incorporate linkages to the network including the Blue Ribbon Network and the wider public realm (Policy 2.18). London Borough Councils are expected to plan positively for the protection, enhancement and management of green infrastructure by supplying a benchmark standard in open space planning. This common standard allows effective cross-boundary planning, particularly relevant for metropolitan parks such as Northolt and Greenford Park.
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3.5 Green Infrastructure (continued)

The new Draft London Plan implements a ‘green infrastructure approach’ under Policy G1. This recognises the economic and social value of green space, emphasising that green infrastructure should be seen as integral element and not as an ‘add-on’ to development. The Policy states that Boroughs should prepare Green Infrastructure Strategies that implement an integrated approach to the planning, design and management of green infrastructure. The Draft Plan furthers that planning for green infrastructure should be integrated with other objectives such as: mental and physical health and well being, climate change, air and water quality, conserving and enhancing biodiversity and ecological resilience. This should be done alongside the more ‘traditional’ functions of green space such as play, sport and recreation. In addition the All London Green Grid (ALGG) is a policy framework which promotes the design and delivery of Green Infrastructure across London. It includes area frameworks which identify projects that will deliver London’s network of green infrastructure. The Brent Valley Barnet Plateau and River Crane Areas fall within the Study Area.

Local Policy
All LPAs in the Study Area support the development of Green Infrastructure through their local plan policies. For example, the London Borough of Hounslow includes ‘Maximising the benefits of our Green and Blue Infrastructure’ as one of its key spatial objectives in the Local Plan 2015. A number of authorities have developed specific policies to require developments to protect and enhance green infrastructure and open space (e.g RBWM Policy IF 4: Open Space, Local Plan Submission Version 2017).
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3.5.3 Planned Infrastructure Portfolio

The baseline data collection identified 11 green infrastructure and open space projects across the Study Area at a total cost of £120m. Of these projects, 9% have secured funding (see Figure 25b) and 27% have planning permission granted.

Whilst there are a lesser number of green infrastructure projects than other infrastructure sectors, this in part is due to the way that new public spaces are often delivered as an integral part of development proposals.

The delivery forecast for green infrastructure projects peaks between 2021-2030 before falling to 2041 (see Figure 25a), reflecting local plan-making periods and the lack of longer term planning and funding timeframes in this sector.

The majority of identified planned strategic projects across the Study Area relate to restoration, enhancement and maintenance of existing assets or the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs). There is a drive to create a network of Green Infrastructure across the Study Area, by upgrading assets and focusing upon green corridors. In addition, there are green infrastructure and open space projects associated with large scale urban extensions such as Longcross Garden Village.

The Colne Valley: A Landscape on the Edge project represents the most significant green infrastructure project within the Study Area, with a range of measures to improve access routes across the area, to conserve wildlife and habitats and to raise awareness of water consumption. There is potential for this project to include the Crane Catchment as well. At present, 21 projects have been identified including improved access routes to the area, conservation of wildlife habitats, various river related projects and water saving projects.

The Crane Valley Partnership Strategy sets out aims and objectives for how the Crane Valley catchment should be managed during the period 2018 to 2028. The strategy contains a range of initiatives that aim to improve community engagement and increase the profile of the catchment in the planning of future projects.
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3.5 Green Infrastructure (continued)

3.5.4 Summary of Strategic Green Infrastructure Projects

**Strategic project definition**

Strategic green and open space projects have been defined as those projects which cross borough boundaries. Our baseline data collection identified the projects below as strategic for the Study Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Driver / Enabler</th>
<th>Cost band (£m)</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Funding status</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G19</td>
<td>Colne Valley Regional Park</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>National Lottery Funding</td>
<td>Secured Identified Project</td>
<td>Identified Project</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic green and open space projects have been defined as those projects which cross borough boundaries. Our baseline data collection identified the projects below as strategic for the Study Area.
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3.5 Green Infrastructure (continued)

This plan provides a composite illustration of the existing infrastructure and planned strategic infrastructure projects.

The following projects are indicated on the adjacent plan and summary details are provided in the database:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G02</td>
<td>Gunnersbury Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G19</td>
<td>Colne Valley Regional Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other, non-strategic waste projects are indicated in the database.

Figure 26: Map showing existing and proposed strategic Green Infrastructure
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3.5 Green Infrastructure (continued)

3.5.5 Other AEP-related Potential Green and Blue Infrastructure Projects

In addition to the green infrastructure projects currently planned in relation to background growth, a series of green and blue infrastructure projects are being defined by HAL in support of the DCO process. A summary of these projects is provided opposite, drawn from the ‘Airport Expansion Consultation Document’ (January 2018), which was consulted on as part of the Consultation 1 exercise.

Projects specifically relating to mitigating the landscape and biodiversity impacts of airport expansion have been excluded from the JEBIS database, as have the major river diversions and water storage projects that are being considered. The scope of these projects has yet to be confirmed and will be specified as part of the DCO process in relation to the findings of environmental impact assessments.

Projects included in the JEBIS database are those which have been identified in adopted strategic planning documents and are being promoted by stakeholders. Further consideration on the impacts and opportunities of these projects in relation to the wider Green and Blue Infrastructure network will be required as the work of the HSPG moves forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green and Blue Infrastructure Proposals Contained in the ‘Airport Expansion Consultation Document’ (Heathrow Airport Limited, January 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>River Diversions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Longford River and Duke of Northumberland’s River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Colne River and Wraysbury River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Colne Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Storage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On-airport storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New upstream storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity offsets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape and visual amenity proposals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including measures to minimise adverse landscape and visual effects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.5 Green Infrastructure (continued)

3.5.6 Existing Capacity

According to data extracted from the Green Infrastructure and Open Space Assessments of the LPAs, South Bucks DC has the highest existing provision of Public Open Space at 2,056 ha and Spelthorne has the lowest provision at 544 ha (see Figure 27). No data has been provided for existing open space provision in Hounslow and Slough.

The amount of public open space varies substantially between authorities in part due to geographic characteristics, but also as a result of different approaches to planning policy. For example, the London Borough of Hillingdon benefits from the Colne Valley Regional Park. Although, as a less urban authority Spelthorne has a substantive amount of green open space, relatively little of this is publicly accessible. In part this can be attributed to relatively low public open space planning standards (Parks and Gardens in Spelthorne applies 0.04 ha per 1,000 population, which compares to Elmbridge’s 0.9ha per 1,000 population for example).

In carrying out their own individual Open Space assessments, each LPA has conducted surveys to understand the local public view toward green infrastructure. This has been used as evidence for a tailored approach to provision. For example, in Hillingdon 85% of residents said that the quality of public space and the built environment had a direct impact upon their lives and the way they feel. In Runnymede, approximately half of the respondents felt the provision of open space in the Borough was too little.

![Figure 27: Graph showing existing total ‘Public Open Space’ standards as per LPA documents](image-url)
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3.5 Green Infrastructure (continued)

3.5.7 Projected growth

As summarised in the JEBIS Stage 3 Report, each local authority is set to experience a background growth of population to 2041 and a small additional projected household growth increase arising from HEP. Figure 28 shows the additional amount of public open space arising as a result of background and HEP growth to 2041, when applying local open space standards per 1000 population.

Quantitively, each local authority in the Study Area requires between approximately 50 and 250 hectares of public open space to be provided to meet local standards. As explained in the JEBIS Stage 4 Report, the additional population growth resulting from the HEP is relatively minor. The quantity of public open space required to accompany this level of population growth equates to 16.85ha distributed across the Study Area (see table).

Figure 28 evidences that Elmbridge, Runnymede and RBWM require the most significant additional amount of public open space to satisfy their local requirements relating to population growth. However, Elmbridge and Runnymede have the greatest existing supply of Public Open Space (see Figure 28).

By comparison, South Buckinghamshire and Spelthorne require the smallest amount of additional Public Open Space to 2041, applying their local standards in relation to population growth.

It should be noted that there is a variance in local standards for public open space per 1000 population and this impacts the amount required across the Study Area as a whole. It is recommended that the relationship between the quantity and quality of existing public open space and additional needs arising from growth across Study Area as a whole is the subject of a future study to enhance the strategic understanding of Green Infrastructure and Open Space planning provision. This study could also incorporate wider categories of Green and Open Space, and be considered in relation to the opportunities for further improvement in the Colne and Crane Valleys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Additional Public Open Space required with Heathrow Expansion (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>No Data Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBWM</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>No Data Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16.85 Ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.5 Green Infrastructure (continued)

3.5.8 Impact of Growth

Whilst the local standards of public open space relate to the quantity of space per 1,000 population, Green Infrastructure assessments undertaken by local authorities assess the demand for public open space under a threefold test. This assesses:

• if the quantity of open space provided is less than standard set; and/or
• if it is recognised that the existing provision is of low quality; and/or
• if the provision is of limited accessibility.

Therefore, quality and accessibility of existing provision must also be taken account of in assessing the ability of existing provision to meet future demand.

As a result, determination of the adequacy of existing provision in relation to projected growth is beyond the scope of JEBIS and should be considered further as the joint planning process moves forward.

It is important to acknowledge that some Green Infrastructure and Open Spaces may be lost as a result of the HEP and associated adjacent developments. This would therefore lead to an increased demand and need for additional Green Infrastructure provision. However, the area of green spaces that are likely to be lost is currently unknown and hence it is not possible to consider this within the assessment. This will need to be incorporated into future assessments at a later stage in the DCO process.
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3.5 Green Infrastructure (continued)

3.5.9 Assessment

The assessment criteria are presented opposite. This assesses the requirements of each Local Authority based on the uplift requirement and identified standards. Existing planning is assessed in relation to the availability of a Green Space Strategy and specified projects. Deliverability is assessed in relation to the existence of implementation-related policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a significant need to 2041?</td>
<td>200ha of open space or less required to meet local standards.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200-400ha of open space required to meet local standards.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 401ha of open space required to meet local standards.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are needs planned for?</td>
<td>There is an existing Green Space Strategy with proposed projects.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is an existing Green Space Strategy.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no existing Green Space Strategy or existing strategy out date.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are projects deliverable?</td>
<td>Local plan policies provide the basis for green space improvements and deliverable projects are identified.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local plan policies provide the basis for green space improvements but no projects are identified for delivery.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are no local plan policies and no projects are identified for delivery.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Is there significant need?
Generally, there is a good supply of Green Infrastructure and Open Space across the Study Area, though there are marked disparities in public open space provision between authorities.

Combining background and Heathrow-specific growth, four Boroughs fall within the ‘green’ category of provision and the remaining three Boroughs marginally fall within the ‘amber’ category. An overall ‘green’ scoring has therefore been applied.

The increase in Green Infrastructure and Open Space required as a result of population growth associated with the Heathrow Expansion is a modest 16.85ha across the Study Area.

As stated previously, it will be necessary to consider the loss of open space as a result of HEP in future assessments. The likely quantity of area to be lost is currently not known but may have a significant impact on the future demand in some Boroughs.

Are the needs planned for?
The majority of the LPAs have an up-to-date Green Space assessment, though some are outdated. These relate to current Local Plan periods. Although these do not project out to 2041 a ‘green’ scoring has been applied. These do not take account of any additional demands arising from Heathrow’s expansion.

Are the projects deliverable?
There are a number of Green Infrastructure projects planned across the Study Area. All HSPG Local Authorities have Green Space policies in their local plan geared to delivering Green Infrastructure, often as an integral part of development proposals.
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3.5 Green Infrastructure (continued)

3.5.10 Considerations for Delivery

Considerations
Given the potential scale of green and blue infrastructure impacts and mitigation opportunities associated with HEP, there are substantial opportunities for HSPG and HAL to work together on joint strategic green and blue infrastructure proposals. Considerations include:

• Recognition of the multifunctional benefits of green infrastructure and open space
• Development of green infrastructure and open space strategies/assessments.
• Enhancement and improvement of existing park and open space facilities.
• Development of a network of green infrastructure and open space that compliments active travel and sustainability drivers.
• Address identified deficiencies in open space through increasing the quality of existing green infrastructure and open space.
• Prioritisation of outdoor sports provision as multifunctional green infrastructure to promote health and wellbeing.
• Protection of all existing green infrastructure and open space against development.
• Ensure that local standards (and national where appropriate) can be met and sustained.
• Ensure sustained membership support for the Colne Valley Community Interest Company and support the Colne Valley Landscape Partnership Scheme.

Colne Valley Regional Park and Crane Catchment
The Colne Valley Regional Partnership has recently secured £2.5m of National Lottery Funding to embark on a series of 19 projects including a map-based 50-year spatial vision. The HSPG have agreed to allocate Planning Delivery Fund resources to build on the current methodology and work, extending coverage to incorporate the Crane Catchment to the area north and south of Heathrow (see Figure 29). Some small adjustments to the project area may occur.

Figure 29: Map showing Colne Valley Regional Park and Crane Catchment Area around Heathrow boundary
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3.5 Green Infrastructure (continued)

**Challenges for delivery**

- **Non-statutory designation** - most parks and open space have non-statutory designations i.e. they are not statutorily protected through the planning system. This means that as local authority budgets get increasingly constrained, parks funding is one of the first items to suffer.

- **Lack of cross boundary consideration and differing standards** - the use of differing quality and accessibility standards across the Study Area can distort a strategic understanding of green infrastructure and open space. Residents will cross borough boundaries to access open space and this must be considered. In addition, the variance in quality standards (not all boroughs utilise Green Flag Standard) can prevent an effective understanding of priorities for the Study Area.

- **To address any Green Infrastructure and Open Space deficit resulting from Heathrow’s expansion and identify appropriate compensating and mitigating measures within the Study Area.**

**Potential funding sources**

In addition to conventional funding mechanisms related to development proposals, potentially forming part S106 / CIL commitments, potential funding sources include:

- **Green and blue infrastructure proposals related to the surrounding Heathrow area funded by HAL (for example related to river diversion and flood storage).**

- **Mitigating and compensating measures associated with major transport infrastructure passing through the area (such as HS2, West and Southern Rail Links), which need to be considered in relation to potential improvements being considered for the Colne Valley Regional Park.**

- **Government agency funding, such as the Environment Agency.**

- **Integration of Green and Blue Infrastructure into the scope of other multi-functional infrastructure proposals (such as major transport or utility infrastructure).**
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3.5.11 Opportunities for innovation

Green Infrastructure has multifunctional impacts which are widely recognised in national policy and by stakeholders such as Natural England. The social, economic and environmental benefits of green infrastructure are important to consider as each of the LPAs in the HSPG work toward their increased targets for planned housing growth. With increased population density, effective consideration of green infrastructure and open space will be fundamental in maintaining a positive, healthy and attractive environment.

Natural England state that Green Infrastructure needs to be ‘delivered at all spatial scales, from sub-regional to local neighbourhood levels’. There are a number of opportunities for innovation that can affect each of these scales encouraging effective development of Green Infrastructure and Open Space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue models</th>
<th>• Developing new revenue models through encouraging multifunctional uses of green space for flood risk alleviation, community uses, healthcare, sports, food and beverage etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Corridors</td>
<td>• Using the importance provided to Green Corridors across the Study Area to enhance Green Corridors in line with active travel, utilising the Corridors as a means of connecting Green Infrastructure and Open Space to develop a strategic network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Projects</td>
<td>• Ensuring that effective mitigation measures are provided with large development projects such as HS2, to ensure that measures not only mitigate but enhance the provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSPG Planning</td>
<td>• Develop a strategic HSPG wide assessment and strategy for Green Infrastructure to plan positively in relation to background growth needs as well as the additional impacts and opportunities that growth associated with the Heathrow Expansion could generate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.6 Social Infrastructure

3.6.1 Methodology

**Definition**

Social infrastructure has a variety of overlapping definitions, which broadly refer to the provision of services to support local needs in health, education, community, recreation, sports, faith and emergency facilities. The social, health and wellbeing benefits of social infrastructure are essential to consider in assessing the future need of such services and facilities. The Draft London Plan (2017) definition describes this well, saying:

Social infrastructure accounts for the services and facilities that meet local and strategic needs and contribute towards a good quality of life.

### SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE AT A GLANCE

**PROJECT PORTFOLIO**

- Significant pipeline of 69 social infrastructure projects, with a combined cost of £1.6 billion – the majority in education (36) reflecting the rapid increase in the numbers of children and young people in recent years. A range of healthcare projects are proposed in response to growing needs of an ageing population and changes in service provision.

- Recent evidence suggests that birth rates (and pressures on primary places) may have peaked (though growth still working through system) and peak secondary spaces in 2023/24.

- Three London Boroughs are predicted to experience the greatest increases ‘background’ household growth and therefore most significant increases in education, healthcare and other community needs.

- Half of these projects have an uncertain funding status and only 9% have secured planning permission.

- The vast majority of projects are planned to be delivered over the short to medium term (86% by 2030), reflecting local plan-making periods and the lack of longer term planning and funding timeframes in this sector.

- None of the planned projects take account of Heathrow’s expansion. In addition to the range of ‘hard’ social infrastructure projects being considered as part of the HEP, HAL is currently developing strategies and measures that support training and skills development with a view to creating thousands of additional apprenticeships (Re; Consultation 1 documents). None of these projects is included within the JEBIS as they have yet to be confirmed.

### SUMMARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- Background growth will continue to significantly increase the demand for the full range of different types of social infrastructure. Burdened by the public debt overhang and the growing demands on and costs of the Welfare State, continuing pressures on public resources for investment can be expected.

- Against this backdrop, additional demands arising from the increase in population growth triggered as a result of Heathrow’s expansion (calculated using standard metrics) will be relatively insignificant. However, it will be important that training, skills development and apprenticeship initiatives are aligned with projected employment needs.

- The lack of funding certainty across many of the education, healthcare and other community projects does give cause for some concern. Whilst this is not unusual given that development-related funding mechanisms are often applied (S106, CIL etc), the HSPG should monitor and seek to aid delivery where possible. There are a range of opportunities for innovations to be explored in funding, delivery, service provision and building typologies including opportunities for cross-boundary co-working.
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Data Source

An assessment of the future demand from growth between 2016-2041 have been determined based solely on population and household figures for the period 2016-2041. An assessment has been carried out using the baseline figures, and those incorporating the Heathrow Expansion.

In order to establish a demand, the population and household figures have been applied to a variety of standards across the three Social Infrastructure categories. These standards have been derived from national standards and applied on other major projects.

Reports from the Education Authorities and Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) were also used in this assessment.

Assessment

Due to the complex, wide-ranging and overlapping nature of social infrastructures, a baseline of existing capacity was not established for the Study Area. Instead, the Local Planning documents for each Local Authority were used to inform the assessment in terms of aspirations for, and approaches to, social infrastructure provisions.

Three broad categories for social infrastructure have been considered in this report:

- Education
- Health
- Community
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3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

3.6.2 Existing Context

All Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) in the Study Area promote increased provision of appropriate social infrastructure in suitable locations through their local plans. The LPAs also advocate for preserving and enhancing existing facilities, when possible, before developing new infrastructure.

Further to the preservation of existing infrastructure, Runnymede Borough Council, the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, the London Borough of Ealing and the London Borough of Hounslow all support the co-location of social facilities. For instance, schools can be used to provide other services in the evenings and at weekends.

Elmbridge Borough Council and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead encourage working in partnership with other bodies to deliver social infrastructure services and facilities.

Education

Planning for education provision is finely tuned to demographic trends. Across the Study Area these trends are leading to very substantial reductions in primary school demand (which may potentially have peaked) and peak secondary school demand, which is projected to occur in 2023/24, followed by a period of significant falls.

In terms of the statutory planning framework. The Education Act 2011 states that if a Local Authority in England needs to establish a new school in their area they must seek proposals for a new Academy and notify the Secretary of State.

Paragraph 72 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out a requirement for LPAs to take a proactive and collaborative approach to providing sufficient choice in school places.

The LPAs recognise a need for growth in the provision of educational facilities. The Surrey County Council report ‘School Organisation Plan: School Places in Surrey 2018-2027’ describes how the responsibility to provide adequate numbers of school places to meet the needs of residents is proving challenging with increasing populations. 16,000 new school places have already been created in the last five years.

Elmbridge Borough Council’s planning documents reference the need to consider independent school provision as this accounts for the education of significant numbers of children within the borough. This may not be the case for other boroughs.

The Mayor of London has set out priorities for education as follows:

- Ensuring young Londoners get the best start in life
- Providing a good school place for every child
- Supporting excellence in teaching and leadership
- Preparing Londoners for life and work in a world city

Within this context, the London Boroughs of Ealing and Hounslow are exploring potential new mixed-use education sites and support transport infrastructure in the development of new education facilities.

Further to the above, there are a number of non-physical skills and training programmes which substantially contribute to education provision across the Study Area. The University of Surrey is a significant higher education provider within the Study Area, as well as the University of West London which has a history of merging between a range of institutions. There are a number of organisations providing non-academic adult learning courses, including East Berkshire College which is also a partner of the Elevate project aiming to help 16-24 year olds in RBWM into education, employment and training.
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Health
In England there are NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), which commission most hospital and community NHS services in the geographic area they are responsible for. There are eight CCGs in the Study Area:

- NHS Surrey Downs CCG
- NHS North West Surrey CCG
- NHS Windsor, Ascot and Maidenhead CCG
- NHS Slough CCG
- NHS Chilterns CCG
- NHS Ealing CCG
- NHS Hillingdon CCG
- NHS Hounslow CCG

Several of these CCGs form part of partnerships with other neighbouring CCGs.

The NPPF outlines a broad commitment to promoting healthy communities (section 8). This refers more generally to wellbeing impacts from engagement in the planning system, creation of safe and accessible environments, access to high quality open space and so on.

The local plans for Elmbridge Borough Council and Runnymede Borough Council acknowledge that there is a higher proportion of elderly residents in each of these boroughs than regional and national average. As such, the boroughs advocate for increased health care facilities for the elderly.

Other LPAs also state a need to adapt health care facilities to cater for changing health needs.

Community
One of the strategic planning principles in the NPPF is to deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.

Paragraph 70 of the NPPF sets out requirements for local planning policies and decision making to ensure delivery of the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services that communities need.

Across the LPAs there is a strong emphasis on protecting and promoting outdoor sports grounds and recreational facilities. Overall LPAs seek to be promoting good quality of life, health and wellbeing through the provision of community facilities for leisure and recreation.
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3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

3.6.3 Planned Infrastructure Portfolio

Of the 69 planned social infrastructure projects that have been identified at a total cost of £1.5bn, the majority (36) fall under the category of education.

Education also accounts for the greatest share of funding across the three categories, however, health has a greater proportion of funding per project. This is due to the fact that health facilities are likely to be of a larger scale and budget than facilities related to education and community.

Half of these projects have an uncertain funding status (see Figure 30b) and only 9% have secured planning permission. Education, health and community projects can be expected to be delivered in shorter time scales than what is seen for some of the larger infrastructure sectors assessed, as they tend to respond to demographic and social changes at smaller scales (see Figure 30a).

Ealing has the largest number (15) of identified social infrastructure projects and Elmbridge has the fewest (2) (see Figure 30c). Due to the small-scale nature of social infrastructure, there are no identified projects that cross borough boundaries or are shared by Local Authorities.

In addition, the HAL ‘Airport Expansion Consultation Document’ (January 2018), describes how HAL is currently developing strategies and measures that support training and skills development as part of the HEP with a view to creating “5,000 additional apprenticeships, bringing the total to 10,000 by 2030.”
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3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

3.6.4 Summary of Social Infrastructure Strategic Projects

**Strategic project definition**

Strategic social infrastructure projects have been defined as those which comprise a new facility or extensive redevelopment (i.e. demolition and reconstruction) and are over £10m in value. The strategic social infrastructure projects identified in the Study Area are outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Driver / Enabler</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Status</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Planning Status</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Six locality Hubs for Healthcare</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£140m</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Hounslow Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
<td>Identified requirement</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S62</td>
<td>Royal Holloway University Growth on Campus</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£100m</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>RHUL</td>
<td>Application submitted</td>
<td>2021-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S58</td>
<td>Re-development of Heatherwood Hospital</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£90m</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>RBWM, NHS, BDP</td>
<td>Identified project</td>
<td>2023-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>Expansion to Wexham Park Hospital</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£49m</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>NHS England / CCG / Frimley Health Foundation Trust / developer contributions</td>
<td>Planning permission granted</td>
<td>2024-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Replace Gurnell Leisure Centre</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£37m</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>LB Ealing</td>
<td>Identified project</td>
<td>2021-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S59</td>
<td>Braywick Leisure Centre (Re-provision and re-location of Magnet Leisure Centre)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£32m</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>RBWM</td>
<td>Application submitted</td>
<td>2023-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47</td>
<td>St Peters Hospital Redevelopment</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£18m</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>Hospital Trust</td>
<td>Application submitted</td>
<td>2023-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>Warren Farm</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>£12m</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>LB Ealing, QPR</td>
<td>Planning permission granted</td>
<td>2024-2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

This plan provides a composite illustration of the existing infrastructure and planned strategic infrastructure projects.

The following projects are indicated on the adjacent plan and summary details are provided in the database:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Replace Gurnell Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>Warren Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>New Brentford Fountain Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47</td>
<td>St Peters Hospital Redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S62</td>
<td>Royal Holloway University Growth on Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S58</td>
<td>Re-development of Heatherwood Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S59</td>
<td>Braywick Leisure Centre (Re-provision and re-location of Magnet Leisure Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S63</td>
<td>Montem Leisure Centre Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S73</td>
<td>Slough Conference Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following projects are not indicated on the adjacent plan but summary details are provided in the database:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Six locality Hubs for Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>Expansion to Wexham Park Hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other waste projects are indicated in the JEBIS database.

Figure 31: Map showing existing and proposed strategic Social Infrastructure
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

3.6.5 Existing Capacity

Current management, maintenance and new investment is undertaken by the Local Planning Authorities, NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups and other stakeholders responsible for social infrastructure provision in relation to current and foreseen demand requirements.

A detailed baseline review of existing social infrastructure capacity was not possible due to scale of the Study Area and availability of data. It is recommended that a study of existing capacity for the Study Area is undertaken to form the basis for future strategic social infrastructure planning.

3.6.6 Population Growth and Implications for Social Infrastructure

As previously referred to in Chapter 2 and detailed in the JEBIS Stage 4 report, each of the HSPG boroughs will experience significant population growth over the coming years (see table below). Whilst this can be used as a broad indicator of the level of additional social infrastructure provision that will be required, more accurate demographic forecasting would be required (taking account of Demographic trends such as declining birth rates and an ageing population, for example) to more accurately predict medium to long term education and healthcare needs (and evaluate this in relation to existing and planned provision), which is beyond the scope of this study. The Oxford Economics forecast data does not include any calibration according to age or any other demographic data.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area Borough</th>
<th>Existing Population 2018 (000's)</th>
<th>Forecast population 2041 (000's) *</th>
<th>Population growth* (000's)</th>
<th>Population growth* (%)</th>
<th>Rank (by absolute growth)*</th>
<th>Rank (by % growth)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Combined baseline and HEP growth
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3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

3.6.7 Projected Growth and Health Impacts

**Metrics**

Requirements for social infrastructure in the area arise from the projected growth in households and residential population. The baseline assessment identifies a significant pipeline of education projects, reflecting the rapid increase in the numbers of children and young people in recent years. However, as noted in 3.6.2, recent evidence* suggests that birth rates may have peaked, at least for the time being. Although previous growth and associated pressures on school provision is still working its way through the system, this may indicate a peak in demand for primary school places is occurring, with the peak for secondary school places forecast in approximately five years time.

As noted in Chapter 2.4 and further detailed in the JEBIS Stage 4 report, the contribution of Heathrow to the substantial residential growth planned across the Study Area is likely to be minimal, given the targets set out in the Draft London Plan (2018) for the London Authorities, the draft standard methodology for the non-London authorities and the step-change this implies in comparison to recent rates of housing delivery. To the extent that authorities plan to meet these targets there is no obvious need for any additional homes to be planned as a result of the Heathrow proposals. The corresponding impact on school places and other forms of community infrastructure provision is likewise anticipated to be minimal over and above the demands arising from background growth requirements.

Nevertheless, to provide an approximate gauge of the number of school places that equate to the Heathrow-related household growth projections detailed in the JEBIS Stage 4 report, the following metrics** are applied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Figure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school children per household</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households to generate new 420 pupil 2 form entry (FE) primary school</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school children per household</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households to generate new 900 pupil 6 form entry (FE) secondary school</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These ‘rule of thumb’ metrics are based on the assumption that new schools will be provided as 2 Form Entry (FE) for primary and 6 FE for secondary, with these average child yield numbers indicating 1,680 households would generate a need for a new primary school and 5,000 households would be required to generate a need for a new secondary school (on the basis of a Year 7-11 secondary school with no 6th Form).

* See 2018 GLA School Place Demand Projections (March 2018)
** Based on the Cambridgeshire Child Yield Calculators for New Developments, September 2015 by Cambridgeshire Insights.
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3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

Findings
In terms of baseline growth, as summarised in Chapter 2.3 and further detailed in the JEBIS Stage 4 report, the three London Boroughs are predicted to experience the greatest increases in residential population, and will therefore have the most significant increases in education need. As previously noted, the impact of this on the necessary school-building programme requires detailed review. Forecasting the number of children living in new developments is an inexact process, and would require data related to dwelling size and tenure mix to predict with a reasonable degree of confidence. This would need to take account of birth rate trends previously referred to.

In terms of educational demands arising from Heathrow-related housing growth, as indicated in the opposite tables, application of the ‘rule of thumb’ metrics illustrates how negligible the impact is expected to be. What’s more, Heathrow-related housing growth is only likely to impact on demand for school places after demand is projected to have peaked (which is considered to have potentially occurred already in respect of primary places and set to occur in 2023/24 for secondary places).

Existing / Planned Strategic Projects
There is one strategic education project that has been identified to be delivered within the period 2016-2041, namely: Royal Holloway University Growth on Campus. Although the JEBIS database makes provision for higher and further education projects, an assessment of need for these sectors is excluded given the wider considered university level education, given the methodological complexities that would be required, taking account of the fact that these institutions potentially draw from a much wider catchment that the HSPG Study Area.

### Table: The application of ‘rule of thumb’ education planning metrics on HEP-related growth 2018-2041 (detailed in JEBIS Stage 4 Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>HEP-related household growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor and Maidenhead</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Application of ‘Rule of Thumb’ Metrics to HEP-related growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tot. primary school children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor and Maidenhead</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>353.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>220.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Application of ‘Rule of Thumb’ Metrics to HEP-related growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tot. secondary school children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor and Maidenhead</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>254.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>254.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

3.6.8 Projected Growth and Health Impacts

**Metrics**

The main aspects of health provision assessed are based on the following metrics from the Department for Health, which should be regarded as a ‘ready reckoner’ only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Figure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients per General Practice (GP) doctor</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings**

As with other forms of social infrastructure, given that all boroughs will be experiencing substantial baseline population growth to 2041, there will be a corresponding increase in health needs, with particular demands placed on the London boroughs.

The opposite table applies the yield metrics to the Heathrow-related population growth number arising from the JEBIS Stage 1-4 work. The impact on provision is minimal and in any event these planning needs are subsumed within the growth planning requirements required to achieve GLA and Government housing targets.

**Existing / Planned Strategic Projects**

Four strategic health projects have been identified in the Study Area for the period 2016-2041:

- Six locality Hubs for Healthcare in Hounslow
- Re-development of Heatherwood Hospital
- Expansion to Wexham Park Hospital
- St Peters Hospital Redevelopment

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Figure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patient numbers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type of Premises</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Single storey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Single storey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Two storey with staircase and lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Two storey with staircase and lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Two storey with staircase and lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Two storey with staircase and lift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: The application of ‘rule of thumb’ health planning metrics on HEP-related growth 2018-2041 (detailed in JEBIS Stage 4 Report)
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3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

3.6.9 Projected Growth and Other Community Facility Impacts

Metrics
The metrics set out were applied to the projected population figures for 2041 to provide an approximate gauge of the potential demands for other types of community facilities (other than education and healthcare-related) that the quantum of Heathrow-related residential growth set out in the JEBIS Stage 4 report would generate. These metrics should be regarded as ‘ready reckoners’ only and are derived from the Sports England Sports Facility Calculator.

Findings
As with other forms of social infrastructure, in general terms the amount of additional community facilities required will mirror the amount of population growth and the extent of housebuilding required to accommodate this across the Study Area, with particular demands being placed on the London boroughs over the study period.

The impact on population growth from the proposed expansion of Heathrow is minimal and, as such, the increases in community facilities required to directly support this population are negligible, as indicated in the opposite table.

This provision is already being provided through the application of policies contained in Local Plans and Sports and Leisure strategies, which express a commitment on behalf of each of the HSPG LPAs to encourage healthy, active lifestyles.

Rather than these facilities being planned for on an individual basis, several of the LPAs expressly support the co-location of community facilities where possible, such as school facilities used for other purposes in the evenings and at weekends.

Existing / Planned Strategic Projects
Two strategic community projects have been identified in the period 2016-2041:
- Replacement of the Gurnell Leisure Centre
- Braywick Leisure Centre (Re-provision and re-location of Magnet Leisure Centre)

Table: The application of ‘rule of thumb’ health planning metrics on HEP-related growth 2018-2041 (detailed in JEBIS Stage 4 Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Application of ‘Rule of Thumb’ Metrics to HEP-related growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>89.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>126.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>271.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>296.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>306.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor and Maidenhead</td>
<td>163.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>742.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>3504.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>2022.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The metrics for this facility provision is calculated per 1000 population, therefore across many boroughs the demand for facilities is negligible.*
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3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

3.6.10 Assessment

Each of the social infrastructure categories has been assessed based on the criteria shown opposite. This applies the amount of population growth as a proxy indicator as to whether demands for additional social infrastructure can be expected to be ‘minor’, ‘moderate’ or ‘major’ nature over the coming years to 2041.

Source data

**Education:** Local Plan documents from Local Authorities and Assessment Reports from Education Authorities have been used to inform this assessment.

**Health:** Local Plan documents from Local Authorities and reports from Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) within the Study Area have been used to inform this assessment. The assessment utilises data from the Department for Health as well as from the CCGs.

**Community:** Local planning documents and Sports and Leisure Strategies have been used as part of this assessment. Data has been collected from Sports England and LPA documents.

The scoring takes account of planned projects as well as considering the provision of new education facilities that may normally be expected in a 25-year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a significant need to 2041?</td>
<td>The level of population growth (background and Heathrow-related growth) across the Study Area would require minor additional social infrastructure (education, healthcare and other community facilities).</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate levels of additional social infrastructure (education, healthcare and other community facilities) required to service the combination of background growth and additional Heathrow-related growth across the Study Area beyond that currently being planned for.</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major additional social infrastructure (education, healthcare and other community facilities) required to service the combination of background growth and Heathrow-related growth across the Study Area beyond that currently being planned for.</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are needs planned for?</td>
<td>There are both short-medium term and long term plans relating to social infrastructure provision, which include identified projects that equate to the level of identified need.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are sufficient short-medium term plans relating to social infrastructure, which include projects that equate to the level of identified need in the short-medium term, but no longer term planning.</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans relating to social infrastructure do not sufficiently address short, medium or long term requirements and planned projects do not equate to the level of identified need.</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are projects deliverable?</td>
<td>There are projects identified within current planning periods that seek to address needs, the majority of which have secured funding and a more certain planning status.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are projects identified within current planning periods that seek to address needs, but funding and planning status is uncertain.</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The projects identified are not within current planning periods and delivery proposals are absent or too vague to be relied upon.</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

Is there significant need?

Education Facilities

Background growth will continue to generate a significant need for both primary and secondary schools – though this will vary across the Study Area (with greatest demand in the London boroughs) and demographic change (including declining birth rates). Of this growth, additional physical infrastructure needs attributable to Heathrow’s growth will be negligible, though there are major skills development, training and apprenticeship needs and HAL is developing a major skills development programme as part of the HEP.

Health Facilities

There are significant background growth pressures, alongside major fiscal constraints and shifts in demographic profile (such as an ageing population) that create additional challenges. The predicted population growth resulting directly from Heathrow is small and associated additional demands on provision marginal.

Other Community Facilities

Overall population growth will generate substantive additional needs for community facilities, within which the amount of community space that can be attributed to Heathrow’s expansion is not considered to be significant. The differences in community space required with and without Heathrow expansion range from 6-228 sqm per borough, with an average of 54 sqm.

Are the needs planned for?

Across the Study Area there is range of planned provisions for additional new and expanded primary and secondary education facilities in relation to background growth over the short-medium term. Six of the nine local authorities already have planned projects intended to address projected demand over the current planned period.

Whilst has not been possible to accurately assess whether planned provision is in line with rising healthcare needs, there is a range of projects in the planning pipeline, with a greater number of projects planned for hospital provision than for GP surgeries. GP-related projects have been identified in four of the nine local authorities.

A wide range of community facilities are contained within the database. The majority of the planned projects across the Study Area are leisure centres, which include a number of sports facilities as well as general community space. Only four of the local authorities have existing plans for additional community facility projects.

Are the projects deliverable?

For primary school provision, generally there are clear delivery arrangements in place for short-medium term provision. Three of the local authorities have projects that have been scored as ‘green’ for deliverability with a further four have been scored as ‘amber’. For secondary school provision, there is a degree of uncertainty. Two of the local authorities have projects that have been scored as ‘green’ with a further four that have been scored as ‘amber’.

Across the four local authority areas with identified GP projects, only one of these has clear delivery arrangements in place. However, in the six hospital projects, half of these have confirmed delivery mechanism specified.

Of the four local authorities with planned community projects, two have clearly identifiable delivery arrangements in place.
Social Infrastructure Findings

The table below sets out the assessment for social infrastructure averages across all of the LPAs. Generally, there is a significant need for new social infrastructure provision within the Study Area arising from substantive population growth, particularly in the London boroughs. There are relatively low levels of projects planned to accommodate this need and, in many instances, planned projects do not yet have secured delivery arrangement. Though raises some concerns, in part this can be expected given the short-medium term planning periods and the fact that much social infrastructure will be delivered and funded through Section 106 and CIL arrangements accompanying planning proposals, for example.

Limitations

The rate of projected population growth per borough is used as a proxy indicator only for the scale of additional social infrastructure that can be expected to be required. As previously stated, a more accurate assessment would require demographic modelling.

Hospital provision is recognised as fundamental and provision is planned for at the regional/national level and it was not within the scope of this study to compare the need and planned provision of hospitals at an HSPG-wide or LPA level. This would require detailed data to be obtained from CCGs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Infrastructure Needs assessment</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a significant need?</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are needs planned for?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are projects deliverable?</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

3.6.11 Considerations for Delivery

**Considerations**

- Taking a strategic approach to planning for Special Education Needs School provision, to ensure sufficient access across the area and a co-ordinated approach
- Considering the demands and existing school provision in neighbouring Local Planning Authority boundaries to create a realistic understanding of education need
- Incorporating community facilities into new education developments, creating mixed-use and attractive environments for all
- Encouraging collaborative working across Clinical Commissioning Groups to provide strategic approach to healthcare provision
- Prioritising the delivery of mixed-use centres for community facilities ensuring space for sports, child care, youth centres, advice centres and libraries
- Retaining and enhancing existing community facilities where possible

**Challenges**

- Varied School Provision - considering the existing provision of private (fee-paying) schools and faith schools in wider area in education forecasting. Ensuring a sufficient understanding of education facility demands and personal preferences in different places
- Healthcare provision for varied population: providing for needs of increasingly ageing population, whilst also planning for influx of working age population as a result of the expansion. Ensuring that hospital provision is effectively considered and planned for at a strategic level
- Demographic trends (such as declining birth rates and an ageing population) and the needs to adjust education, healthcare and other community services accordingly.

**Potential funding sources**

In addition to conventional funding mechanisms related to Government educational health and other community-service providers, much social infrastructure will be provided via S106 / CIL mechanisms linked to development proposals. Additional potential funding sources include:

- providing flexible working space within facilities to be utilised by local residents/start ups/companies with agile working capabilities at a fee that is cross-subsidised by more commercial facilities.
- providing contracts for a private gym and/or health club as part facility to provide upfront funding and partnership.
3. Infrastructure Needs Assessment

3.6 Social Infrastructure (continued)

3.6.12 Opportunities for innovation

| Encourage Healthy and Active School Travel | • Incorporate bus and rail links into education planning, encourage access via pedestrian routes, cycling routes and green corridors where possible.  
• In planning new schools, ensure that catchment area for pupils is small enough to facilitate active transport by some means. |
| Health Hubs | • Ensure a wider, more varied provision of healthcare in individual locations, providing more than GP service and accessibility across demographics.  
• Locating these services in the most easily accessible locations for the wider community and ensuring that the majority of the population have easy access, with consideration for cross-boundary availability. |
| Multi-functional Community Facilities | • Explore opportunities to combine community facilities into multi-functional, hybrid buildings – providing a one-stop-shop approach and efficiencies in operation. |
| Cross-Boundary School Catchments | • Where appropriate, undertake cross-boundary planning in relation to school catchments and the implications of projections in changing demographics. |
4. Building on the evidence base
4.1 Next Steps

This JEBIS Stage 5 Report provides an evidence base with a foundation of research that relates to the existing planned infrastructure pipeline that is proposed to support ‘background growth’ within the Study Area to 2041.

Added to this, by drawing on Oxford Economics employment and housing growth projections, as detailed in JEBIS Reports Stages 1 to 4, this JEBIS Stage 5 Report identifies potential additional infrastructure needs of a strategic nature for consideration across the Study Area as a result of layering Heathrow expansion-related growth on top of current background growth expectations.

The JEBIS Reports and associated databases therefore provide a common resource that HSPG Members and HAL can use to help assess and evaluate HEP proposals as these are formulated.

The excel database summarising the planned infrastructure project pipeline is intended to provide a dynamic resource that enables information to be updated as and when this is required.

Beyond the preparation of the current JEBIS Reports, the next steps are envisaged to include:

- Continued ongoing engagement and collaboration between HSPG Members and HAL to discuss the JEBIS findings and their implications.
- Further sector-specific analytical and planning work where this would be beneficial, particularly where infrastructure projects of a strategic scale traverse individual authority boundaries.
- Discussion around a coordinated approach towards a Joint Strategic Planning Framework.
APPENDIX A – Fixed line broadband – Example Sampling

Utility analysis (related to Chapter 3.3)
HSPG Post code sampling with mapping information for quality of broadband access (Source: OFCOM)

A1.1 Broadband ratings (RG10 0JH) – Substandard performance at Standard access, good performance at Superfast access, no ultrafast access

A1.2: Mapping information – for area (substandard patchy coverage)
APPENDIX A – Fixed line broadband – Example Sampling

Utility analysis (related to Chapter 3.3)
HSPG Post code sampling with mapping information for quality of broadband access (Source: OFCOM)

A2.1 Broadband ratings – SL1 1JP – moderate performance at standard access, good performance at Superfast access, no ultrafast access

A 2.2 mapping information – for area moderate to well served, no ultrafast coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Broadband Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL1 1JP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows what broadband services are available in your area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Download Speed</th>
<th>Upload Speed</th>
<th>Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>16 Mbps</td>
<td>1 Mbps</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superfast</td>
<td>80 Mbps</td>
<td>20 Mbps</td>
<td>☢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultrafast</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Find out what these results mean ▼ View map of available services ▶
APPENDIX B – Utility Cost Assumptions

Utility analysis (related to Chapter 3.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Cost per new connection (household)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>£1,900</td>
<td>Arup Internal due diligence project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>SSE’s Online Calculator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>£4,400 Thames Water £3,000 Affinity Water</td>
<td>Arup Benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Infrastructure</td>
<td>£500 BT Openreach</td>
<td>FTTP on Demand Connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C – Population proportions applied across Waste Authority Areas

As the majority of these documents report waste generation data for the entirety of a waste planning authority area, in order to include only those districts of each authority area that fall into the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group area, the waste generation data for each waste planning authority were proportioned according to the district populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Authority</th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Population Proportion Applied*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West London Waste Authority</td>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire County Council</td>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire County Council</td>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 2016 Census Information.
APPENDIX D – Waste Data Interrogator

Environment Agency’s Waste Data Interrogator (WDI) tool was used to obtain information on the quantities of waste received at different waste operating facilities across the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group area for the period 2006-2015.

The WDI provides information based on annual waste throughputs* for the different waste operating facilities. However, it does not provide information on the permitted operating capacity** of these facilities. The annual throughput of waste transfer and treatment facilities is likely to indicative of the practical capacity.

The following information was obtained from the WDI for each operating waste facility found in the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group area for each year in the period 2006-2015:

- District in which the facility was located (e.g. Ealing);
- Name of the facility operator (e.g. Ealing London Borough Council);
- Type of facility (e.g. waste transfer station); and
- Annual throughput for each facility (e.g. 3,211 tonnes/annum).

Any facilities that were deemed to be outside the scope of the waste capacity projections, were removed from the WDI datasets, and were not used in the projection analysis process. Facilities removed primarily included private businesses not accepting waste on a municipal or merchant basis; examples of such facilities include:

- Thorpe Park; and
- Oakland Golf Club.

Waste capacity – Incineration facilities

Incineration facilities are not reported in the WDI. However, incineration data is publically available from the Environment Agency’s annual waste management report for England. Unlike other waste facilities, the permitted waste capacity for incineration facilities are reported, however, the actual and projected waste capacities used in this Note, are based on annual waste throughputs, for consistency purposes. As with waste transfer and treatment facilities, the annual waste throughput of incineration facilities is thought to be representative of each incineration facility’s capacity.

Although incineration throughput data is available for 2016, this data was not used in the analysis, to ensure consistency. An overview of the data for 2016 showed that no new incineration facilities became operational, and no existing facilities ceased to operate in the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group area in 2016 when compared to 2015. In addition, the waste throughputs of all facilities remained at similar levels when compared to 2015.

---

*Annual waste throughput is the total quantity of waste entering a waste operating facility over a period of one year.
**Permitted capacity is the maximum waste quantity that a site is legally allowed to handle at any one.
APPENDIX D – Waste Data Interrogator

**Waste capacity – Disposal sites**

The WDI was also used to obtain annual waste throughput information for waste disposal sites (i.e. landfill sites). However, for landfill sites, the annual throughput does not give an indication of the ultimate capacity of the site. Available void space is the clearest indicator of landfill waste capacity.

Actual void space for the landfill sites in the Study Area was obtained for the years 2015 and 2016. These are the only years for which the Environment Agency has published Remaining Landfill Capacity datasets.

The void space at the end of 2015 and the void space data at the end of 2016 were compared. The difference between the void space at the end of 2015 and the void space at the end of 2016 was calculated.

It should be noted that the Environment Agency’s Remaining Landfill Capacity dataset for 2015 includes some landfill sites that do not appear in the WDI of 2015. This is likely to be the case for two potential reasons:

- Some landfill sites may not have submitted their waste data returns to the Environment Agency in 2015; and/or
- Some landfill sites may not have accepted any waste in 2015

---

*Annual waste throughput is the total quantity of waste entering a waste operating facility over a period of one year.

**Permitted capacity is the maximum waste quantity that a site is legally allowed to handle at any one.
APPENDIX E – Landfill Void Space

Landfill void space comparison to landfill throughput in 2015

The table below shows remaining void space available at each of the permitted sites in the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group area. The data shows that some of the landfill sites (e.g. Ingrebourne Valley Ltd and Veolia ES Landfill Limited) have significant capacity (void space) remaining, while others have reached the end of their lifetime (e.g. Brett Aggregates Ltd and Shepperton Aggregates). The difference in void space between 2015 and 2016 shows us the approximate rate at which void space is decreasing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Landfill type</th>
<th>Void space at end of 2015 (m$^3$)</th>
<th>Void space at end of 2016 (m$^3$)</th>
<th>Void space reduction between 2015 and 2016 (m$^3$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Streeter (Sand &amp; Ballast) Ltd</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>464,925</td>
<td>353,603</td>
<td>111,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerbuild Limited</td>
<td>Land restoration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappagh Public Works Limited</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemex U K Materials Ltd</td>
<td>L04 - Non Hazardous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biffa Waste Services Ltd</td>
<td>L04 - Non Hazardous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham Group Contracting Limited</td>
<td>Land restoration</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayflex (Aggregates) Ltd</td>
<td>L05 - Inert Landfill</td>
<td>811,600</td>
<td>747,000</td>
<td>64,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Aggregates Ltd</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrebourne Valley Ltd</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>1,888,419</td>
<td>1,802,329</td>
<td>86,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmac Trading Limited</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>39,819</td>
<td>29,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerleaze</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>-400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veolia ES Landfill Limited</td>
<td>Non Hazardous Merchant Landfill</td>
<td>10,473,851</td>
<td>10,098,726</td>
<td>375,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappagh Public Works Ltd</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>113,439</td>
<td>101,154</td>
<td>12,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepperton Aggregates</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>90,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI Land Limited</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimated years of remaining void space for landfill sites based on 2015 data

The landfill sites in the table below are reported in annual waste throughput order, from largest to smallest. This helps to understand the level of contribution of each landfill site to the overall management of the waste generated in the Study Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Landfill type</th>
<th>Void space reduction between 2015 and 2016 (m³)</th>
<th>Years of void space remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veolia ES Landfill Limited</td>
<td>Non Hazardous Merchant Landfill</td>
<td>375,125</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Aggregates Ltd</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Streeter (Sand &amp; Ballast) Ltd</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>111,322</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepperton Aggregates</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>90,750</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrebourne Valley Ltd</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>86,090</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayflex (Aggregates) Ltd</td>
<td>L05 - Inert Landfill</td>
<td>64,600</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmac Trading Limited</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>29,181</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerbuild Limited</td>
<td>Land restoration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappagh Public Works Ltd</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>12,285</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemex U K Materials Ltd</td>
<td>L04 - Non Hazardous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biffa Waste Services Ltd</td>
<td>L04 - Non Hazardous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerleaze</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
<td>-400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappagh Public Works Limited</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham Group Contracting Limited</td>
<td>Land restoration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI Land Limited</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F – Strategic Waste Project Definition

The permitted waste management facilities in the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group area that contributed to waste management capacity, accepted 6,582,426 tonnes of waste in 2015; this quantity was managed at 100 facilities. Of the total quantity of waste accepted at facilities in the area, only 28,600 tonnes (approximately 0.4%) was classified as hazardous waste. It is therefore clear that the threshold at which a facility should be considered strategically significant should be separate and lower for facilities permitted to accept hazardous waste.

**Inert and non-hazardous waste**

Of the 100 active waste facilities in the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group area, the average quantity accepted in 2015 was 66,000 tonnes. There were 32 facilities reporting have accepted quantities of waste above the average, ranging from 66,000 tonnes (Biffa Waste Services Ltd landfill site in Slough) up to 557,171 tonnes (L Lynch Ltd waste transfer station). Combined, the 32 facilities accepting above average quantities of waste, accepted more than 81% of the total quantity of waste managed in the area.

If any of these facilities were to close, it would have an appreciable impact on the capacity in the area and would be of strategic significance. Based on the capacity of these facilities, it is proposed to set 66,000 tonnes per annum of inert and non-hazardous waste management capacity, as the threshold at which a waste facility is considered to be strategically significant.

**Strategic Project Threshold:** Inert and non-hazardous waste projects are classified as strategic if they have a management capacity of 66,000 tonnes per annum and over.

**Hazardous waste**

The National Policy Statement for Hazardous Waste sets the threshold for nationally significant hazardous waste management infrastructure at 100,000 tonnes per annum in the case of disposal of hazardous waste by landfill, or 30,000 tonnes per year in any other case. However, the use of these thresholds in the context of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group area would be inappropriate, due to the lower quantities of waste managed.

Approximately 78% of the hazardous waste accepted at waste facilities in the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group area in 2015, was managed at six facilities, ranging from 1,138 tonnes (Agrivert anaerobic digestion facility) to 10,460 tonnes (London Auto Parts Ltd end of life vehicle dismantlers). If any of these facilities were to close, it would have an appreciable impact on the capacity in the area and would be of strategic significance. Based on the capacity of these facilities, it is proposed to set 1,100 tonnes per annum of hazardous waste management capacity, as the threshold at which a waste facility is considered to be strategically significant.

**Strategic Project Threshold:** Hazardous waste projects are considered strategic if they have a management capacity of 1,100 tonnes per annum and over.
## APPENDIX G – Public Open Space Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPA</th>
<th>Public Open Space</th>
<th>Local Standard Identified (ha per 1,000 population)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>Public Open Space</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>Green Spaces Strategy 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>Recreational Open Space*</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Open Space Strategy 2011-2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBWM</td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>RBWM Open Space Audit 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural/ Semi-Natural</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Sports</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>South Bucks and Chiltern Joint Open Space Study 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural/ Semi-Natural</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Sports</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>Elmbridge Open Space and Recreation Assessment (OSRA) 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Open Space Study (Amended Version) February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural/ Semi-Natural</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Sports</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Assessment of Open Space, Sport and Recreation Provision in Runnymede 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural/ Semi-Natural</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Sports</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>Amenity Green Space</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural/ Semi-Natural</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Sports</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hillingdon have a standard for ‘All Open Space’ of 6.0ha per 1,000 population which includes Semi-Natural/Natural space, taking account of Colne Valley Regional Park. The Recreational Open Space standard was applied to be more consistent with other London borough standards.
APPENDIX H – Public Open Space Existing and Projected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPA</th>
<th>Total Existing Public Open Space (Ha)</th>
<th>Additional Demand as result of Heathrow (Ha)</th>
<th>Central Demand to 2041 (Ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Green Space, Parks and Gardens, Natural/Semi Natural. Outdoor Sports</td>
<td>Central Projection - Background Projection</td>
<td>(Central population data x local standard)- Existing Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>610.58</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>130.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>1660.28</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>-939.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>No quantifiable data available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBWM</td>
<td>1194.96</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>402.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>3159.08</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>-2768.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>No quantifiable data available</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>1732.6</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>359.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>1477.54</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>462.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>543.93</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>115.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Surplus likely due to Colne Valley Regional Park
**Surplus likely related to much lower local standards
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SUMMARY REPORT & POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING

JOINT EVIDENCE BASE AND INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY

OCTOBER 2018
DISCLAIMER: This paper is part of the Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study, prepared jointly by Arup and Quod. This work is draft. The findings and conclusions in this paper represent the views of consultants. They do not form part of the evidence base for any current or draft Local Plans. No policy conclusions can be drawn from this paper; it is necessary background work to inform joint working associated with a potential DCO application relating to the expansion of Heathrow Airport.
1 Introduction

The Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study (JEBIS) was commissioned by Heathrow Airport Limited and Heathrow Strategic Planning Group to understand the implications for strategic planning in the area of the proposed third runway and expansion at Heathrow Airport. This report summarises the five-stage process (each of which has its own separate report) and identifies possible implications for strategic planning. The study is accompanied by a database of information which will allow findings to be updated as more detailed information becomes available through the planning process for Heathrow.

Purpose and Scope

1.1 The Joint Evidence Base and infrastructure Study (JEBIS) was commissioned by Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) and the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group (HSPG).

1.2 The intention of the Study was to provide an evidence base for the authorities in the study area, in the context of the wider region and sub-region, concerning the potential impacts of the expansion of Heathrow Airport in addition to planned ‘background’ growth in the sub-region. The evidence base looks principally at potential impacts on the local economy, labour market and associated demand for employment land and housing. It assesses associated infrastructure requirements to support this level of development.

1.3 Although this summary report provides some broad conclusions as to the types of issues and options facing the Authorities in developing planning policy – both strategic and local – it is not intended to suggest any particular conclusions. Instead the Authorities and other partners can use the evidence base to develop the approach in the context of their own priorities and wider strategic and national policy guidance.

1.4 The evidence in the five reports is, where possible, provided in electronic format in a way that can be updated by the partners from time to time as new information becomes available, and the Airport expansion proposals are developed.

Proposals for Heathrow Expansion

1.5 The Airports Commission examined the need for additional UK airport capacity and made a report to the Secretary of State for Transport on 1 July 2015. Following its analysis of the report, on 25 October 2016, the Government announced its preference for a third runway to be developed at Heathrow.

1.6 The National Policy Statement (NPS) was designated by Parliament in June 2018 following consultation. This states that:

“The policies in the Airports NPS will have effect in relation to the Government’s preferred scheme, having a runway length of at least 3,500m and enabling at least 260,000 additional air transport movements per annum. It will also have effect in relation to terminal infrastructure associated with the Heathrow Northwest Runway Scheme and the reconfiguration of terminal facilities in the area between the two existing runways at Heathrow airport.”

1.7 An Illustrative Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme masterplan is appended to the NPS which is shown overleaf. Its status is described in paragraph 4.11. This suggests an expansion of the Airport footprint to the Northwest which will displace some existing uses and will also have a range of direct social, economic and environmental impacts.

1.8 Heathrow Airports Limited are required to apply for a Development Consent Order for the project and associated development. In doing so they are required to follow a statutory process of consultation and engagement on the proposed project and its impacts before formally submitting an application.
1.9 Consultation will occur. This will happen during the remainder of 2018 and through 2019 and until this is completed there will be no final Masterplan on which impacts can be assessed.

1.10 At this stage therefore the JEBIS work, which is considering potential impacts on the wider area is based on assumptions from information published as part of the Airports Commission consultation and the subsequent statutory process in relation to the NPS. This is explained in further detail below and in the five ‘stage’ reports.

1.11 There will be an obvious interaction between the proposals, specifically for the Airport within the DCO application, and how that interacts with the wider area, particularly in the immediate authorities (Hillingdon, Hounslow, Spelthorne and Slough). This issue is the subject of ongoing engagement between the HSPG authorities and HAL and the JEBIS work will inform this discussion. This is dealt with further in Sections 5 and 6 below.

The Study Area

1.12 A Study Area was defined in partnership with the HSPG group, and following Planning Practice Guidance approach to defining commercial property markets and housing market areas. The approach to this is set out in Section 2 of the Stage 1 report.

1.13 This found that the HSPG area is very similar to the Heathrow and Slough Travel to Work area and also contains the authorities accounting for a high proportion of current Heathrow employees. All of the authorities in the Core Study Area are members of the HSPG, apart from LB Hillingdon. This is shown in Figure 2 below.

1.14 The Study also includes other spatial areas for assessment. This includes a wider sub-regional area incorporating the Elizabeth Line West sub-area in the Draft New London Plan (2018) and the Thames Valley Berkshire, Buckinghamshire Thames Valley and M3 LEP areas. It also includes current labour market catchment areas, and property market areas for logistics and offices.
Methodology

1.15 The Methodology of the study was agreed with the HSPG group. This involved a five-stage incremental process as set out in Box 1. Each stage involved a presentation of the interim findings in a workshop with the HSPG group and their approval of key inputs for the subsequent stage.

1.16 The analysis considered the full range of top down and bottom up forecasts against background growth in 5 yearly phases to 2041, through construction until utilisation of new airport capacity is fully established.

1.17 Each stage was brought together into a Draft Report that was issued to the group for comment before the reports were finalised. This report brings together a summary of the findings of each stage and identifies some suggested approaches that HSPG may wish to consider in future strategic planning.

Box 1

The 5 Stage Process

Stage 1:
Baseline Analysis
Heathrow Growth Scenarios

Stage 2:
Combined Growth Projections to Input to Economic Model

Stage 3
Employment, Property and Labour Market Implications from ‘Oxford Economics’ Model
‘Bottom Up’ Implications from Lichfields’ Floorspace Demand Study

Stage 4:
Labour Force, Population and Household projections and Implications

Stage 5:
Infrastructure Assessment and Issues
2 Growth Scenarios and Forecasts (Stages 1 and 2)

The starting point for the Study was to understand the projected growth arising from the Heathrow proposals and how they related to background growth already assumed and/or planned for in the area. This involved a detailed review of the eight assessments that have been undertaken to date – by HAL themselves, the Airports Commission, the Department for Transport and on behalf of Local Authorities. Two core ‘scenarios’ were agreed with HSPG to input to Oxford Economics model of the area to test wider economic and demographic impacts.

Current Position at Heathrow

2.1 Heathrow Airport Ltd undertakes a regular Employment Survey to understand the amount of people who work at the Airport. The two most recent published surveys (2008/9 and 2013/14) identify approximately 76,000 people working at the Airport.

2.2 These are people who work for an employer located within the boundary of the Airport, HAL’s Compass Centre and British Airways’ Waterside HQ. This is a ‘headcount’ figure. This forms the basis for estimates of ‘Direct’ employment. Details of the employer and job types are set out in Section 3 of the Stage 1 report.

2.3 Optimal Economics undertook a wider assessment for HAL in 2011 to understand how many jobs were supported in the wider area. In addition to the 76,000 on site. This identified several further categories of employment: Direct Off-Airport employment: 7,700 jobs, Indirect Employment: 11,800 ‘local’ jobs, Induced Employment: 18,600 ‘local’ jobs. This gave a total local employment attributed to the Airport of 114,000.¹

2.4 This data is survey based and therefore remains the most reliable assessment of local impacts. Several of the subsequent studies have used this assessment as a basis for their own modelling of current and future relationships.

‘Top-Down’ Assessments of Potential Growth

2.5 The JEBIS study has then reviewed in detail the methodologies used to project current and future employment at Heathrow. These are:

- Regeneris (2013) London Heathrow Economic Impact Study
- Parsons Brinkerhoff/Berkeley Hanover (2013), Heathrow Employment Impact Study
- Frontier Economics, for HAL, (2014), Employment Impacts from Growth at Heathrow
- Airports Commission (2014/2015) Local Economic Impacts Assessment

2.6 A detailed description of the methodology and findings of each study is set out in Section 3 of the Stage 1 report.

2.7 The Regeneris and Parsons Brinkerhoff studies were undertaken for local stakeholders and for the most part seek to provide a ‘re-scaled’ version of the Optimal Economics assessment but for different geographical areas.

¹ For Optimal Economics ‘Local’ was defined as Hillingdon, Hounslow, Spelthorne, Ealing, Slough
2.8 The Parsons Brinkerhoff Study also introduced the concept of ‘Catalytic Effects’ essentially seeking to identify those businesses that have a wider market area and are not airport (or air passenger transport) serving but are attracted locate in the area because of the proximity of the airport. It suggests that for Hounslow, Slough and Ealing these impacts would be more significant than the direct, indirect and induced employment.

2.9 Frontier Economics Study for HAL uses the relationship between passenger numbers, air traffic movements and employment with the Heathrow Employment Survey as base. This assessment which formed part of the ‘Taking Britain Further’ submission to the Airports Commission in 2014, forecast 35,600 additional direct jobs at Heathrow by 2040. This assessment will be updated in due course.

2.10 The Airports Commission undertook two studies to inform their reports, in 2014 and 2015. These were produced by PWC and included (for ‘Local’ impacts) Direct, Indirect and Induced Employment. This included ranges for the scale of impact and different reference dates. A separate assessment was undertaken of net impact on UK job creation using complex econometric modelling.

2.11 The Airports Commission studies provide the best assessment of the total Direct, Indirect and Induced impacts at the ‘Local’ level, which covers an area larger than the HSPG Core area but smaller than the regional assessment. It includes an ‘end’ (2050) position of between 28,100 and 41,400 additional direct jobs at Heathrow. It is worth noting that Heathrow’s own assessment sits at the centre of this range.

Box 2

**Types of Employment Impact**

**Direct Employment**: Employment by business operating within the Airport boundary or wholly providing services or activities to the airport and its users

**Indirect Employment**: Firms providing goods and services to the ‘direct employment’ businesses

**Induced Employment**: Employment supported by the expenditure of employees of the direct and indirect employers

**Catalytic Employment**: Employment generated by companies locating close to the airport because of its connectivity, and/or employment generated in the wider economy because of the effects of enhanced trade links due to network effects

‘Bottom-Up’ Assessment of Potential Demand for Land for Employment Uses

2.12 HAL commissioned Lichfields to produce an Employment Land Forecasting Study to inform its engagement with HSPG and establish the current extent of airport related and supporting development is and might be in the future. This study contains two parts, a ‘current state assessment’ to identify the baseline position for employment land related to the Airport and a ‘future state assessment’ which makes projections based on scaling up floorspace demand in key sectors in line with projected increased Air Traffic Movements, passenger numbers and cargo.
Figure 3: Lichfield’s Floorspace and Land Requirements by 2040: with Expanded Runway (Carbon Traded & Carbon Capped) and Existing Runway (2R Constrained)

2.13 Unlike the other studies the outcomes are expressed as areas of floorspace rather than as employment numbers. For the purposes of spatial planning the findings of the study will inform both Heathrow’s Masterplan and the response of the Local Authorities in whether/how they seek to provide capacity for the uses that are not provided on the Airport.

2.14 Figure 3 shows the Lichfield’s data, for floorspace and land requirements based on these scenarios. This includes uses displaced by the physical expansion of the Airport. These requirements have been translated into indicative jobs numbers to test them against the ‘top down’ assessment described above.

2.15 The identified ‘additional’ floor area required equates to around 50,000 jobs, although this will not all be net additional and will include parts of the direct, indirect and catalytic employment forecasts.

2.16 HAL has been peer reviewing the findings of the Study in relation to Industry and Warehousing Uses and updating the position on hotels. This information will be shared with the HSPG authorities and the implications for JEBIS will be updated in response to this.

3 Full details of the methodology are set out in the two reports (Lichfields 2018). This includes a ‘straight line’ extrapolation of growth in Airport activity to growth in land uses. This assumption will need to be tested in planning for growth.
Area Baseline and Context

2.17 The expansion of the Airport will take place in the context of an area with a very large economy and population. It will also happen over a 20 to 30 year period, in which the economy will go through several economic cycles and is predicted to grow significantly.

2.18 The Core HSPG area is currently home to around 1 million jobs and 1.6 million people. Even without factoring in the third runway at Heathrow trend-based forecasts by Oxford Economics suggest that by 2041 employment could grow by around 130,000 and population by around 250,000. This would be the equivalent of a town the size of Reading or a new London Borough.

2.19 The Local Authorities are already working to consider how to Plan to meet this growth. This includes joint working across Housing Market Areas. This is summarised in the Stage 1 and Stage 2 reports, including current forecasts.

Scenarios for Testing Additionality

2.20 In order to understand the potential 'additionality' of the top down and bottom up assessments described above it was agreed that some scenarios would be run through Oxford Economics' macro-economic model.

2.21 The inputs to the model are the direct employment forecasts broken down by sector and location. The model then calculates indirect and induced employment by Local Authority and identifies where those taking the jobs would live and the impact on (among other things) commuting and household numbers.

2.22 In order to provide these inputs modelling of the likely sectoral breakdown of jobs based on the Heathrow Employment Survey and official data (See Stage 2 report) was undertaken. The direct jobs were then split between Hillingdon and Hounslow boroughs on the basis of the current split in air transport related jobs, again based on ONS data.

2.23 It was agreed that two scenarios would be run, one based on the HAL forecast of direct employment and one based on the Airport Commission. This was on the basis that the identification of direct employment is clear in each model, including assumptions about dates. Effectively the Heathrow figure provides a 'central case' and the Airports Commission a 'high end' scenario.

### Figure 4. Direct Employment Scenarios for Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>HAL</th>
<th>AC/DFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 to 2021</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 to 2026</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027 to 2031</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031 to 2042</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0 (possible fall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct</td>
<td>35,600</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Implications for the Labour Market, Property Market, Housing and Economic Growth (Stages 3 and 4)

The Oxford Economic Model

3.1 As described above the Oxford Economics model is an integrated model, based on the observed interrelationship between demographic and economic indicators. The model is ‘trend based’ and therefore extrapolates forward existing relationships.

3.2 For the purposes of this study it should therefore be seen as a ‘do as now’ model in terms of sectoral and demographic trends. It does not make assumptions on the basis of policy decisions eg. the decision on the third runway or housing targets, but its datasets are based on existing sectoral strengths and rates of demographic growth and therefore housing delivery.

3.3 It does not assume that any pro-active actions are taken by HAL, or by local partners to capture growth in the area including catalytic growth.

Employment Growth

3.4 Full details of the economic and employment outcomes are set out in the Stage 3 and 4 reports, and the detailed data is in the associated spreadsheets provided to the HSPG members supporting the JEBIS work. The table below shows the baseline projected employment growth for the Core Study Area authorities, and the additional Heathrow growth. This is workplace-based employment, from a trend based ‘top down’ model.

3.5 This shows the vast majority of employment growth, without additional actions to capture it, will take place in Hillingdon and Hounslow. However, this is to some extent an arbitrary extrapolation of how employment is currently recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment growth 2018-2041</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Additional in Heathrow central case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>17,985</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>21,216</td>
<td>29,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>36,196</td>
<td>17,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>12,124</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>9,979</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>10,860</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>7,894</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</td>
<td>12,520</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 As noted above direct employment can be both on and off airport and with an expanded airport there is the potential for direct employment to be captured in other authorities which abut the Airport, particularly Slough.

3.7 In addition, the Optimal Economic research described in the previous section finds higher levels of off-site direct, indirect and induced employment in its defined ‘local area’ based on survey data.

Labour Market Impacts

3.8 Labour market impacts are more widely dispersed. Jobs at Heathrow are taken by people living in a wide area, and the biggest economic impact on most authorities will be in their residents taking jobs at the Airport. The 2013 Employment Survey found that over half the jobs at Heathrow were taken by residents of the five closest local authority areas.

3.9 If current patterns were replicated by the new direct jobs at Heathrow that would mean an additional 5,000 to 6,000 residents of Hillingdon and Hounslow, and 2,800 to 3,300 of Ealing and Slough and 1,750 to 2,000 from Spelthorne would work at the Airport.

3.10 The Oxford Economics model suggests that this increases the employment rate compared to the baseline, particularly in Hillingdon and Hounslow where is prevents a projected fall in employment rates.
3.11 Current employment patterns in part relate to accessibility by public transport to the airport, which is particularly important for local residents and those in lower paid and entry level jobs. The surface access strategy for the airport is required to achieve a significant increase in the proportion of employees accessing the airport by sustainable means.

Impact on Population and Households

3.12 As we have already noted in the previous section the area already has a large and rapidly growing population. This is projected to continue during the period of Airport expansion.

3.13 The Oxford Economics model ‘central case’ suggests that Heathrow’s expansion and impacts on labour demand will have a negligible impact on population growth, and consequently on the number of households.

Figure 7: Projected Population Growth to 2041 (with and without 3rd runway, Central Case)

3.14 As Figure 7 shows the population of the area is projected to grow by around 15% or 250,000 by 2041. Growth at Heathrow could increase this by c. 10,000. The reason for the relatively small impacts is that the model assumes higher levels of economic activity, reduced out-commuting and increased in-commuting.

3.15 This is mirrored in projected household growth. This is projected to be c. 26% by 2041 an increase of 162,000 to 795,000. Heathrow growth could add an extra 3,000 households to this total. Almost all of this growth would be in the three London boroughs – Ealing, Hillingdon and Hounslow. The impact on the non-London authorities would be negligible. The detailed figures are set out in the Stage 4 report and accompanying dataset.

3.16 Recent population and household projections from both the Office for National Statistics and the Mayor of London have been volatile. This has been due to changes in fertility, migration, mortality and average household sizes. It will therefore be important to continue to monitor our findings as broader projections are updated.

3.17 It should however be noted that both the Mayor of London and the Government (through the draft standard methodology for assessing housing need) are currently proposing targets that exceed the household projections described above, in some cases significantly.

Figure 8: Housing Targets, Delivery and Household Growth
3.18 Figure 8, above, identifies the targets set out in the Draft new London Plan (2018) for the London Authorities, the draft standard methodology for the non-London authorities, the Oxford Economics projections (including Heathrow Growth, and recent delivery. These targets are still in draft and in the Mayor’s case will be subject to examination. Also the Government methodology is expected to be finalised informed by updated household projections.

3.19 Nevertheless, to the extent that authorities plan to meet these targets there is no obvious need for any additional homes to be planned as a result of the Heathrow proposals.

**Commercial Property Market Impacts**

3.20 The Lichfield’s Study and ongoing engagement between HAL and the HSPG authorities set the context for the consideration of property market requirements and impacts.

3.21 Figure 10 (overleaf) seeks to reconcile the ‘top down’ employment forecasts (Direct, Indirect, Induced and Catalytic) against the types and amounts of employment floorspace identified by the Lichfields study.

3.22 This identifies the series of Lichfields categories that are identified as ‘on’ or ‘adjacent’ to the airport that equate to the ‘Direct’ (on and off site) employment. It then identifies those that are likely to meet the ‘Indirect’ category which potentially have a wider catchment, and finally the ‘catalytic’ type uses (HQ offices and strategic Logistics) that could be attracted to the area but equally could locate elsewhere in the sub-region/region. Further exploration and testing of these requirements and locational flexibility will be required as part of masterplanning design stages prior to DCO submission. (see Finding 5.3.1)

3.23 Clearly these categories are not mutually exclusive and there will be significant overlaps but it does provide a useful way of thinking about the spatial options for meeting these requirements. Figure 9, below, identifies four tentative spatial levels which the HSPG authorities may wish to consider in their spatial planning thinking.

3.24 A pro-active approach potentially offers the opportunity to enhance the ‘do as now’ employment effects described above by providing strategic capacity for direct and indirect employment on and adjacent to the Airport and by seeking to secure ‘catalytic’ employment which has previously been identified by several of the authorities as a significant opportunity for them.

**Figure 9: Illustrative Spatial Approaches for Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial Level</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport Masterplan and Integration</strong></td>
<td>• Understand disposition and capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heathrow &amp; HSPG</strong></td>
<td>• Understand displacement and additional requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Logistics and Industrial</strong></td>
<td>• Review capacity to meet requirement within and adjacent to airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HSPG</strong></td>
<td>• Review broader demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large Scale Office Occupiers</strong></td>
<td>• Ability/capacity to meet additional requirement (and extent of additionality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HSPG</strong></td>
<td>• Specific assessments of strategic locations including capacity for intensification &amp; related infrastructure investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Centres and Growth Points</strong></td>
<td>• Understand capacity and pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HSPG</strong></td>
<td>• Understand market positioning – catchment potentially from Canary Wharf to Reading with Elizabeth Line, and Southern and Western Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large sub-regional locations eg Old Oak</strong></td>
<td>• New sub-regional locations eg, Old Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wider “place making” and infrastructure requirements</strong></td>
<td>• Wider “place making” and infrastructure requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.25 The Stage 4 report gives more detail on the industrial and commercial property markets in the relevant authorities and where relevant beyond the Core Study Area.
3.26 This concludes that in relation to office provision there is significant capacity and planned capacity in the area and in the context of uptake the quantum identified by Lichfields is manageable. The more critical issue therefore is about quality (including the setting/image as well as buildings) and securing occupiers.

3.27 The logistics sector is more challenging. There is very limited capacity in the current local market, and pressure on existing stock from competing land uses. It will therefore be important for HSPG to consider what is essential to be provided, in the context of the emerging HAL masterplan and the extent to which it would be preferable/acceptable for some growth to be provided beyond the core area. Aylesbury Vale appears to be the only authority which is planning to provide significant additional capacity in the wider study area. (see Findings 5.3.1 and 5.3.5)

3.28 Town Centres and other growth points form an additional potential focus. Several of the authorities have programmes of, or ambitions for, Town Centre regeneration, and interest in providing capacity for offices, hotels and other Town centre uses. Market demand for these uses will depend on operator models, the attractiveness of locations and the accessibility to the Airport and wider sub-region/region. Some town centres have plans/capacity for residential development which could contribute to labour supply at the Airport. (see Finding 5.3.4)

Figure 10: Reconciliation of Top-Down and Bottom-Up Assessments
4 Implications for Infrastructure (Stage 5)

Stage 5 of the Study provides a comprehensive assessment of the infrastructure that is currently being planned for and delivered in the Study area to the year 2041. It covers Transport, Utilities, Waste, Green Infrastructure and Social Infrastructure. The report is accompanied by a database that provides HSPG Members with a dynamic model that can be refreshed and updated based on new policy priorities and projects in the future.

Needs Assessment

4.1 The table below shows the infrastructure sectors covered by the needs assessment. A database of planned projects has been compiled using publicly available documents and information provided by HSPG stakeholders through consultation. From this database, infrastructure portfolios containing projects over £1m in value planned in the period has been developed for each of the five sectors.

Figure 11 Infrastructure Needs Assessment
(Source: Arup)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active transport (walking and cycling)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy (electricity and gas)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and industrial waste (C&amp;I)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, demolition and excavation waste (CDEW)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity greenspace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural &amp; semi-natural greenspace</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social infrastructure</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 The database identifies over 300 infrastructure projects of which over half are transport projects followed by social infrastructure, and utilities. As is typical of most infrastructure planning there is a significant funding gap (around 25% of total value) and projects are ‘front-loaded’ in the development period.

4.3 These projects are those in current plans and therefore do not incorporate any plans for the 3rd runway at Heathrow. However some, particularly the transport projects, would form essential context for planning for the Airport proposals, which in turn will influence the detail of those projects which are not yet ‘confirmed’ or ‘fixed’.

4.4 HALs DCO application will be required to undertake comprehensive assessments of infrastructure requirements and direct impacts on existing infrastructure and the provision of infrastructure to avoid or mitigate these impacts. It is not the intention of the JEBIS study to pre-judge any of these outcomes but instead flag up those potential for investments to support complementary strategies to deliver all growth requirements.

4.5 In the same way as HAL and HSPG are working together to consider the direct impacts of land use decisions for the Airport in the context of wider planning a parallel (but linked) process will need to take place on infrastructure.

Transport Infrastructure

4.6 Transport projects are easily the largest single category identified in the assessment. There are 149 projects of which 59 are road projects, 61 public transport and 29 active transport.
4.7 The major public transport projects are of particular significance in the context of Airport expansion although there are already significant capacity constraints. Crossrail 1/Elizabeth Line is already underway and will significantly improve east-west links and frequency. A range of other investments are being promoted including Southern and Western Rail links to Heathrow which could contribute to ‘leading’ how growth is directed and securing some of the Town Centre and catalytic benefits described in the previous section.

4.8 The Heathrow Masterplan will potentially require major road realignments and changes to the local network, including the M25. It will be important that this planning considers the wider spatial planning of the core zone around the Airport, particularly if the authorities are seeking to retain and/or accommodate more logistics uses in the surrounding area.

4.9 Local access to the Airport and airport related development will be very important in maximising local employment and community benefits from expansion as well as meeting DCO surface access and air quality objectives. This needs to ensure effective bus routes and corridors to the airport from local population centres and also the promotion of sustainable and active travel modes to the airport including walking and cycling.

4.10 Given the range of projects identified and competition for funding it will be important for HSPG partners to prioritise investments and work with providers and regional and national Government to secure funding packages.

Green Infrastructure

4.11 Although it accounts for a relatively small proportion of the identified projects in the study area Green Infrastructure, including Open Space, will play a critical role in improving quality of life and the local environment. Not only would this play an important role in its own right, but would also increase the attractiveness of the area to business and potentially help secure the ‘catalytic’ investment described above.

4.12 Across the HSPG Area, there are a number of key Green Infrastructure and Open Space assets including:

- Colne Valley Regional Park
- The River Crane and Crane Valley Partnership area
- Rivers Brent, Duke of Northumberland and others
- The ten miles of canals in Ealing
- St Ann’s, Manor and Fleet Lakes
- Bedfont Lakes and Country Park
- Reservoirs
- Windsor Great Park
- The Jubilee River
- The River Thames

4.13 The Colne Valley Regional Park is the most significant Green Infrastructure asset in the HSPG area. The 43 square mile park includes 200 miles of river and canal network as well as over 60 lakes. It is managed by the Colne Valley Park Community Interest Company (CIC), of which Slough, South Bucks, RBWM and both Surrey and Buckinghamshire County Council are part.
4.14 The Colne Valley: A Landscape on the Edge project represents the most significant green infrastructure project within the JEBIS study area. At present, 21 projects have been identified including improved access routes to the area, conservation of wildlife habitats, various river related projects and water saving projects. The HSPG has provided funding to extend this project to include the River Crane Catchment and other adjacent areas from its Planning Delivery Fund allocation.

4.15 Provision of new and enhanced open space will be required as a result of the growth that will take place in the area in the baseline assessment and the Heathrow proposals will have limited additional impact. However, the DCO proposals will have direct impacts on local Green and Blue infrastructure as identified in the January 2018 airport expansion consultation document.

4.16 Joint planning between the authorities offers the potential to extend the Colne Valley Regional Park vision across the River Crane Catchment, and create wider linkages between and through the area, potentially linked with public and active transport corridors and town centre improvements.

Social Infrastructure

4.17 Requirements for social infrastructure in the area arise from the projected growth in households and residential population in the area.

4.18 The baseline assessment identifies a significant pipeline of education projects reflecting the rapid increase in the numbers of children and young people in recent years. It does however note that recent evidence suggests that birth rates may have peaked, at least for the time being, although previous growth is still working its way through the system. Health and leisure projects form the majority of the remaining projects.

4.19 The report identifies ‘ready reckoners’ for future demand arising from population growth although it notes that the contribution of Heathrow to this growth is likely to again be minimal.

4.20 The DCO application will have impacts on some community facilities to the north west of the Airport, including displacement, and HAL will need to engage with the relevant stakeholders to plan to mitigate these impacts.

Utilities

4.21 The utilities assessment covers water, energy and digital. Energy forms majority of the projects (60 of 100) followed by water. Utilities providers haven’t identified significant current capacity constraints however, the Environment Agency has identified the South East as a whole as an area of serious water stress.

4.22 The assessment uses growth assumptions from the JEBIS to identify indicative requirements for different utilities. The growth is small in the context current requirements and wider growth. However, given the lack of specific identified provision strategic planning will need to consider how these requirements can be met, alongside any direct growth and implications on current provision of the DCO application for Heathrow expansion.

Waste

4.23 The waste assessment covers household waste, commercial and industrial waste and construction, demolition and excavation waste. It then considers the various types of waste facilities – landfill, metal recycling, transfer, treatment and incineration. The study reviews the relevant waste plans and identifies seven projects across the study area.
4.24 The assessment applies growth factors to the projected household and economic growth across the area which shows a steady growth in demand with that attributed to Heathrow having a relatively small impact. The critical challenge for authorities is to meet this growth with non-landfill solutions, and its relationship to wider growth in London and the South East from where the area’s facilities ‘import’ waste. The potential displacement of existing provision by Heathrow expansion will also need to be considered.

**Summary**

4.25 In thinking about joint spatial planning, it will be important for the HSPG authorities to monitor and prioritise infrastructure investment.

4.26 In the case of utilities, social infrastructure and waste, except for any direct impacts of the Heathrow Masterplan, the remaining investment will be driven by background demographic and housing growth rather than the Heathrow expansion itself.

4.27 Transport and Green Infrastructure investments are likely to have a more strategic function in the area, influence spatial growth options, and underpin the ability to capture and sustain growth in preferred locations.
5 Implications for Strategic Planning

5.1 The previous sections of this report have summarised the process and some key findings of the JEBIS. Full details are contained in the five background reports and in the evidence and infrastructure databases. They provide a snapshot at a point in time and will need to be updated alongside the HAL’s DCO process and the authorities’ policy development.

5.2 It is not the intention of the study to provide any definitive conclusions as to the approach to or shape of whatever Joint Spatial Planning approach the authorities wish to take. However the findings do suggest some emerging broad themes that the authorities may wish to consider.

5.3 These are summarised below and are as follows:

5.3.1 Airport Masterplan and Integration
The interaction between direct on and off airport employment is critical, and requires an iterative process of Masterplan and wider policy development.

5.3.2 Economic Development Strategy
Labour market impacts (jobs for residents) and business opportunities will be the main direct benefit of the expansion for most authorities. Maximising such benefits will require a combination of accessibility improvements and ‘soft’ investments in jobs, training and brokerage.

5.3.3 Housing Demand
The impact of the expansion on population and housing demand is likely to be small. However demographic and economic trends, as well as housing targets, change and it will be important to keep a watching brief.

5.3.4 Town Centres and Growth Points
Given the constraints, including Green Belt, and limited availability of land it will be important that Town Centres and, if appropriate, planned growth points are able to maximise investment which is likely to require investment in infrastructure and urban quality.
5.3.5 Capturing Catalytic Benefits

The desire and ability to capture ‘catalytic’ benefits from commercial office and strategic logistics growth will determine the scale of impacts in the wider core area. This will need a commercially driven strategy and understanding of the requirements of occupiers and operators and an appropriate ‘quality of place’ and infrastructure. In the case of logistics, it will be important to consider wider market and technological trends, working with providers and operators in the sector.

5.3.6 Transport Infrastructure

Transport Infrastructure investment will be the key growth driver in the area, and accessibility will strongly influence the spatial options. It will be essential in determining options for growth if it is to be different to ‘do as now’ and drawn extensively from the HSPG area and in an easterly direction. It should be noted though that more localised public and active transport investments could have strong positive impacts.

5.37 Green Infrastructure

Green infrastructure, and particularly improving current spaces, connectivity and urban quality can have a strong positive impact on both health and wellbeing and also perceptions of the area, supporting the ability to maximise inward investment.
Appendix 5 – List of Authorities contacted regarding unmet needs in 2016

Neighbouring Authorities

Elmbridge Borough Council
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Spelthorne Borough Council
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Woking Borough Council

Other Authorities

Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
Guildford Borough Council
Hart District Council
London Borough of Hillingdon
London Borough of Hounslow
London Borough of Kingston
Mole Valley Council
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
London Borough of Richmond
Rushmoor Borough Council
Slough Borough Council
South Bucks District Council
Tandridge District Council
Waverley Borough Council
Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to Elmbridge 18th March 2016 and Elmbridge Response
Dear Richard,

Thank you for engaging Elmbridge Borough Council on the initial findings of the evidence base review for the preparation of a new Runnymede Local Plan.

Following previous consultations, I can confirm that the cross-boundary, strategic planning issues that we share and which need to be addressed by both our authorities in our respective Local Plans are:

- Housing
- Gypsies & Travellers
- Economic Development
- Green Belt
- Climate Change, Biodiversity & TBHSPA
- Transport
- Flooding
- Infrastructure

Each authority has identified and agreed these as part of their Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statements / Frameworks (Elmbridge, January 2015 and Runnymede, October 2015).

Focusing on those issues set out and in your email below, Elmbridge Borough Council would like to make the following responses:

**Housing**

Elmbridge Borough Council recognises and shares the challenge faced by Runnymede Borough Council of ensuring that its local plan meets the objectively assessed need (OAN) for new housing within its administrative boundaries. Similarly, Elmbridge Borough Council has committed to a review of the evidence base supporting its Local Plan to ensure conformity with national policy and to establish its own OAN and that of the wider Housing Market Area (HMA). As part of this review the Council has commissioned a joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) with The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames; the Borough of Epsom & Ewell; and the District of Mole Valley.

Elmbridge Borough Council recognises under the Duty to Cooperate the need for on-going liaison between relevant authorities regarding the scale and options for accommodating any potential unmet development need. It also recognises that HMAs are difficult to define, overlap and there are often multiple linkages between areas, especially in and around greater London. In particular, it is noted that as part of our evidence base collection, links have been identified between Elmbridge and Runnymede Boroughs.

Nevertheless, a draft SHMA has been provided to the four authorities and, at this initial stage, it is considered by the Council that it is highly unlikely that it will be able to meet its own OAN or contribute to meeting any deficits in supply that may occur within the three remaining HMA authorities. On this basis, Elmbridge Borough Council does not anticipate being able to assist Runnymede Borough Council in meeting its unmet housing need.

**Gypsies & Travellers**
Working alongside Reigate & Banstead Borough Council and Tandridge District Council, the Council is currently in the process of updating its understanding of the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople residing in Elmbridge Borough. The three authorities have commissioned Opinion Research Services (ORS) to produce a joint-methodology for assessing needs in light of the 2015 revisions to the PPTS and other recent changes in legislation and practice. Individual assessments are being produced for each local authority.

At this time the Council is unable to predetermine the level of need however, the previous TAA identified a need for 36 pitches between 2012 and 2027. As part of its Land Availability Assessment (2014) the Council identified three potential development sites with a total capacity for 33 pitches. This is not sufficient to meet identified need however, did ensure that the Council had a 5 year supply (plus 5% or 20% buffer) of developable / deliverable site. Nevertheless, since the publication of the 2014 LAA, the Council has become aware that two sites previously identified are no longer considered available. The Council is therefore unable to identify sufficient sites to meet its own identified need.

As part of the review of the Local Plan evidence base the Council will shortly be establishing a new target for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and plots for Travelling Showpeople (where appropriate) and will be seeking to meet this need. The Council does not envisaged this being too dissimilar from its existing target of 36 pitches. Therefore in light of the existing challenges the Council faces in meeting the requirement, difficulties in meeting any new target are anticipated with the Council likely to be looking towards sites currently in the Green Belt. On this basis, Elmbridge Borough Council does not anticipate being able to assist Runnymede Borough Council in meeting its unmet need for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites.

Economic Development

The Council will respond separately to the consultation on Runnymede’s ELR. Work by Elmbridge BC recognises the link between Elmbridge and the Runnymede/ Spelthorne area and that this issue is both a strategic and cross boundary matter between our authorities. Our expected demand for employment floorspace based projected growth in the labour market in Elmbridge is between 20,000 to 30,000sqm of B8 floorspace and 30,000 to 40,000sqm of B1 floorspace. However, there is limited capacity for the growth of employment uses in the Borough with the Council seeking to meet current demand through intensification of existing sites and ensuring existing vacant floorspace meets the needs of business locally. A further review of demand may be necessary as part of any future plan preparation to take account of any changing economic circumstances.

In addition, the value of the housing market in Elmbridge creates a high demand for, and increasing value of, development land in the Borough. This competition between uses makes it difficult not only to increase the supply of employment uses but to retain existing sites for employment uses. As such the Council does not anticipate being able to assist in meeting demand from another area but would welcome discussions as to how we can work together on this matter.

Green Belt

Elmbridge Borough Council is in a very similar position, having commissioned a review of the land designated as Green Belt within the Borough and assessing whether it still meets the purposes, as set out in the NPPF. Officers are currently in the process of finalising the review. The Council acknowledges this as an important cross-boundary issue and is happy to discuss further this strategic matter with you as part of wider discussions relating to housing, Travellers and the economy.

Other Issues

Where necessary we are happy to engage in discussions relating to infrastructure provision with Runnymede Borough Council and the appropriate infrastructure provider to address any strategic, cross-boundary issue identified.

Finally, I can confirm that I will be attending the workshop on Friday 22nd April to discuss these issues further and hear from Runnymede Borough Council on its suggested strategies.
How do you rate the service we provided in this email?

Good   Average   Poor
therefore writing to you now to seek your assistance in respect of the cross boundary matters that we have previously agreed are of mutual interest. These are as set out in the paragraphs that follow:

Housing
The Council’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (November 2015) draws the rounded conclusion on the overall need for housing in the Borough, over the 2013 to 2033 period, as being 466 to 535 homes per annum. The Council is currently producing an interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) report to support the Council’s Issues and Options consultation. By Easter 2016, officers will have determined the maximum annual housing target that the Council will be able to sustainably pursue. Early indications are that the Council will not be able to meet its proportion of the objectively assessed housing need for the Housing Market Area within the Borough boundaries.

Travellers
The Council’s Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) (September 2014) recognises that sufficient sites need to be identified and allocated to meet the established level of need for travellers’ pitches and plots over the period of the Plan. The need from 2013 to 2028 is identified as being 117 plots for gypsies and travellers and 127 pitches for travelling showpeople. The matter of the TAA was considered at a Runnymede public inquiry into three appeals, each for a single traveller pitch and associated development. At that inquiry, discussion on the TAA related to differences between the Council and the appellant on a number of points. Despite the Inspector stating at paragraph 22 of his decision letter (dated 31 July 2015) that “it is not the place in this decision to make a finding on the quality of the TAA”, he nevertheless went on to express a view that “the TAA is likely to underestimate the need for pitches”.

Again, it is clear to the Council that it is not going to be possible to accommodate this level of need on sustainable sites in the Borough.

Economic Development
The Council is due to publish its 2016 Employment Land Review imminently. This report concludes that over the Plan period (up to 2035) the Council should aim to provide between 182,380 sqm of commercial floorspace based on a labour supply scenario which is linked to the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA, and 237,180 sqm of floorspace based on a baseline labour demand scenario. Following an analysis of the Council’s pipeline supply and SLAA site submissions, it is apparent that the Council will not be in a position to meet its identified economic needs within the Borough boundary.

Green Belt
In light of the demand/supply imbalances highlighted above, officers are of the opinion that it will be necessary to recommend to Runnymede’s elected Members that there are exceptional circumstances that justify the review of the Borough’s Green Belt boundaries. This would have the effect of returning some of the Borough’s Green Belt land which has been assessed as performing weakly against the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, to the urban area to meet identified needs. Given that the Green Belt is identified in the Council’s Duty to Co-operate scoping framework as a cross boundary issue, this is also a matter that the Council will wish to discuss with you as part of wider discussions relating to housing, travellers and the economy.

Other issues
There are a number of other cross boundary issues that will also require engagement under the Duty to Co-operate as the Council prepares its Local Plan; primary amongst these is the issue of infrastructure. The Council will contact relevant Duty to Co-operate partners and seek engagement on such issues following the conclusions of the initial discussions with the relevant partners relating to housing, travellers, the economy and the Green Belt.

Based on the findings of the Council’s emerging evidence, which are summarised above, and given that the Council has identified your authority as a relevant partner in its Duty to Co-operate Scoping Framework in relation to housing/travellers/the economy/Green Belt, officers would like to explore with your authority whether you anticipate that you will be able to assist Runnymede in meeting its unmet needs. It would be helpful if you could email your response to the Council on planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk as soon as practicable, but by no later than Friday 8 April. However, if you would prefer to discuss the matter more fully by telephone or at a meeting, please let me know and I will make arrangements as appropriate.
In addition, the Council is holding a Duty to Co-operate Workshop at the Runnymede Civic Centre in Addlestone on Friday 22 April, from 10 am to 1 pm. At this workshop there will be the opportunity to discuss the cross boundary issues that have been highlighted through the preparation of the Local Plan evidence base more fully. At this workshop the Council will also present its suggested strategies that it intends to include in its Issues and Options consultation for discussion (those relating to cross boundary matters only). We would be very pleased if you could confirm your attendance by email at planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk by Friday 8 April. The agenda for the workshop will follow in due course.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print

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

This message has been analyzed and no issues were discovered. Click here to report this email as spam

This email, and any attachments, is strictly confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended only for use by the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or other use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender and delete it from your system. The opinions expressed in this email are not necessarily those of Elmbridge Borough Council.

This message has been analyzed and no issues were discovered.
Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to RBWM 18th March 2016 and RBWM Response
Richard

Thank you for your emails concerning the above I had not picked up that it was really about duty to co-operate on my initial reading, so I think it would help both parties discharge their duties by making it clear in the heading of the email, that the process you are seeking to engage in, is part of the ongoing process of the duty to co-operate. Each of the topics you have identified are being considered by the council and will need a separate response and we are not able to give you a final response to them at the moment. The response by the Royal Borough will include officer attendance at the workshop on the 22nd of April, I am not sure if you would require elected member attendance as well? The Royal Borough is also finalising the evidence base, for the Local Plan, and further work on the plan itself and this will require us to engage with your council as well.

Kind regards

Robert Paddison MRTPI MRICS
Project Lead Neighbourhood Planning
Development and Regeneration
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
Town Hall, St Ives Road, Maidenhead SL6 1RF

01628 796508

General email: planning.policy@rbwm.gov.uk
Website: www.rbwm.gov.uk
Follow us on twitter: @RBWM
Like us on Facebook

Did you know that each person in the UK uses over 200kg of paper every year? Please respect the environment. ONLY print this e-mail if you have to.

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the individual(s) or destination to which it is addressed.

Any unauthorised use, retention, distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited.

This e-mail may contain sensitive or protectively marked material up to RESTRICTED security classification and should be handled accordingly.

If you have received this transmission in error please call the RBWM Customer Service Centre on 01628 683800 to let us know, or notify us by e-mail on customer.service@rbwm.gov.uk

Please then delete the message.
Any views expressed by the sender of this e-mail are not necessarily those of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. All communications sent to or from the Council may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and are subject to and maybe disclosable under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

All e-mails sent are checked for viruses, but this does not constitute a guarantee. The Council will not accept liability for any damage caused by a virus or other malware.

Thank you http://www.rbwm.gov.uk

**********************************************************************
FYI

From: Richard Ford
Sent: 11 April 2016 11:20
To: planning.policy@rbwm.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Runnymede Local Plan: RBWM

Good morning,

You may recall that I wrote to you recently concerning this Council’s emerging Local Plan (please see my email below).

To date I have not received a reply from you. I would be pleased if you could give consideration to the content of the email and let me have your views.

Thank you.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print

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

From: Richard Ford
Sent: 18 March 2016 11:17
To: planning.policy@rbwm.gov.uk
Subject: Runnymede Local Plan: RBWM

Good morning,

Runnymede Local Plan

Runnymede Borough Council is preparing a single Local Plan that will guide development in Runnymede up to 2035. In drawing up the Plan, the Council has a legal Duty to Co-operate with other bodies in the interests of ensuring that strategic cross-boundary matters are dealt with effectively. In October 2015, the Council produced a Duty to Co-operate Scoping Framework. This identified the strategic matters that need to be addressed during the preparation
of the Local Plan, as well as the bodies with which the Council needs to co-operate https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=13520&p=0.

The completion of the evidence base for the Local Plan is now imminent, and it is apparent to the Council that we are not going to be able to meet our own needs within the Borough in respect of a number of policy matters. I am therefore writing to you now to seek your assistance in respect of the cross boundary matters that we have previously agreed are of mutual interest. These are as set out in the paragraphs that follow:

**Housing**
The Council’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (November 2015) draws the rounded conclusion on the overall need for housing in the Borough, over the 2013 to 2033 period, as being 466 to 535 homes per annum. The Council is currently producing an interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) report to support the Council’s Issues and Options consultation. By Easter 2016, officers will have determined the maximum annual housing target that the Council will be able to sustainably pursue. Early indications are that the Council will not be able to meet its proportion of the objectively assessed housing need for the Housing Market Area within the Borough boundaries.

**Travellers**
The Council’s Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) (September 2014) recognises that sufficient sites need to be identified and allocated to meet the established level of need for travellers’ pitches and plots over the period of the Plan. The need from 2013 to 2028 is identified as being 117 plots for gypsies and travellers and 127 pitches for travelling showpeople. The matter of the TAA was considered at a Runnymede public inquiry into three appeals, each for a single traveller pitch and associated development. At that inquiry, discussion on the TAA related to differences between the Council and the appellant on a number of points. Despite the Inspector stating at paragraph 22 of his decision letter (dated 31 July 2015) that “It is not the place in this decision to make a finding on the quality of the TAA”, he nevertheless went on to express a view that “the TAA is likely to underestimate the need for pitches”.

Again, it is clear to the Council that it is not going to be possible to accommodate this level of need on sustainable sites in the Borough.

**Economic Development**
The Council is due to publish its 2016 Employment Land Review imminently. This report concludes that over the Plan period (up to 2035) the Council should aim to provide between 182,380 sqm of commercial floorspace based on a labour supply scenario which is linked to the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA, and 237,180 sqm of floorspace based on a baseline labour demand scenario. Following an analysis of the Council’s pipeline supply and SLAA site submissions, it is apparent that the Council will not be in a position to meet its identified economic needs within the Borough boundary.

**Green Belt**
In light of the demand/supply imbalances highlighted above, officers are of the opinion that it will be necessary to recommend to Runnymede’s elected Members that there are exceptional circumstances that justify the review of the Borough’s Green Belt boundaries. This would have the effect of returning some of the Borough’s Green Belt land which has been assessed as performing weakly against the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, to the urban area to meet identified needs. Given that the Green Belt is identified in the Council’s Duty to Co-operate scoping framework as a cross boundary issue, this is also a matter that the Council will wish to discuss with you as part of wider discussions relating to housing, travellers and the economy.

**Other issues**
There are a number of other cross boundary issues that will also require engagement under the Duty to Co-operate as the Council prepares its Local Plan; primary amongst these is the issue of infrastructure. The Council will contact relevant Duty to Co-operate partners and seek engagement on such issues following the conclusions of the initial discussions with the relevant partners relating to housing, travellers, the economy and the Green Belt.

Based on the findings of the Council’s emerging evidence, which are summarised above, and given that the Council has identified your authority as a relevant partner in its Duty to Co-operate Scoping Framework in relation to
housing/travellers/the economy/Green Belt, officers would like to explore with your authority whether you anticipate that you will be able to assist Runnymede in meeting its unmet needs. It would be helpful if you could email your response to the Council on planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk as soon as practicable, but by no later than Friday 8 April. However, if you would prefer to discuss the matter more fully by telephone or at a meeting, please let me know and I will make arrangements as appropriate.

In addition, the Council is holding a Duty to Co-operate Workshop at the Runnymede Civic Centre in Addlestone on Friday 22 April, from 10 am to 1 pm. At this workshop there will be the opportunity to discuss the cross boundary issues that have been highlighted through the preparation of the Local Plan evidence base more fully. At this workshop the Council will also present its suggested strategies that it intends to include in its Issues and Options consultation for discussion (those relating to cross boundary matters only). We would be very pleased if you could confirm your attendance by email at planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk by Friday 8 April. The agenda for the workshop will follow in due course.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk
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Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to Spelthorne BC 18th March 2016 and Spelthorne BC Response
Richard

Thank you for your email. John is on leave until next Tuesday but I will discuss matters with him on his return. My initial reaction is to suggest that we have an officer level meeting as soon as possible before your DtC event on 22 April to discuss in detail the various issues you identify.

I am aware that Cheryl is also seeking to set up a meeting of the Joint Member Liaison Group to discuss the implications of the SHMA and SLAA process.

John or I will get back to you next week.

Regards

Geoff

Geoff Dawes
Principal Planning Officer
Spelthorne Borough Council
Council Offices Knowle Green Staines TW18 1XB
Tel: 01784 446397

Runnymede Local Plan

Runnymede Borough Council is preparing a single Local Plan that will guide development in Runnymede up to 2035. In drawing up the Plan, the Council has a legal Duty to Co-operate with other bodies in the interests of ensuring that strategic cross-boundary matters are dealt with effectively. In October 2015, the Council produced a Duty to Co-operate Scoping Framework. This identified the strategic matters that need to be addressed during the preparation of the Local Plan, as well as the bodies with which the Council needs to co-operate [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=13520&p=0](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=13520&p=0).

The completion of the evidence base for the Local Plan is now imminent, and it is apparent to the Council that we are not going to be able to meet our own needs within the Borough in respect of a number of policy matters. I am therefore writing to you now to seek your assistance in respect of the cross boundary matters that we have previously agreed are of mutual interest. These are as set out in the paragraphs that follow:

Housing
The Council’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (November 2015) draws the rounded conclusion on the overall need for housing in the Borough, over the 2013 to 2033 period, as being 466 to 535 homes per annum. The Council is currently producing an interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) report to support the Council’s Issues and Options consultation. By Easter 2016, officers will have determined the maximum annual housing target that the Council will be able to sustainably pursue. Early indications are that the Council will not be able to meet its proportion of the objectively assessed housing need for the Housing Market Area within the Borough boundaries.

Travellers
The Council’s Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) (September 2014) recognises that sufficient sites need to be identified and allocated to meet the established level of need for travellers’ pitches and plots over the period of the Plan. The need from 2013 to 2028 is identified as being 117 plots for gypsies and travellers and 127 pitches for travelling showpeople. The matter of the TAA was considered at a Runnymede public inquiry into three appeals, each for a single traveller pitch and associated development. At that inquiry, discussion on the TAA related to differences between the Council and the appellant on a number of points. Despite the Inspector stating at paragraph 22 of his decision letter (dated 31 July 2015) that “it is not the place in this decision to make a finding on the quality of the TAA”, he nevertheless went on to express a view that “the TAA is likely to underestimate the need for pitches”.

Again, it is clear to the Council that it is not going to be possible to accommodate this level of need on sustainable sites in the Borough.

Economic Development
The Council is due to publish its 2016 Employment Land Review imminently. This report concludes that over the Plan period (up to 2035) the Council should aim to provide between 182,380 sqm of commercial floorspace based on a labour supply scenario which is linked to the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA, and 237,180 sqm of floorspace based on a baseline labour demand scenario. Following an analysis of the Council’s pipeline supply and SLAA site submissions, it is apparent that the Council will not be in a position to meet its identified economic needs within the Borough boundary.

Green Belt
In light of the demand/supply imbalances highlighted above, officers are of the opinion that it will be necessary to recommend to Runnymede’s elected Members that there are exceptional circumstances that justify the review of the Borough’s Green Belt boundaries. This would have the effect of returning some of the Borough’s Green Belt land which has been assessed as performing weakly against the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, to the urban area to meet identified needs. Given that the Green Belt is identified in the Council’s Duty to Co-operate Scoping framework as a cross boundary issue, this is also a matter that the Council will wish to discuss with you as part of wider discussions relating to housing, travellers and the economy.

Other issues
There are a number of other cross boundary issues that will also require engagement under the Duty to Co-operate as the Council prepares its Local Plan; primary amongst these is the issue of infrastructure. The Council will contact relevant Duty to Co-operate partners and seek engagement on such issues following the conclusions of the initial discussions with the relevant partners relating to housing, travellers, the economy and the Green Belt.

Based on the findings of the Council’s emerging evidence, which are summarised above, and given that the Council has identified your authority as a relevant partner in its Duty to Co-operate Scoping Framework in relation to housing/travellers/the economy/Green Belt, officers would like to explore with your authority whether you anticipate that you will be able to assist Runnymede in meeting its unmet needs. It would be helpful if you could email your response to the Council on planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk as soon as practicable, but by no later than Friday 8 April. However, if you would prefer to discuss the matter more fully by telephone or at a meeting, please let me know and I will make arrangements as appropriate.

In addition, the Council is holding a Duty to Co-operate Workshop at the Runnymede Civic Centre in Addlestone on Friday 22 April, from 10 am to 1 pm. At this workshop there will be the opportunity to discuss the cross boundary issues that have been highlighted through the preparation of the Local Plan evidence base more fully. At this
workshop the Council will also present its suggested strategies that it intends to include in its Issues and Options consultation for discussion (those relating to cross boundary matters only). We would be very pleased if you could confirm your attendance by email at planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk by Friday 8 April. The agenda for the workshop will follow in due course.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk
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My Spelthorne - providing Spelthorne Council and public service information relevant to you

Please visit our brand new website at www.spelthorne.gov.uk to see the new things you can find and do.

************************************************************************************
We scan every e-mail for viruses but it is your responsibility to carry out any checks on receipt. This e-mail is for the addressee only.
************************************************************************************

Think before you print.
Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to Surrey Heath BC 18th March 2016 and Surrey Heath BC Response
Dear Richard,

Further to your letter of the 18th March, please find attached our response in respect of Surrey Heath’s anticipated capacity to meet Runnymede’s unmet needs.

I hope this is of assistance to you and I look forward to attending the Duty to Co-operate workshop on the 22nd April.

Kind regards,

Kate Baughan  BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Surrey Heath House
Knoll Road
Camberley
Surrey
GU15 3HD
01276 707429
www.surreyheath.gov.uk

Great Place • Great Community • Great Future
Mr R. Ford  
Runnymede Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
Station Road  
Addlestone  
Surrey  
KT15 2AH  

22nd March 2016  

BY EMAIL  

Dear Richard,  

RE RUNNYMEDE LOCAL PLAN  

Thank you for your letter of the 18th March in respect of Duty to Cooperate matters pertaining to the emerging Runnymede Local Plan. Surrey Heath welcomes the opportunity to engage with Runnymede and as such I can confirm that I will be attending the Runnymede Duty to Cooperate workshop on the 22nd April on behalf of Surrey Heath Borough Council.

We recognise that Runnymede has identified Surrey Heath as a relevant partner in its Duty-to-Co-operate Scoping Framework in relation to housing, travellers and Green Belt. In this context, it is asked whether it is anticipated that Surrey Heath Borough Council will be in a position to assist Runnymede in meeting its unmet needs. In response, I refer you to the points raised below.

Housing

The Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (December 2014) indicates an Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) for Surrey Heath of 340 dwellings per annum over the period of 2011 - 2031. Surrey Heath is currently in the process of updating its evidence-based documents; cumulatively, these will allow the Council to make an informed decision in respect of the extent to which the Borough is capable of meeting its own identified objectively assessed needs (consistently with the policies of the NPPF). Early indications do however suggest that it is unlikely that Surrey Heath will be in a position to meet even its own full OAHN, with the Council only able to demonstrate a 3.67 year housing land
supply at this time. As such, Surrey Heath Borough Council does not anticipate that it will be in a position to assist Runnymede in helping to deliver its unmet housing needs.

**Travellers**

Policy CP7 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2011 – 2028 (CSDMP DPD) indicates that Surrey Heath Borough Council will seek to provide 19 additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches by 2027. Since the date of adoption of the CSDMP DPD (2012) up until 31st March 2015 no additional pitches have yet been identified. Given Surrey Heath’s continuing difficulties in identifying pitches to meet its own needs, Surrey Heath Borough Council does not anticipate that it will be in a position to assist Runnymede in helping to deliver its own unmet traveller accommodation needs.

**Green Belt**

The current spatial strategy for Surrey Heath indicates that the current extent of the Green Belt is to be maintained. In the event that Surrey Heath seeks to prepare a new Local Plan, the Council will have regard to national planning policy in determining whether an assessment of the function of the Green Belt within Surrey Heath is essential to establishing the extent to which the Borough is capable of meeting its own identified objectively assessed needs (consistently with the policies of the NPPF).

I hope this information is of assistance to you.

Kind regards,

Kate Baughan
Senior Planning Officer (Planning Policy and Conservation)
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to Woking BC 18\textsuperscript{th} March 2016 and Woking BC Response
Dear Mr Ford

Thank you for your e-mail regarding the strategic cross boundary issues that you have identified for the purposes of the duty to cooperate. As you are aware, Woking has an adopted Core Strategy with a housing requirement of an annual average of 292 dwellings. This is against a backdrop of an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwelling per year (2009 SHMA) and 517 per year (2015 SHMA). It is clear that Woking is unable to meet its own objectively assessed housing need having considered all its environmental constraints in accordance with the NPPF. Consequently, the Council is unable to plan to meet any part of your unmet housing need. Similarly, it is unable to meet any part of your unmet employment and Traveller accommodation needs. Woking is presently preparing a Site Allocations DPD to identify sufficient land to meet its housing requirement. It is hoping to publish the DPD for Regulation 19 consultation in Summer 2016. As part of the duty to cooperate, we have already met your Council to discuss the emerging proposals in the Site Allocations DPD, and is thankful for your cooperation so far.

Woking forms part of the West Surrey Housing Market Area comprising Guildford, Waverley and Woking Borough Councils. The three authorities are committed to work together to explore options for meeting future unmet housing need across the Housing Market Area. Hopefully, and it goes without saying that you will be exploring similar opportunities with the authorities that form part of your Housing Market Area.

I agree with you that we need to continue to work together to explore opportunities to address cross boundary issues including infrastructure provision and others, and is happy to engage positively in this process. In this regard, please do not hesitate to contact me as I will do if any strategic matters are identified for future discussion.

I will be responding separately to your invite to attend a duty to cooperate meeting.

Many thanks

Ernest

---

**From: Richard Ford** [mailto:richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk]
**Sent:** 18 March 2016 11:15
**To:** Planning Policy
**Subject:** Runnymede Local Plan: Woking Borough Council

Good morning,

**Runnymede Local Plan**

Runnymede Borough Council is preparing a single Local Plan that will guide development in Runnymede up to 2035. In drawing up the Plan, the Council has a legal Duty to Co-operate with other bodies in the interests of ensuring that strategic cross-boundary matters are dealt with effectively. In October 2015, the Council produced a Duty to Co-operate Scoping Framework. This identified the strategic matters that need to be addressed during the preparation of the Local Plan, as well as the bodies with which the Council needs to co-operate [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=13520&p=0](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=13520&p=0).
The completion of the evidence base for the Local Plan is now imminent, and it is apparent to the Council that we are not going to be able to meet our own needs within the Borough in respect of a number of policy matters. I am therefore writing to you now to seek your assistance in respect of the cross boundary matters that we have previously agreed are of mutual interest. These are as set out in the paragraphs that follow:

**Housing**
The Council’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (November 2015) draws the rounded conclusion on the overall need for housing in the Borough, over the 2013 to 2033 period, as being 466 to 535 homes per annum. The Council is currently producing an interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) report to support the Council’s Issues and Options consultation. By Easter 2016, officers will have determined the maximum annual housing target that the Council will be able to sustainably pursue. Early indications are that the Council will not be able to meet its proportion of the objectively assessed housing need for the Housing Market Area within the Borough boundaries.

**Travellers**
The Council’s Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) (September 2014) recognises that sufficient sites need to be identified and allocated to meet the established level of need for travellers’ pitches and plots over the period of the Plan. The need from 2013 to 2028 is identified as being 117 plots for gypsies and travellers and 127 pitches for travelling showpeople. The matter of the TAA was considered at a Runnymede public inquiry into three appeals, each for a single traveller pitch and associated development. At that inquiry, discussion on the TAA related to differences between the Council and the appellant on a number of points. Despite the Inspector stating at paragraph 22 of his decision letter (dated 31 July 2015) that “It is not the place in this decision to make a finding on the quality of the TAA”, he nevertheless went on to express a view that “the TAA is likely to underestimate the need for pitches”.

Again, it is clear to the Council that it is not going to be possible to accommodate this level of need on sustainable sites in the Borough.

**Economic Development**
The Council is due to publish its 2016 Employment Land Review imminently. This report concludes that over the Plan period (up to 2035) the Council should aim to provide between 182,380 sqm of commercial floorspace based on a labour supply scenario which is linked to the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA, and 237,180 sqm of floorspace based on a baseline labour demand scenario. Following an analysis of the Council’s pipeline supply and SLAA site submissions, it is apparent that the Council will not be in a position to meet its identified economic needs within the Borough boundary.

**Green Belt**
In light of the demand/supply imbalances highlighted above, officers are of the opinion that it will be necessary to recommend to Runnymede’s elected Members that there are exceptional circumstances that justify the review of the Borough’s Green Belt boundaries. This would have the effect of returning some of the Borough’s Green Belt land which has been assessed as performing weakly against the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, to the urban area to meet identified needs. Given that the Green Belt is identified in the Council’s Duty to Co-operate scoping framework as a cross boundary issue, this is also a matter that the Council will wish to discuss with you as part of wider discussions relating to housing, travellers and the economy.

**Other issues**
There are a number of other cross boundary issues that will also require engagement under the Duty to Co-operate as the Council prepares its Local Plan; primary amongst these is the issue of infrastructure. The Council will contact relevant Duty to Co-operate partners and seek engagement on such issues following the conclusions of the initial discussions with the relevant partners relating to housing, travellers, the economy and the Green Belt.

Based on the findings of the Council’s emerging evidence, which are summarised above, and given that the Council has identified your authority as a relevant partner in its Duty to Co-operate Scoping Framework in relation to housing/travellers/the economy/Green Belt, officers would like to explore with your authority whether you anticipate that you will be able to assist Runnymede in meeting its unmet needs. It would be helpful if you could email your response to the Council on planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk as soon as practicable, but by no later
than Friday 8 April. However, if you would prefer to discuss the matter more fully by telephone or at a meeting, please let me know and I will make arrangements as appropriate.

In addition, the Council is holding a Duty to Co-operate Workshop at the Runnymede Civic Centre in Addlestone on Friday 22 April, from 10 am to 1 pm. At this workshop there will be the opportunity to discuss the cross boundary issues that have been highlighted through the preparation of the Local Plan evidence base more fully. At this workshop the Council will also present its suggested strategies that it intends to include in its Issues and Options consultation for discussion (those relating to cross boundary matters only). We would be very pleased if you could confirm your attendance by email at planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk by Friday 8 April. The agenda for the workshop will follow in due course.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk
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Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to Elmbridge BC 10th July 2016
Good afternoon,

**Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate**

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The **Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches** document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until **Wednesday 17 August**. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation).

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to you (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I am writing to you now to request that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances may have changed since that time. Even if they have not, there may be opportunities for co-operation between us in the future, identified through our respective monitoring processes. To that end, I am now in the course of drawing up a simple framework that could hopefully assist in facilitating such co-operation, with required processes being agreed between us by way of a Memorandum of Understanding.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email in due course, but it would be helpful if you could confirm your Council’s position to me by 22 July.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

---

**Please Think Before You Print**

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to RBWM 10th July 2016 and Response
Good afternoon,

**Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate**

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The **Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches** document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until **Wednesday 17 August**. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation).

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to you (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I am writing to you now to request that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances may have changed since that time. Even if they have not, there may be opportunities for co-operation between us in the future, identified through our respective monitoring processes. To that end, I am now in the course of drawing up a simple framework that could hopefully assist in facilitating such co-operation, with required processes being agreed between us by way of a Memorandum of Understanding.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email in due course, but it would be helpful if you could confirm your Council’s position to me by 22 July.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

---

**Please Think Before You Print**

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

Thank you for the Duty to Co-operate meetings, briefing and the opportunity to consider your latest Issues and Options and preferred approach to the new Borough Local Plan. More detail is now available in this consultation, however in your preferred approach you indicate that you may be able to meet between 56% and 82% of your Objectively Assessed Housing Need, depending on further work loss/use of employment land and other factors. From the consultation it is difficult to see how you will be developing your town centres and how you will seek to optimise the development potential of them, you are considering density standards though. In this light it is difficult to see exactly what the impact on or likely requirement will be for adjoining councils as part of the duty to co-operate process. If you are able to meet 100% or close to 100% of your Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) then the need to seek opportunities to meet that need in nearby council areas will of course reduce or disappear.

There are also new 2014 based Household Projections which may have an impact on your OAN, I am not sure if you have taken them into account but they also add to the matters to be considered when dealing with duty to co-operate. As the development of your strategy evolves we look forward to continuing our duty to co-operate discussions and expect to hear from you again in due course. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead may consider making more detailed representations as your Local Plan progresses.

Kind regards

Robert

Robert Paddison MRTPI MRICS
Project Lead Neighbourhood Planning
Development and Regeneration
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
Town Hall, St Ives Road, Maidenhead SL6 1RF

01628 796508

General email: planning.policy@rbwm.gov.uk
Website: www.rbwm.gov.uk
Follow us on Twitter: @RBWM
Like us on Facebook
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Good afternoon,

**Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate**

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The **Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches** document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until **Wednesday 17 August**. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation).

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to you (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I am writing to you now to request that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances may have changed since that time. Even if they have not, there may be opportunities for co-operation between us in the future, identified through our respective monitoring processes. To that end, I am now in the course of drawing up a simple framework that could hopefully assist in facilitating such co-operation, with required processes being agreed between us by way of a Memorandum of Understanding.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email in due course, but it would be helpful if you could confirm your Council’s position to me by 22 July.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

---

**Please Think Before You Print**
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Good afternoon,

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until Wednesday 17 August. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to you (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I am writing to you now to request that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances may have changed since that time. Even if they have not, there may be opportunities for co-operation between us in the future, identified through our respective monitoring processes. To that end, I am now in the course of drawing up a simple framework that could hopefully assist in facilitating such co-operation, with required processes being agreed between us by way of a Memorandum of Understanding.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email in due course, but it would be helpful if you could confirm your Council’s position to me by 22 July.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to Woking BC 10th July 2016 and Woking BC Response
From: Ernest Amoako [mailto:Ernest.Amoako@woking.gov.uk]
Sent: 14 July 2016 10:50
To: Richard Ford
Subject: RE: Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate - WOKING

Dear Richard

Thank you for your e-mail regarding whether Woking Borough Council could meet any part of your unmet need for Housing and Traveller pitches. I can confirm that the Council’s position has not changed, and that Woking Borough Council is not in a position to meet any part of your unmet need. I would also say that the Council is willing to cooperate with Runnymede Borough Council to address future strategic issues of common interest such as transport improvement measures.

I hope you will continue to update the Council on progress with the preparation of your Plan.

Thank you

Ernest Amoako
Planning Policy Manager
Woking Borough Council

From: Richard Ford [mailto:richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk]
Sent: 13 July 2016 15:50
To: Planning Policy
Subject: Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate - WOKING

Good afternoon,

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until Wednesday 17 August. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to you (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I am writing to you now to request that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances may have changed since that time. Even if they have not, there may be opportunities for co-operation between us in the future, identified through our respective monitoring processes. To that end, I am now in the course of drawing up a
simple framework that could hopefully assist in facilitating such co-operation, with required processes being agreed between us by way of a Memorandum of Understanding.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email in due course, but it would be helpful if you could confirm your Council’s position to me by 22 July.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to Elmbridge BC 19th August 2016 and Elmbridge BC Response
Dear Richard

Thank you for this email and my apologies for this late response but I wanted to investigate the points that you make before responding.

I have attached a letter which is intended to address the general concerns you have set out. However, I have to say that I was disappointed that you also sent what I regard as operational correspondence to my Leader and the Planning Portfolio Holder. In future I would appreciate it if you would send this sort of correspondence to me or my officer colleagues and allow us to decide whether and in what way we present these matters to our Members.

I hope that the attached letter is helpful and that we can continue to have regular dialogue so that we make the most of a co-operative approach to future planning and any opportunities that we can take together.

Yours sincerely

Robert Moran
Chief Executive
Elmbridge Borough Council
Civic Centre
High Street
Esher
Surrey KT10 9SD
01372 474380
rmoran@elmbridge.gov.uk
www.elmbridge.gov.uk

---

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation.
until **Friday 26 August**. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation).

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I recently wrote again, on 13 July (please see email below) requesting that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances could have changed since my original contact.

I am now writing to your authority again for two reasons. First, I would like to elaborate on the details of the issues on which we have previously agreed to co-operate; these are set out sequentially below. Secondly, as the Duty to Co-operate applies to all levels of contact between local authorities, I am writing to you to seek to progress these matters of common interest to us. In my last email I made reference to a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between our authorities, setting out how required processes might be agreed between us. I now attach a draft MoU for your consideration. Officers at Runnymede Borough Council are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority, which is a key partner for the cross boundary matter(s) outlined above, is crucial to ensuring that a common position can be agreed on each relevant matter, which should prove to be of benefit to both our authorities. I am keen to come and meet with you at your authority to discuss the attached MoU and to try to reach agreement on its content. I currently have availability in the first half of September and from early October onwards, and I would be grateful if you could confirm whether these periods contain any dates that would be convenient for a meeting to explore this avenue further.

**Housing**

*The Council has concluded that it will be unable to meet its identified housing needs as set out in the Runnymede-Spelthorne Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (November 2015).*

Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils have worked together to prepare a SHMA. The SHMA sets out the extent of the housing market area that the two authorities are located within and the number and types of homes needed to meet housing demand in that combined area over the period 2013 to 2033, based on population and economic projections. The SHMA draws the following rounded conclusion on the overall need for housing in Runnymede over the period: 466 to 535 homes per annum. Following the completion of the Council’s interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment in June 2016, the Council is currently recommending in its Issues, Options and Preferred Approached consultation document that a housing target of 302 to 383 homes per annum should be aimed for. This housing target would deliver between 56 and 82% of the Council’s identified housing needs.

**Gypsies and Travellers**

*The Council has identified that it is unlikely that it will be able to meet its identified need for traveller plots and pitches as set out in its Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) (September 2014).*

Runnymede’s traveller population is well-established. The traveller population, as a proportion of the Borough’s total population, is larger than in the majority of local authority areas in England and Wales. The Council recognises that it has a high need for traveller accommodation, which has been confirmed in its published TAA, which makes an assessment of need for pitches and plots between the years 2013 and 2028. The identified need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in years 1 to 5 is 71, with 1 plot for Travelling Showpeople also needed. The need for years 6 to 15 is 117 traveller pitches, together with 17 Showpeople plots.

The Council is in the course of preparing a new TAA, but this is at a very early stage of preparation and there is no useful output to date.

**B8 Employment Uses**

*The Council has concluded that it will be unable to meet its B8 storage and distribution needs as set out in its Employment Land Review (ELR) (2016).*
Runnymede has a significant need for additional B8 (storage and distribution) floorspace, and in particular, for more modern, small to medium sized units. A need for between 105,842 and 138,887sqm of B8 floorspace has been identified up to 2035. There are, however, limited suitable sites for additional provision due to competition from higher value uses, conflict with neighbouring uses, poorly located sites with reference to the strategic road network and Green Belt constraints. In the short term, limited developer appetite and viability concerns have been reported in the ELR, which threaten the delivery of additional B8 uses, even if allocations are provided.

It may be that there are other locations in the Functional Economic Areas (FEA) in which the Borough lies, where the provision of B8 floorspace would be more viable and where suitable sites are located. These locations may, or may not, be closer than Runnymede to Heathrow Airport.

**Green Belt**

Runnymede Borough Council carried out a Borough wide review of the Green Belt in 2014. This was with a view to confirming which parts of it continue to fulfil the purposes as set out in para. 80 of the NPPF, and whether alterations to the boundaries could be made. The alterations would allow areas of the Green Belt to be returned to the urban area to assist in meeting any identified needs that cannot be met in the Borough’s existing urban areas due to limited capacity.

The Green Belt is of course a policy designation that is shared by many authorities in the South East region. Consideration as to the potential for amendment to the boundary of the Green Belt, with consequent possibilities for additional residential provision, should be given by all such authorities, in the way that Runnymede has done.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email, both in respect of the issues above, and in particular, your views on my suggestion to hold a meeting to discuss the draft MoU.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print

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

__________________________________________________________________________________________

Good afternoon,

**Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate**

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until Wednesday 17 August. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.
In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to you (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I am writing to you now to request that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances may have changed since that time. Even if they have not, there may be opportunities for co-operation between us in the future, identified through our respective monitoring processes. To that end, I am now in the course of drawing up a simple framework that could hopefully assist in facilitating such co-operation, with required processes being agreed between us by way of a Memorandum of Understanding.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email in due course, but it would be helpful if you could confirm your Council’s position to me by 22 July.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print

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

This message has been analyzed and no issues were discovered.
Click here to report this email as spam

This email, and any attachments, is strictly confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended only for use by the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or other use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender and delete it from your system. The opinions expressed in this email are not necessarily those of Elmbridge Borough Council.

This message has been analyzed and no issues were discovered.
Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to RBWM 19th August 2016 and RBWM Response
Subject: FW: Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate - RBWM

From: Alison Alexander [mailto:Alison.Alexander@RBWM.gov.uk]
Sent: 21 August 2016 13:51
To: Richard Ford; Cllr D Wilson; Cllr Dudley
Cc: Planning Policy; Russell O'Keefe
Subject: RE: Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate - RBWM

Dear Richard,

Thank you for your email. My colleague Russell O'Keefe will be making contact, if he has not already, to discuss the issues and requests in your email.

Regards,

Alison

Alison Alexander
Managing Director & Strategic Director of Adult, Children and Health Services
Adult, Children and Health Directorate
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
Town Hall, St Ives Road
Maidenhead
Berkshire SL6 1RF
Tel:01628 796673/796322/07799074198

Website: www.rbwm.gov.uk
Follow us on Twitter: @RBWM
Like us on Facebook

The Royal Borough respects the work life balance of its staff. If this email has been sent out of normal working hours, there is no expectation for you to provide an immediate response.

From: Richard Ford [mailto:richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk]
Sent: 19 August 2016 14:46
To: Alison Alexander; Cllr D Wilson; Cllr Dudley
Cc: Planning Policy
Subject: Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate - RBWM

Good afternoon,

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until Friday 26 August. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers;
Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I recently wrote again, on 13 July (please see email below) requesting that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances could have changed since my original contact.

I am now writing to your authority again for two reasons. First, I would like to elaborate on the details of the issues on which we have previously agreed to co-operate; these are set out sequentially below. Secondly, as the Duty to Co-operate applies to all levels of contact between local authorities, I am writing to you to seek to progress these matters of common interest to us. In my last email I made reference to a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between our authorities, setting out how required processes might be agreed between us. I now attach a draft MoU for your consideration. Officers at Runnymede Borough Council are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority, which is a key partner for the cross boundary matter(s) outlined above, is crucial to ensuring that a common position can be agreed on each relevant matter, which should prove to be of benefit to both our authorities. I am keen to come and meet with you at your authority to discuss the attached MoU and to try to reach agreement on its content. I currently have availability in the first half of September and from early October onwards, and I would be grateful if you could confirm whether these periods contain any dates that would be convenient for a meeting to explore this avenue further.

**Housing**

*The Council has concluded that it will be unable to meet its identified housing needs as set out in the Runnymede-Spelthorne Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (November 2015).*

Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils have worked together to prepare a SHMA. The SHMA sets out the extent of the housing market area that the two authorities are located within and the number and types of homes needed to meet housing demand in that combined area over the period 2013 to 2033, based on population and economic projections. The SHMA draws the following rounded conclusion on the overall need for housing in Runnymede over the period: 466 to 535 homes per annum. Following the completion of the Council’s interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment in June 2016, the Council is currently recommending in its Issues, Options and Preferred Approached consultation document that a housing target of 302 to 383 homes per annum should be aimed for. This housing target would deliver between 56 and 82% of the Council’s identified housing needs.

**Gypsies and Travellers**

*The Council has identified that it is unlikely that it will be able to meet its identified need for traveller plots and pitches as set out in its Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) (September 2014).*

Runnymede’s traveller population is well-established. The traveller population, as a proportion of the Borough’s total population, is larger than in the majority of local authority areas in England and Wales. The Council recognises that it has a high need for traveller accommodation, which has been confirmed in its published TAA, which makes an assessment of need for pitches and plots between the years 2013 and 2028. The identified need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in years 1 to 5 is 71, with 1 plot for Travelling Showpeople also needed. The need for years 6 to 15 is 117 traveller pitches, together with 17 Showpeople plots.

The Council is in the course of preparing a new TAA, but this is at a very early stage of preparation and there is no useful output to date.

**B8 Employment Uses**

*The Council has concluded that it will be unable to meet its B8 storage and distribution needs as set out in its Employment Land Review (ELR) (2016).*

Runnymede has a significant need for additional B8 (storage and distribution) floorspace, and in particular, for more modern, small to medium sized units. A need for between 105,842 and 138,887sqm of B8 floorspace has been identified up to 2035. There are, however, limited suitable sites for additional provision due to competition from higher value uses, conflict with neighbouring uses, poorly located sites with reference to the strategic road network and Green Belt constraints. In the short term, limited developer appetite and viability concerns have been reported in the ELR, which threaten the delivery of additional B8 uses, even if allocations are provided.
It may be that there are other locations in the Functional Economic Areas (FEA) in which the Borough lies, where the provision of 88 floorspace would be more viable and where suitable sites are located. These locations may, or may not, be closer than Runnymede to Heathrow Airport.

**Green Belt**
Runnymede Borough Council carried out a Borough wide review of the Green Belt in 2014. This was with a view to confirming which parts of it continue to fulfil the purposes as set out in para. 80 of the NPPF, and whether alterations to the boundaries could be made. The alterations would allow areas of the Green Belt to be returned to the urban area to assist in meeting any identified needs that cannot be met in the Borough’s existing urban areas due to limited capacity.

The Green Belt is of course a policy designation that is shared by many authorities in the South East region. Consideration as to the potential for amendment to the boundary of the Green Belt, with consequent possibilities for additional residential provision, should be given by all such authorities, in the way that Runnymede has done.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email, both in respect of the issues above, and in particular, your views on my suggestion to hold a meeting to discuss the draft MoU.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

**Please Think Before You Print**

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

--------------------------------------------------------

Good afternoon,

**Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate**

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The **Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches** document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until **Wednesday 17 August**. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation).

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to you (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I am writing to you now to request that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances may have changed since that time. Even if they have not, there may be opportunities for co-operation between us in the
future, identified through our respective monitoring processes. To that end, I am now in the course of drawing up a simple framework that could hopefully assist in facilitating such co-operation, with required processes being agreed between us by way of a Memorandum of Understanding.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email in due course, but it would be helpful if you could confirm your Council’s position to me by 22 July.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print

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

Did you know that each person in the UK uses over 200kg. of paper every year? Please respect the environment. ONLY print this e-mail if you have to.

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the individuals(s) or destination to which it is addressed.

Any unauthorised use, retention, distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited.

This e-mail may contain sensitive or protectively marked material up to RESTRICTED security classification and should be handled accordingly.

If you have received this transmission in error please call the RBWM Customer Service Centre on 01628 683800 to let us know, or notify us by e-mail on customer.service@rbwm.gov.uk

Please then delete the message.

Any views expressed by the sender of this e-mail are not necessarily those of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. All communications sent to or from the Council may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and are subject to and maybe disclosable under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

All e-mails sent are checked for viruses, but this does not constitute a guarantee. The Council will not accept liability for any damage caused by a virus or other malware.

Thank you http://www.rbwm.gov.uk

*******************************************************************************
Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to Spelthorne BC 19th August 2016 and Spelthorne BC Response
Good afternoon,

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until Friday 26 August. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I recently wrote again, on 13 July (please see email below) requesting that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances could have changed since my original contact.

I am now writing to your authority again for two reasons. First, I would like to elaborate on the details of the issues on which we have previously agreed to co-operate; these are set out sequentially below. Secondly, as the Duty to Co-operate applies to all levels of contact between local authorities, I am writing to you to seek to progress these matters of common interest to us. In my last email I made reference to a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between our authorities, setting out how required processes might be agreed between us. I now attach a draft MoU for your consideration. Officers at Runnymede Borough Council are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority, which is a key partner for the cross boundary matter(s) outlined above, is crucial to ensuring that a common position can be agreed on each relevant matter, which should prove to be of benefit to both our authorities. I am keen to come and meet with you at your authority to discuss the attached MoU and to try to reach agreement on its content. I currently have availability in the first half of September and from early October onwards, and I would be grateful if you could confirm whether these periods contain any dates that would be convenient for a meeting to explore this avenue further.

Housing

The Council has concluded that it will be unable to meet its identified housing needs as set out in the Runnymede-Spelthorne Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (November 2015).

Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils have worked together to prepare a SHMA. The SHMA sets out the extent of the housing market area that the two authorities are located within and the number and types of homes needed to meet housing demand in that combined area over the period 2013 to 2033, based on population and economic projections. The SHMA draws the following rounded conclusion on the overall need for housing in Runnymede over the period: 466 to 535 homes per annum. Following the completion of the Council’s interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment in June 2016, the Council is currently recommending in its Issues, Options and Preferred Approached consultation document that a housing target of 302 to 383 homes per annum should be aimed for. This housing target would deliver between 56 and 82% of the Council’s identified housing needs.
Gypsies and Travellers
The Council has identified that it is unlikely that it will be able to meet its identified need for traveller plots and pitches as set out in its Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) (September 2014).

Runnymede's traveller population is well-established. The traveller population, as a proportion of the Borough’s total population, is larger than in the majority of local authority areas in England and Wales. The Council recognises that it has a high need for traveller accommodation, which has been confirmed in its published TAA, which makes an assessment of need for pitches and plots between the years 2013 and 2028. The identified need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in years 1 to 5 is 71, with 1 plot for Travelling Showpeople also needed. The need for years 6 to 15 is 117 traveller pitches, together with 17 Showpeople plots.

The Council is in the course of preparing a new TAA, but this is at a very early stage of preparation and there is no useful output to date.

B8 Employment Uses
The Council has concluded that it will be unable to meet its B8 storage and distribution needs as set out in its Employment Land Review (ELR) (2016).

Runnymede has a significant need for additional B8 (storage and distribution) floorspace, and in particular, for more modern, small to medium sized units. A need for between 105,842 and 138,887sqm of B8 floorspace has been identified up to 2035. There are, however, limited suitable sites for additional provision due to competition from higher value uses, conflict with neighbouring uses, poorly located sites with reference to the strategic road network and Green Belt constraints. In the short term, limited developer appetite and viability concerns have been reported in the ELR, which threaten the delivery of additional B8 uses, even if allocations are provided.

It may be that there are other locations in the Functional Economic Areas (FEA) in which the Borough lies, where the provision of B8 floorspace would be more viable and where suitable sites are located. These locations may, or may not, be closer than Runnymede to Heathrow Airport.

Green Belt
Runnymede Borough Council carried out a Borough wide review of the Green Belt in 2014. This was with a view to confirming which parts of it continue to fulfilled the purposes as set out in para. 80 of the NPPF, and whether alterations to the boundaries could be made. The alterations would allow areas of the Green Belt to be returned to the urban area to assist in meeting any identified needs that cannot be met in the Borough’s existing urban areas due to limited capacity.

The Green Belt is of course a policy designation that is shared by many authorities in the South East region. Consideration as to the potential for amendment to the boundary of the Green Belt, with consequent possibilities for additional residential provision, should be given by all such authorities, in the way that Runnymede has done.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email, both in respect of the issues above, and in particular, your views on my suggestion to hold a meeting to discuss the draft MoU.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print
Good afternoon,

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until Wednesday 17 August. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to you (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I am writing to you now to request that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances may have changed since that time. Even if they have not, there may be opportunities for co-operation between us in the future, identified through our respective monitoring processes. To that end, I am now in the course of drawing up a simple framework that could hopefully assist in facilitating such co-operation, with required processes being agreed between us by way of a Memorandum of Understanding.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email in due course, but it would be helpful if you could confirm your Council’s position to me by 22 July.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print

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

From: Brooks, John <J.Brooks@spelthorne.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 August 2016 15:31
To: Richard Ford; Georgina Pacey
Cc: Dawes, Geoff; Cook, Hannah
Subject: Runnymede Issues and Options Consultation
Attachments: Minutes of meeting with Spelthorne Borough Council 09.08.16.docx; 22 Aug 16 Response to Issues and Options Consultation.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Richard/Georgina

I refer to our meeting on 9 August and attach a formal response to the Issues and Options consultation document.

You have sent through a minute of our meeting on 9 August which I attach. Our formal response to the Issues and Options document elaborates on many of the points discussed and updates a number of matters in the meeting note. I will not try and redraft the meeting note but for the record the meeting note needs to be read in the context of our consultation response.

We are also in receipt of you recent email of 19 August to the Leader, Cabinet Member and Chief Executive on the matter of the Duty to Cooperate. That email and MOU document are predicated on you being unable to meet housing, gypsy and traveller and B8 needs. In our response to the Issues and Option document we have raised fundamental questions about the robustness of some of the work you have undertaken so far and the narrow way in which options have been formulated.

We place considerable importance on the DtC and have actively engaged with you and also shared research and general advice, however, it is also important that resultant plan work reflects the outcomes of such joint work including robustness and thoroughness of the evidence that underpins it. DtC activity and agreements between authorities are no substitute for sound planning work. Discussions about exactly what Runnymede is unable to provide within its own Borough clearly needs a lot more work before we can formally respond to the DtC email and MOU. It is evident from our discussion that there are also other significant strategic issues that need to be added to the list of matters we need to consider and these include flood risk, retailing and environmental matters relating to the River Thames.

When you have assimilated our response to your Issues and Options consultation it may be appropriate to have a further meeting to understand fully how our current concerns and observations are being responded to and we can at that stage consider when an appropriate MOU might be formulated. For the meantime I will lead on any meetings on an MOU and only involve our Councillors and Chief Executive when matters have reached a stage where I could recommend such a document can be agreed.

Please let me know if you require clarification on any issues raised above.

Regards

John Brooks  BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI MCMI
Assistant Head of Planning (Policy)
Spelthorne Borough Council
Council Offices
Knowle Green
Staines upon Thames
TW18 1XB
Tel 01784 446346
Email: J.Brooks@spelthorne.gov.uk
**Disclaimer**

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).
Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to Surrey Heath BC 19th August 2016
Graham Holmes

From: Richard Ford
Sent: 19 August 2016 14:47
To: 'karen.whelan@surreyheath.gov.uk'; 'moira.gibson@surreyheath.gov.uk'; 'charlotte.morley@surreyheath.gov.uk'
Cc: 'jane ireland@surreyheath.gov.uk'
Subject: Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate - SURREY HEATH
Attachments: Template DtC MoU RF GP.docx

Good afternoon,

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until Friday 26 August. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I recently wrote again, on 13 July (please see email below) requesting that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances could have changed since my original contact. Thank you for your response.

I am now writing to your authority again for two reasons. First, I would like to elaborate on the details of the issues on which we have previously agreed to co-operate; these are set out sequentially below. Secondly, as the Duty to Co-operate applies to all levels of contact between local authorities, I am writing to you to seek to progress these matters of common interest to us. In my last email I made reference to a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between our authorities, setting out how required processes might be agreed between us. I now attach a draft MoU for your consideration. Officers at Runnymede Borough Council are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority, which is a key partner for the cross boundary matter(s) outlined above, is crucial to ensuring that a common position can be agreed on each relevant matter, which should prove to be of benefit to both our authorities. I am keen to come and meet with you at your authority to discuss the attached MoU and to try to reach agreement on its content. I currently have availability in the first half of September and from early October onwards, and I would be grateful if you could confirm whether these periods contain any dates that would be convenient for a meeting to explore this avenue further.

Housing

The Council has concluded that it will be unable to meet its identified housing needs as set out in the Runnymede-Spelthorne Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (November 2015).

Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils have worked together to prepare a SHMA. The SHMA sets out the extent of the housing market area that the two authorities are located within and the number and types of homes needed to meet housing demand in that combined area over the period 2013 to 2033, based on population and economic projections. The SHMA draws the following rounded conclusion on the overall need for housing in Runnymede over the period: 466 to 535 homes per annum. Following the completion of the Council’s interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment in June 2016, the Council is currently recommending in its Issues, Options and Preferred Approached consultation document that a housing target of 302 to 383 homes per annum should be aimed for. This housing target would deliver between 56 and 82% of the Council’s identified housing needs.
Gypsies and Travellers
The Council has identified that it is unlikely that it will be able to meet its identified need for traveller plots and pitches as set out in its Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) (September 2014).

Runnymede’s traveller population is well-established. The traveller population, as a proportion of the Borough’s total population, is larger than in the majority of local authority areas in England and Wales. The Council recognises that it has a high need for traveller accommodation, which has been confirmed in its published TAA, which makes an assessment of need for pitches and plots between the years 2013 and 2028. The identified need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in years 1 to 5 is 71, with 1 plot for Travelling Showpeople also needed. The need for years 6 to 15 is 117 traveller pitches, together with 17 Showpeople plots.

The Council is in the course of preparing a new TAA, but this is at a very early stage of preparation and there is no useful output to date.

B8 Employment Uses
The Council has concluded that it will be unable to meet its B8 storage and distribution needs as set out in its Employment Land Review (ELR) (2016).

Runnymede has a significant need for additional B8 (storage and distribution) floorspace, and in particular, for more modern, small to medium sized units. A need for between 105,842 and 138,887sqm of B8 floorspace has been identified up to 2035. There are, however, limited suitable sites for additional provision due to competition from higher value uses, conflict with neighbouring uses, poorly located sites with reference to the strategic road network and Green Belt constraints. In the short term, limited developer appetite and viability concerns have been reported in the ELR, which threaten the delivery of additional B8 uses, even if allocations are provided.

It may be that there are other locations in the Functional Economic Areas (FEA) in which the Borough lies, where the provision of B8 floorspace would be more viable and where suitable sites are located. These locations may, or may not, be closer than Runnymede to Heathrow Airport.

Green Belt
Runnymede Borough Council carried out a Borough wide review of the Green Belt in 2014. This was with a view to confirming which parts of it continue to fulfil the purposes as set out in para. 80 of the NPPF, and whether alterations to the boundaries could be made. The alterations would allow areas of the Green Belt to be returned to the urban area to assist in meeting any identified needs that cannot be met in the Borough’s existing urban areas due to limited capacity.

The Green Belt is of course a policy designation that is shared by many authorities in the South East region. Consideration as to the potential for amendment to the boundary of the Green Belt, with consequent possibilities for additional residential provision, should be given by all such authorities, in the way that Runnymede has done.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email, both in respect of the issues above, and in particular, your views on my suggestion to hold a meeting to discuss the draft MoU.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford
Good afternoon,

**Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate**

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The **Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches** document is now (from 6 July) the subject of statutory public consultation until **Wednesday 17 August**. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation).

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, I have previously written to you (initially in March 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, I asked whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that we had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; Employment; and Green Belt. I was pleased to receive a response, but disappointed that you were unable to provide us with any practical assistance at that time.

I am writing to you now to request that your Council give further consideration to this matter, as circumstances may have changed since that time. Even if they have not, there may be opportunities for co-operation between us in the future, identified through our respective monitoring processes. To that end, I am now in the course of drawing up a simple framework that could hopefully assist in facilitating such co-operation, with required processes being agreed between us by way of a Memorandum of Understanding.

I look forward to receiving your response to this email in due course, but it would be helpful if you could confirm your Council’s position to me by 22 July.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

**Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council**
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

**Please Think Before You Print**

This message, and associated files, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please note that any copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Runnymede Borough Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Appendix 5 – E-Mail sent to Woking BC 19th August 2016 and Woking BC Response
Dear Douglas,

Thank you for your email in response to mine sent to you last week.

Thank you also for agreeing to have a meeting with me at your offices. Your PA, Katy, has already been very helpful in making the necessary arrangements for us to meet on 6 October.

I appreciate that it is unusual for Council members and senior management to be written to direct in the way that Runnymede has done in this case, but in view of Runnymede’s past failing in respect of the Duty to Co-operate, we are very concerned this time around to be seen to be involving our partners, at all levels, as we seek to make progress with the Local Plan. I would like to make the point, though, that this should not be interpreted as a suggestion of failure of co-operation between our respective authorities to date. I am sure Ernest will agree with me when I say that the working relationship between us continues to be really very good, with both parties engaging fully with the other in respect of our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities.

In your email, you express interest in which other local authorities Runnymede has approached in the same way as it has your own. The full list is as follows: Bracknell Forest; Elmbridge; Epsom & Ewell; Guildford; Hart; Hillingdon; Hounslow; Kingston; Mole Valley; Windsor & Maidenhead; Reigate & Banstead; Richmond; Rushmoor; Slough; South Buckinghamshire; Spelthorne; Surrey Heath; Tandridge; Waverley.

I do hope that this email explains satisfactorily to you the matter of Runnymede’s approach, but please let me know if any clarification is required. Otherwise, I look forward to meeting you, with Ernest, in October.

Kind regards,

Richard

---

**Please Think Before You Print**

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

---

**From:** Douglas Spinks [mailto:Douglas.Spinks@woking.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 25 August 2016 11:00  
**To:** Richard Ford
Richard,

I refer to your e-mail of 19 August 2016 in connection with the above. As you know, this matter has been referred to me and Ernest and we are surprised that you approached our Leader and Chief Executive direct rather than us.

Ernest and I would be willing to meet you to discuss the issues you have raised, but at this stage we will give no commitment to entering into a MoU. In particular, we would like to explore the following matters with you:

- why the MoU is necessary given that our respective authorities are in different Housing Market Areas (HMA) and Functional Economic Market Areas (FEMA).
- the evidence behind the reasons why the unmet needs of Runnymede could not be met within your HMA and FEMA.
- why options that could deliver the entire housing needs have not been fully explored.
- the implications of the timing of agreeing to the terms of the MoU as drafted prior to your Council’s consideration of representations arising from the Issues and Options consultation.
- why Runnymede B.C considers the need to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers as a bilateral strategy matter to be covered in a MoU.
- why the unmet need for B8 use in Runnymede could not be met in your FEMA.

I will ask my PA, Katy Marlow to contact you to arrange a meeting with us, but in the meantime I would be interested to know which other Councils you have approached in similar terms.

Regards,

Douglas.

Douglas Spinks | Deputy Chief Executive
Woking Borough Council, Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking, Surrey, GU21 6YL
Phone: 01483 743440  Web: www.woking.gov.uk
For general enquiries please call Woking Borough Council’s Contact Centre on 01483 755855

**********************************************************************
This transmission is intended for the named addressee only.
It may contain sensitive material and be marked as CONFIDENTIAL and accordingly must not be disclosed
to anyone other than the named addressee, unless authorisation is granted by the sender.
If you are not the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), you may not copy, use or
disclose it to anyone else.
If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender
immediately. All Public Services Network(PSN) traffic may be subject to recording
and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.
**********************************************************************
Appendix 5 – Duty to Co-operate Letters sent to Neighbouring Authorities 16th December 2016
16 December 2016

Mr Robert Moran
Chief Executive
Elmbridge Borough Council
Civic Centre, High Street
Esher
Surrey
KT10 9SD

Dear Robert,

Runnymede Local: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, ‘Runnymede 2035’. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document was recently the subject of statutory public consultation. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, officers in my Planning Department have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016, and most recently in August), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, you were asked as to whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that our Councils had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; B8 employment uses; and Green Belt.

Our most recent communication with you included a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the aim of which is to set out how required policy processes in respect of the matters highlighted above might be agreed between us. Officers are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority is the best way of ensuring that a common position can be agreed on relevant matters, which should prove to be of benefit to both our authorities.

Thank you for your response dated 21 September, which is very encouraging in terms of the importance that your Council clearly attaches to the matter of the Duty to Co-operate. I appreciate that you do not feel able to set out your detailed position until you have established the strategic options for your Local Plan, but I note your comment that “it will be important to reach a common understanding and shared position on this matter”. In the spirit of this statement, may I suggest that, in the short term, a Statement of Common Ground between us could be a helpful way forward. I am therefore asking my Planning Policy Manager, Richard Ford 01932 425278 richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk to revert to your officers, so that they are able to work together to find a mutually acceptable way to make progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities.

Whatever means is employed, what is essential is that the position between us in respect of the identified matters is set out clearly and unequivocally, so that there is no ambiguity concerning these matters when our respective plans come to be scrutinised at examination.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Runnymede Borough Council, Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone, Surrey, KT15 2AH
Tel: 01932 838383 Fax: 01932 838384 www.runnymede.gov.uk www.runnymede.gov.uk/enews
Yours sincerely

Paul Turrell
16 December 2016

Ms Alison Alexander  
Chief Executive  
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  
Town Hall, St Ives Road  
Maidenhead  
SL6 1RF

Dear Alison,

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, ‘Runnymede 2035’. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document was recently the subject of statutory public consultation. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, officers in my Planning Department have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016, and most recently in August), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, you were asked as to whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that our Councils had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; B8 employment uses; and Green Belt. Our most recent communication with you included a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the aim of which is to set out how required policy processes in respect of the matters highlighted above might be agreed between us.

The response (dated 1 September) to us from Russell O’Keefe, Strategic Director of Corporate and Community Services, confirms that your Council “is unable to offer any practical assistance in helping you to meet your needs with regards to housing, Gypsies and Travelers, employment of Green Belt until such time as your actual requirements are more clearly stated”. However, he confirms that “the proposed Memorandum of Understanding is an appropriate way of taking forward those matters on which we agree and indeed on which we might disagree”, and advises that a draft, annotated MoU that “will enable us to further engage in meaningful discussions to arrive at an agreed position without undue delay” has been drawn up.

I understand that a meeting between our respective Planning Policy Managers to review the draft MoU’s has recently been arranged for next week. We should certainly take encouragement from the co-operation that has been, and is currently being, achieved, although we will need to ensure that progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities does not falter.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Yours sincerely

Paul Turrell
16 December 2016

Mr Roberto Tambini
Chief Executive
Spelthorne Borough Council
Knowle Green
Staines-upon-Thames
TW18 1XB

Dear Roberto,

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, ‘Runnymede 2035’. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document was recently the subject of statutory public consultation. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, officers in my Planning Department have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016, and most recently in August), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, you were asked as to whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that our Councils had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; B8 employment uses; and Green Belt.

Our most recent communication with you included a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the aim of which is to set out how required policy processes in respect of the matters highlighted above might be agreed between us. Officers are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority is the best way of ensuring that a common position can be agreed on relevant matters, which should prove to be of benefit to both our authorities.

Your Council’s response (23 August) explained that you would expect Runnymede to carry out more work in connection with its currently unmet needs before you could formally respond to MoU and associated email. In view of this stance being taken, I would like to suggest that a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between us could be a helpful way forward. This could be as straightforward as a statement that our authorities are in agreement that neither party is currently able to assist the other in meeting unmet needs, but that the position might alter over time, as a result of a material change in circumstances or as a result of each Council’s monitoring function. I am aware that officers from our two authorities have already met on several occasions to discuss matters of mutual concern, and I would expect this arrangement to continue.

What is essential is that, whatever the means employed, the position between us in respect of the identified matters is set out clearly and unequivocally, so that there is no ambiguity when our respective plans come to be scrutinised at examination. I am therefore asking my Planning Policy Manager, Richard Ford 01932 425278 richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk to revert to your officers, so that they are able to work together to find a mutually acceptable way to make progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities.

Runnymede Borough Council, Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone, Surrey, KT15 2AH
Tel: 01932 838383  Fax: 01932 838384  www.runnymede.gov.uk  www.runnymede.gov.uk/enews
In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Yours sincerely

Paul Turrell
16 December 2016

Ms Karen Whelan
Chief Executive
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Knoll Road
Camberley
Surrey
GU15 3HD

Dear Karen,

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, ‘Runnymede 2035’. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document was recently the subject of statutory public consultation. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, officers in my Planning Department have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016, and most recently in August), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, you were asked as to whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that our Councils had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; B8 employment uses; and Green Belt.

Our most recent communication with you included a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the aim of which is to set out how required policy processes in respect of the matters highlighted above might be agreed between us. Officers are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority is the best way of ensuring that a common position can be agreed on relevant matters, which should prove to be of benefit to both our authorities. I am advised that we have to date received no response from you to this particular email.

As we are neighbouring authorities, albeit in different identified Housing Market Areas and Functional Economic Areas, it is especially important that we continue to co-operate with each other as we seek to move forward with our Local Plans. The consideration of large scale proposals in proximity, at Fairoaks in Surrey Heath and at Longcross in Runnymede, with the implications for existing and proposed infrastructure that that entails, is reason enough in itself to require our authorities to work very closely together.

I would therefore urge you to advise officers in your Planning Policy team to make contact with my Planning Policy Manager, Richard Ford 01932 425278 richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk so that they are able to work together to find a mutually acceptable way to make progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities. It is vital that the position between us in respect of the identified matters is set out clearly and unequivocally, so that there can be no ambiguity concerning these matters when our respective plans come to be scrutinised at examination.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.
Yours sincerely

Paul Turrell
16 December 2016

Mr Ray Morgan  
Chief Executive  
Woking Borough Council  
Civic Offices, Gloucester Square  
Woking  
Surrey  
GU21 6YL

Dear Ray,

**Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate**

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The **Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches** document was recently the subject of statutory public consultation. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation).

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, officers in my Planning Department have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016, and most recently in August), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, you were asked as to whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that our Councils had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; B8 employment uses; and Green Belt.

Our most recent communication with you included a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the aim of which is to set out how required policy processes in respect of the matters highlighted above might be agreed between us. Officers are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority is the best way of ensuring that a common position can be agreed on relevant matters, which should prove to be of benefit to both our authorities.

I am aware that my Planning Policy Manager, Richard Ford, met with Douglas Spinks and Ernest Amoako on 6 October to discuss the matter of the MoU. I understand that there was agreement on a number of points, but it was made clear that your authority could make no commitment to the signing of a MoU.

In view of this stance being taken, I would like to propose that a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between us could be a helpful way forward. This could be as straightforward as a statement that our authorities are in agreement that neither party is currently able to assist the other in meeting unmet needs, but that the position might alter over time, as a result of a material change in circumstances or as a result of each Council’s monitoring function.

As we are neighbouring authorities, albeit in different identified Housing Market Areas – but with some links between our Functional Economic Areas - it is especially important that we continue to co-operate with each other as we seek to move forward with our Local Plans. I suggest that the consideration of large scale proposals in proximity, at Martyrs Lane in Woking and at Longcross in Runnymede, with the implications for existing and
proposed infrastructure that entails, is reason enough in itself to require our authorities to work very closely together.

I would therefore urge you to advise officers in your Planning Policy team to make contact with Richard Ford 01932 425278 richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk so that they are able to work together to find a mutually acceptable way to make progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities. It is vital that the position between us in respect of the identified matters is set out clearly and unequivocally, so that there can be no ambiguity concerning these matters when our respective plans come to be scrutinised at examination.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Yours sincerely

Paul Turrell
From: Suzanne Parkes [mailto:SParkes@elmbridge.gov.uk]
Sent: 19 August 2016 08:58
To: Planning Policy
Subject: Runnymede 2035 Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches Consultation

Please find attached Elmbridge Borough Council’s response to the above consultation.

This has been agreed by our portfolio holder however, is subject to call in. Although unlikely, we would therefore like to reserve the opportunity to add any additional comments.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries regarding our response.

Kind regards

Suzanne

Suzanne Parkes BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTP, RICS, Dip CMI Deputy Planning Policy Manager (Strategy & Policy) Direct Line – 01372 474810 Email – sparkes@elmbridge.gov.uk

Please note I am out of the office on Wednesdays

Elmbridge Borough Council
Civic Centre
High Street, Esher
Surrey KT10 9SD
www.elmbridge.gov.uk
Mr Richard Ford  
Planning Policy Manager  
The Policy & Strategy Team  
Runnymede Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
Station Road  
Addlestone, Surrey  
KT15 2AH  

contact: Mark Behrendt  
Planning Policy Manager  
direct line: 01372 474829  
e-mail: mbehrendt@elmbridge.gov.uk  
my ref: RBC/LP/001  
your ref:  

16th August 2016

Dear Mr Ford,

Runnymede Local Plan 2035 Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches Consultation (July 2016)


As you know, we are keen to work with you and other authorities to meet the identified development needs of our areas, ensuring that the best and most suitable sites are brought forward for development and that other cross-boundary and strategic planning matters are continuously addressed with the key principles of sustainable development at the forefront. In responding to this consultation we have therefore focused on those points where cross-boundary issues could arise and where we consider that further joint-working between our two authorities is required.

Please note we have not been able to review the entire supporting evidence base in detail. As such, further comments may be forthcoming on additional issues as the Runnymede Local Plan 2035 progresses.

Spatial Vision, Objectives and Strategy

As with many other local authorities we recognise the difficulties in delivering sustainable growth and the challenge of effectively balancing competing environmental, social and economic pressures. Officers have previously commented on the evidence base identifying the development needs of Runnymede Borough and the various opportunities and constraints that have been considered and identified in meeting them. The consultation document takes this work one step further, identifying the preferred spatial strategy having balanced these considerations.

Whilst we are supportive of the pragmatic approach being undertaken by Runnymede Borough Council in seeking to meet their identified development needs, we do not

Chief Executive: Robert Moran  
Strategic Director and Deputy Chief Executive  
Sarah Selvanathan  
Strategic Director  
Ray Lee

CUSTOMER EXCELLENCE  
CSE
necessarily consider it appropriate to comment on how best other Boroughs and Districts achieve this. Nevertheless we would like to emphasise one of the risks that has been identified when considering the various spatial strategy approaches available to Runnymede Borough Council namely, the Government’s duty to cooperate.

Runnymede Borough Council’s preferred spatial approach (SS3) states that any unmet housing need would be met by neighbouring Housing Market Areas (HMAs) following duty to cooperate discussions. You will be aware that Elmbridge Borough Council is undertaking a review of its Local Plan evidence base including assessments of the development needs of the Borough and the various opportunities and constraints identified in meeting them. Whilst not formally published, I can confirm that the significant development needs identified within the Borough and wider HMA when balanced against the absolute constraints to development and also giving consideration to Green Belt means that is highly improbable that we will meet our objectively assessed development needs. Elmbridge Borough Council will therefore not be able to accommodate any residual development needs from neighbouring authorities or HMAs.

Housing

The proactive approach to meeting the accommodation needs of specialist populations e.g. Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, is welcomed in preferred approach H4/03. At the duty to cooperate workshop hosted by Runnymede Borough Council on 22nd April 2016, concern was raised that the plan intended to have a criteria based policy for assessing applications as opposed to allocating sites. As discussed, and notwithstanding the significant political element that needs to be considered with this topic, we welcome this change in approach and consider this to be consistent with Government policy.

Natural Environment

The preferred spatial approach (SS3) identifies the risk of not being able to identify sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) for the level of development proposed in the longer term and that some Resultant Land Parcels (RLPs) may need to / be able to accommodate on-site SANG. As the detailed consideration of site specific allocations progress, and should Runnymede Borough Council find that the strategy of on-site provision is not feasible, Elmbridge Borough Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss SANG capacity and any potential available surplus within our Borough that could aid the delivery of neighbouring authorities’ development needs.

Transport & Infrastructure

The increased pressure of development on infrastructure provision and in particular on the strategic and local road network is a principal concern for the Borough Council and our residents. In terms of cross-boundary strategic issues between our two authorities, of particular concern is the A317 St. Peter’s Way roundabout junction with A318 Chertsey Road and A317 Woburn Hill which is a recognised ‘hot spot’. In light of these concerns we welcome the modelling work already undertaken as part of the Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) and the acknowledgement that individual development sites and / or allocations will likely impact on the transport and highway network.

The Council also strongly supports the preferred policy approach (T2/01) and will be particularly interested to see the detailed modelling for the proposed development sites /
allocations and the comprehensive travel plans put forward for each including, the mitigation measures proposed to reduce impacts.

**Flooding**

We are encouraged that Runnymede Borough Council recognises the significant risk of fluvial flooding and is taking a proactive stance in its preferred policy approach (F1/F01). However, whilst the evidence acknowledges the potential of flooding from other sources this appears not to have been taken forward in some instances e.g. surface water and the approach to managing this and drainage on minor sites.

The Council is also concerned that emphasis has been placed on development within the flood plain (Flood Zone 3b) rather than development coming forward within areas of high and medium risk of flooding in regards to requiring the design of new development to be flood resistant. For example, preferred policy approach F1/B01 is equally applicable to sites within Flood Zone 2 and 3a as it is 3b. In regards to preferred policy approach F1/C01 - improving community resilience in the event of a flood, the Council considers that the preparation of flood plans should be a requirement of any forthcoming Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) rather than just being encouraged.

The pragmatic approach to the sequential test to sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3a is noted and we would be interested to see the response from the Environment Agency in regards to this issue.

I hope you find these comments useful in progressing work on the Local Plan.

Please do not hesitate to contact Mark Behrendt, Planning Policy Manager, if any of the points raised requires further explanation. Officers would be happy to meet with you to discuss our comments in more detail.

Yours sincerely,

Councillor Mrs. Karen Randolph
Portfolio Holder for Planning Services
Elmbridge Borough Council
Anna, Andrew,

Representation from Spelthorne BC attached.

Richard

---

From: Brooks, John [mailto:J.Brooks@spelthorne.gov.uk]
Sent: 23 August 2016 15:31
To: Richard Ford; Georgina Pacey
Cc: Dawes, Geoff; Cook, Hannah
Subject: Runnymede Issues and Options Consultation

Richard/Georgina

I refer to our meeting on 9 August and attach a formal response to the Issues and Options consultation document.

You have sent through a minute of our meeting on 9 August which I attach. Our formal response to the Issues and Options document elaborates on many of the points discussed and updates a number of matters in the meeting note. I will not try and redraft the meeting note but for the record the meeting note needs to be read in the context of our consultation response.

We are also in receipt of you recent email of 19 August to the Leader, Cabinet Member and Chief Executive on the matter of the Duty to Cooperate. That email and MOU document are predicated on you being unable to meet housing, gypsy and traveller and B8 needs. In our response to the Issues and Option document we have raised fundamental
questions about the robustness of some of the work you have undertaken so far and the narrow way in which options have been formulated.

We place considerable importance on the DtC and have actively engaged with you and also shared research and general advice, however, it is also important that resultant plan work reflects the outcomes of such joint work including robustness and thoroughness of the evidence that underpins it. DtC activity and agreements between authorities are no substitute for sound planning work. Discussions about exactly what Runnymede is unable to provide within its own Borough clearly needs a lot more work before we can formally respond to the DtC email and MOU. It is evident from our discussion that there are also other significant strategic issues that need to be added to the list of matters we need to consider and these include flood risk, retailing and environmental matters relating to the River Thames.

When you have assimilated our response to your Issues and Options consultation it may be appropriate to have a further meeting to understand fully how our current concerns and observations are being responded to and we can at that stage consider when an appropriate MOU might be formulated. For the meantime I will lead on any meetings on an MOU and only involve our Councillors and Chief Executive when matters have reached a stage where I could recommend such a document can be agreed.

Please let me know if you require clarification on any issues raised above.

Regards

John Brooks  BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI MCMI
Assistant Head of Planning (Policy)
Spelthorne Borough Council
Council Offices
Knowle Green
Staines upon Thames
TW18 1XB
Tel 01784 446346
Email: J.Brooks@spelthorne.gov.uk

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a safer and more useful place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more Click Here.
I refer to the draft consultation document and set out our formal response. The comments made reflect matters that were discussed in some detail at officer level on 9 August.

I will respond separately to your notes of that meeting but much is also covered in this formal response.

As discussed at our meeting we have significant reservations about the robustness and adequacy of some of the work that underpins the I&O document and the conclusions it reaches. In particular not all relevant options have in our view been identified and for this reason we consider at this stage the housing capacity and related plan options may significantly understate the levels of housing development in particular that could be achieved.

Our conclusion is significant for two reasons.

1. Firstly, the Inspector who conducted the examination in 2014 of the now withdrawn local plan said “whilst recognising the significant constraints to development within the Borough, I do not consider that the Council has positively sought opportunities to meet the development needs of Runnymede”. This was set a clear direction for future work by your authority which in our view has not been realised as not all opportunities have been sought.

2. You have since written formally to our Leader, Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development and Chief Executive to say you are unable to meet all your objectively assessed need and ask if my authority can meet part of that need. In the light of our concerns this request is premature.

I set out our concerns as follows:

Major issues of approach:

1. **Structure of the I&O document.** This is essentially on a thematic basis with housing economic and other matters dealt with under separate chapters. Within each theme options are largely related to that theme alone. Nowhere does the document seek to assess for example the extent to which housing and economic needs may be traded with each other and specifically the scope for identified surplus availability of some types of employment land be used for housing.

2. **Employment floor space.** If we have understood it correctly you identify a surplus of 58,000m² of office floor space and identify a deficit of 87,000m² of industry and storage space. The report explains there appears no developer appetite to bring forward and implement schemes to meet the industry and storage ‘need’. Given the lack of market interest we question the robustness of the work which has established the storage (B8) need. It is on the basis of the work that has been done that you have formally asked Spelthorne under the Duty to Cooperate to consider if we can meet that need. This request is premature given the further work that is clearly required to substantiate the claimed need.
   a. The document states you want to protect the employment floor space at strategic business locations but have not explained why floor space in non-strategic locations
is not being actively promoted for housing – this is surely the role of a Local Plan to consider.

b. It is explained that some of the surplus industry and storage space is at the former DERA site and this is close to the TBH SPA and therefore cannot be developed for housing. I am unclear why some of that space could not be used for additional SANG to meet further housing provision or whether other SANGs could be brought forward – the I&O document simply does not explore the options around this important issue. I would have expected some general explanation of what sites have been identified to extend available SANG to meet higher levels of growth.

3. **Size of dwellings required.** We have supplied you with a copy of work we have done to assess the extent to which extensions to existing dwellings increase the size of units in the existing stock and accordingly the requirement more smaller units to secure a balanced stock to meet the needs identified in the SHMA. We have suggested previously that Runnymede should undertake similar work but this has not taken place. The consequence of ensuring the need for smaller dwellings is properly understood is that it is likely to result in a greater proportion of smaller dwellings and in turn enable more dwellings to be secured from the land that is available.

4. **Densities.** The I&O document provides no consideration of density options. Given your initial conclusion that you are unable to meet all of your housing need I would have expected this to be a central piece of work to your I&O document. You have explained at our meeting this will be considered over the coming months with landowners after which there will be a much greater level of confidence about the amount of development each site can take. In our view this work should have been completed before the I&O document was published. At present your SHLA does not give the site area of sites to enable densities to be understood. Para 5.27 makes the statement that Runnymede is not currently proposing to consider higher densities around commuter hubs and that for the present you will rely on minimum density policy. We understand that for the DERA site, which represents by far the largest housing site you are identifying, relatively low densities are currently proposed.

5. **20% buffer for housing allocations.** You have built into you housing supply figures an allowance that 20% will not be implemented. We ask you to clarify the basis of this approach. Our understanding is that any general under provision from previous plan periods needs to be addressed in the first 5 years – but we have been unable to identify such a figure in the I&O document. There is a separate point around demonstrating a continuous 5 year supply where a 5% buffer is normally required and 20% buffer where under delivery has previously been experienced. That is not applicable in our view to the whole plan period where through robust assessments of deliverability you will be expected to demonstrate what is proposed can be achieved. We think the 20% figure in this context is unjustified and simply serves to depress the extent to which your OAN could be met.

6. **Elderly and Student accommodation.** We have suggested there is scope to include such accommodation in the overall delivery of housing. We understand your position to be that this is not worth looking at further as you expect to meet the assessed need for these two groups and statistically the implications of such supply is limited. This misses the point that whatever provision is made – including provision in excess of any theoretical need figure
deduced at this stage - clearly provides accommodation that meets a need and can reasonably be counted against the OAN.

7. **Gypsy and Traveller needs.** – These are identified at paras 5.28 – 5.30 but no options appear to be presented to explain how that need might be met within Runnymede. Under the DtC you have nevertheless asked Spelthorne to assist in meeting that need. Within the consultation document there is no clear evidence you have explored all options to meet this need.

Our initial view is that the above points in combination could, if addressed positively with a view to maximising housing provision, substantial meet the OAN or possibly even exceed it. It is of concern you have formally approach my authority to ask if we can meet part of your need without robustly assessing all available options and accepting that some key work has yet to be done.

**Other matters:**

1. Para 5.41 – you have reflected the affordable housing requirement arising from the SHMA for the HMA of 513 – 924 but have not undertaken further work to assess the extent to which this theoretical figure is matched by local evidence of need held by your Housing Department. This is a point we recommended you did at the time the SHMA was prepared and we have done previously.

2. Para 4.36- it appears that from an economic point of view you are seeking to meet a labour supply demand from building 466 houses but currently only planning actually build between 302 and 383. This discrepancy needs to be resolved.

3. Para 6.40 and page 85- retail. No reference is made to the role of Staines Upon Thames as a major comparison goods centre serving the sub region of north Surrey. It is of course virtually on the Runnymede boundary. The document (option R6) refers to high. The analysis of where expenditure takes place ignores the established retail hierarchy in the wider area and the particular proximity of Staines to Runnemede and the fact Staines retail catchment area extends across much of Runnymede.

4. Page 80 – Heathrow – a decision on a third runway is currently expected in October which is well ahead of your projected publication of a submission plan. I would have expected the implications of this project proceeding to have been considered more fully in the document given the Airport Commissions endorsement of it.

5. SFRA it is noted that the latest SFRA does not reflect the most recent guidance on climate change and updated mapping is required from the EA. Without this there is a significant risk that ‘options’ for the plan have at this stage not been fully understood. Given the EA intend to implement the River Thames Scheme mid-way through the proposed plan period the implications for development should have been considered in this Issues and Options document.

6. Para 4.5 (point 12) reference is made to sustain the economy by the document does not define what this means. Does it mean employment numbers, floor space, GVA?

7. Page 36 ref SSS - This refers amongst other matters to a surplus of office space in Runnymede offsetting deficits in other authorities in the FEA and offsetting Runnymede’s unmet storage and distribution needs. This is not a matter discussed previously under the Duty to Cooperate and in any case, as already identified, the claimed storage and
distribution needs requires a more robust justification given the admission there is no market interest in bringing such space forward.

23 Aug 16 jb
Dear Richard

Thank you for your email and for giving RBWM the opportunity to comment on your new Local Plan, Runnymede 2035. We would like to give you comments as detailed below and may have further comments as your relative policy positions on the highlighted matters become more defined.

I will address the points that you raise in the order that they appear in your email thus:

- I can confirm that our position has not changed since our response to you earlier this year in that currently RBWM anticipates that it is unable to offer any practical assistance in helping you to meet your needs with regards to housing, Gypsies and Travellers, employment or Green Belt until such time as your actual requirements are more clearly stated.

- The proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) is an appropriate way of taking forward those matters on which we agree and indeed on which we might disagree. Please find attached the draft MoU with comments clearly annotated and that will enable us to further engage in meaningful discussions to arrive at an agreed position without undue delay. I therefore agree that a meeting to discuss our areas of agreement and concern would be of benefit and would suggest that my Borough Planning Manager, Jeni Jackson and my Interim Planning Policy Manager, Chris Berry attend. They are both available on 14th, 15th, 20th or 27th of September or alternatively 4th October or pm on 11th October. I would ask that you liaise directly with Chris Berry to agree a mutually convenient date. The Lead Member for Planning, Cllr Derek Wilson has also indicated that he would be happy to attend any meetings if required.

- Our formal comments on your emerging Local Plan are as follows:
  - **Housing** – we are concerned that you now appear to be indicating that you will only be able to meet between 56% and 82% of your Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN). This is a very wide range and therefore your policy position and spatial development strategy is unclear to us. In particular it is not clear to us how you are seeking to develop your town centres in order to optimise the development potential of what would appear to be inherently sustainable locations although we do appreciate that you are considering density standards. We would urge you to look to increase densities in town centres in common with the approach we are adopting with regards to Maidenhead Town Centre, Windsor and Ascot. Until there is further clarity that you have properly considered all options relating to this approach it is difficult for us to determine both what the impact of your current approach would be and what proportion of your OAHN you would be seeking us to try and accommodate. If, after further consideration, you are able to meet your OAHN or close to it then the need to seek opportunities to meet that need elsewhere will of course reduce or disappear. We also believe that you will need to be
specific about what your housing target is so that it is possible to judge how your housing trajectory meets the requirements of national policy, guidance and legislation.

- **SHMA** – whilst we appreciate the joint working that has resulted in your joint SHMA we are concerned that you, in conjunction with Spelthorne, do not appear to have taken into account the potential for change that may be brought about by the revised Household projection recently released by the Office for National Statistics. This is a matter that should be taken into consideration when entering into any discussions on Duty to Cooperate matters especially with regards to meeting any potential unmet housing needs in other areas.

- **Gypsies and Travellers** – we are concerned that you have determined that you will be unable to meet your need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation base on a Travellers Accommodation Assessment (TAA) that is already more than two years old and cannot therefore take into account the new definition of Gypsies and Travellers which may well result in a lower level of need being identified and subsequently needing to be met. Before we reach a final position on accommodating needs I would ask that you progress your new Travellers Accommodation Assessment (TAA) at which point we could usefully revisit whether we would be able to help meet any unmet need.

- **Employment** – we are concerned that you are stating that you are unable to meet your identified need for B8 employment uses due to competition with other higher value uses. We do not believe that this is a defensible position. We are particularly concerned that you are unable to meet this need given your relative proximity to Heathrow although we do appreciate that there may be some concerns regarding relative ease of access to the Strategic Road Network we are of the opinion that this issue should be further explored through work you will be carrying out regarding your sustainability appraisal, traffic modelling and work on your Infrastructure Delivery Plan. We would be happy to be a part of any discussions you may wish to arrange on this matter.

- **Green Belt** – We appreciate the clarity of your approach to Green Belt matters but we remain concerned that even minor amendments to Green Belt boundaries will require the establishment of a case of exceptional circumstances in line with Paragraph 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework and that this case does not appear to have yet been made.

- **Infrastructure** – our Members remain concerned about the impact of development adjacent to the Royal Borough boundary particularly with regard to housing development and the provision of school places and we would ask that this issue in particular is given further attention. We do appreciate that there are several large developments currently coming to fruition particularly at the DERA site at Longcross including the new Data Centre which were permitted a number of years ago but our Members remain concerned about the cumulative impact of those developments when added to the quantum of development that may be proposed as a result of your emerging Local Plan. We would therefore request further meetings to discuss with you the cumulative impacts of development and how those impacts which will be felt in the Royal Borough may be appropriately and adequately mitigated. We would also ask that The Royal Borough is consulted in its role as Highways Authority as distinct from its role as the Local Planning Authority. I will forward details of the appropriate contact separately.

We do appreciate the positive manner in which you have approached the issues that are relevant to the Duty to Cooperate and trust that you are able to take on board our concerns as detailed above. We look forward to continuing to positively engage with you on these issues and any others that may emerge as we both progress our respective Local Plans. Please note that we reserve the right to submit further comments to you as your plan develops.

Kind regards
From: Cllr Bateson  
Sent: 29 August 2016 08:59  
To: Russell O'Keefe  
Subject: Re: See WBC submission p.13-p.17 on RBC Local Plan 2035

Russell  
Thank you - look forward to seeing our reply.  
Regards  
Christine

Sent from my iPad

On 26 Aug 2016, at 15:55, Russell O'Keefe <Russell.O'Keefe@RBWM.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Christine

We have agreed an extension with Runnymede Borough Council until next week so we can build in all these points to our response, which was already extensive, and circulate to you all for comments first. We will send this round as soon as it ready.

Kind regards

Russell O'Keefe  
Strategic Director of Corporate and Community Services  
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead  
Town Hall, St Ives Road,  
Maidenhead, SL6 1RF  
Tel: 01628 796521

General email: communications@rbwm.gov.uk  
Website: http://www.rbwm.gov.uk  
Follow us on Twitter: @RBWM  
Like us on Facebook

From: Cllr Bateson  
Sent: 26 August 2016 13:22  
To: Russell O'Keefe; Cllr Luxton; Cllr L Evans  
Cc: Cllr D Wilson  
Subject: Fwd: See WBC submission p.13-p.17 on RBC Local Plan 2035

Russell
I believe you are dealing with this. Please may all above see a copy of the consultation response before it goes back to Surrey. I hope everyone has filled you in on the DERA Site and the Data centre (will be the biggest in Europe) which will be located less than a mile from the centre of Sunningdale. Oh and also the Leisure Centre and houses that Cllr Evans has talked about. This development is just the start of many phases to come and nearly all those that have cars will come through the village of Sunningdale to get to the M£ and M4. Please see all the attachments.

Look forward to your reply.
Christine.

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sayonara Luxton
Date: 26 August 2016 at 12:57:17 BST
To: Emily Geary <Cllr.Bateson@RBWM.gov.uk>, [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: See WBC submission p.13-p.17 on RBC Local Plan 2035

FYI

Cllr. Sayonara Luxton
Mayor
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Begin forwarded message:

From: Florence Churchill
<Date: 26 August 2016 at 9:30:39 am BST
To: Cllr Luxton [redacted], Cllr Wilson [redacted], Cllr D Wilson <cllr.d.wilson@rbwm.gov.uk>
Cc: Jenifer Jackson <Jenifer.Jackson@RBWM.gov.uk>, Russell O'Keefe <Russell.O'Keefe@RBWM.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: See WBC submission p.13-p.17 on RBC Local Plan 2035

Dear Cllr Luxton

A draft response to the Runnymede consultation is currently with Russell O’Keefe for approval that had picked up on the broad issues that Cllr Evans has mentioned. She is of course free to make representations in her own right. We are engaged in a constructive discussion with RBC on a number of issues under the broad umbrella of Duty to Cooperate that affords us the opportunity to bring these concerns into focus.

I have copied Russell in on this email as he may wish to respond either to you or to Cllr Evans directly and Cllr Wilson for his information.

With regards
From: Jenifer Jackson  
Sent: 26 August 2016 09:21  
To: Cllr Luxton; Florence Churchill  
Subject: RE: See WBC submission p.13-p.17 on RBC Local Plan 2035

Flo,
Would you please respond to Cllr Luxton.
Regards
Jeni

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: Cllr Luxton  
Sent: 26/08/2016 08:46  
To: [Redacted]  
Cc: anne-catherine.buxton@sunningdaleparish.org.uk; michael.burn@sunningdaleparish.org.uk; Yvonne Jacklin; Sunningdale Parish Contact; lilly.evans@sunningdaleparish.org.uk; Cllr Bateson; Cllr Luxton  
Subject: Re: See WBC submission p.13-p.17 on RBC Local Plan 2035

Jennifer

Could you please act on this immediately as the deadline is the today.

Thanks and regards

Cllr. Sayonara Luxton
Mayor
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
On 26 Aug 2016, at 12:01 am, Lilly Evans wrote:

Dear all,

My sincere apologies for this very late hour in sending you the material from Runnymede Planning site relevant to consultation on their Local Plan 2035. The four pages of Wokingham BC submission explain clearly the dangers, to RBWM in general and to Sunningdale Parish in particular, should RBC pursue their preferred option SS3. The first email is from RBWM planning officer suggesting they are preparing a response following a series of late consultations with RBC.

https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=15632&p=0

You may have also noted in their recent updated Duty to Cooperate document (dated 11.7.2016) that while under Transport they have gone on to consult with Highways England, no such consultation has occurred with RBWM. I can send it separately but it is 321p long as it includes evidence, so just relevant Transport pages matter.

Further, with the proposed increases of number of dwellings in Virginia Water and Longcross amounting to well over 2,000 houses there is clearly inadequate reference to further Infrastructure requirements especially regarding Education needs at secondary level. We are already aware that the prospectus for Longcross North development of some 200 houses mentions Charters School as being one of the two nearest secondary schools. It is also the only one accessible via public transport (by train and walking).

Please note that any representation, whether personal or from the Council needs to be received by 5pm on Friday 26.8.2016

Kind regards

Lilly
Did you know that each person in the UK uses over 200kg. of paper every year? Please respect the environment. ONLY print this e-mail if you have to.

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the individuals(s) or destination to which it is addressed.

Any unauthorised use, retention, distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited.

This e-mail may contain sensitive or protectively marked material up to RESTRICTED security classification and should be handled accordingly.

If you have received this transmission in error please call the RBWM Customer Service Centre on 01628 683800 to let us know, or notify us by e-mail on customer.service@rbwm.gov.uk

Please then delete the message.

Any views expressed by the sender of this e-mail are not necessarily those of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. All communications sent to or from the Council may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and are subject to and maybe disclosable under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

All e-mails sent are checked for viruses, but this does not constitute a guarantee. The Council will not accept liability for any damage caused by a virus or other malware.

Thank you http://www.rbwm.gov.uk
Dear Sir/Madam,

Runnymede Issues and Options and Preferred Options Local Plan consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2016 Runnymede Issues, Options and Preferred Local Plan consultation. Surrey Heath Borough Council wishes to make the following comments.

Whilst SHBC does not object in principle to the DERA sites being released from the Green Belt it considers that in taking these sites forward through the Local Plan process there is a need to address both local and strategic transport impacts through further modelling work. To this end any Local Plan policy for the DERA North and South sites should include a requirement to address these transport issues. Improvements to the A320 should also be considered to deal with strategic growth within the area.

There should also be discussions with Highways England regarding the possible provision of a restricted access Junction (2a) of the M3 to allow separate entry and exit for local traffic to and from the West at the B386 Longcross Road over bridge.

Surrey Heath would welcome the opportunity, under Duty to Co-operate, to have further discussions with Runnymede in respect of seeking improvements to the strategic network as identified above. This will help facilitate sound and effective plan making.

Yours faithfully

Jane Ireland
Planning Policy and Conservation Manager
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Appendix 7 – Neighbouring Authorities Response to Additional Sites and Options Consultation
Dear Richard

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Additional Sites and Options consultation. Please find attached Surrey Heath Borough Council’s response which re-iterates our earlier response to the previous consultation.

Regards
Jane
Jane Ireland
Planning Policy and Conservation Manager
Policy and Conservation
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Knoll Road
Camberley
GU15 3HD
01276 707100
(Direct dial 01276 707213)
www.surreyheath.gov.uk
Great Place I Great Community I Great Future

SURREY HEATH DISCLAIMER

This email and any attachments are intended for the addressee only. The information contained in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, the use of the information contained in this email or any disclosure, copying or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately.

Surrey Heath Borough Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing email to ensure compliance with current procedures. This email has been checked for computer viruses prior to sending, but it is also your responsibility to virus check the email upon receipt.

For contact and service information, please refer to www.surreyheath.gov.uk
The Policy and Strategy Team  
Runnymede Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
Station Road  
Addlestone  
KT15 2AH  
United Kingdom

19th June 2017  

BY EMAIL ONLY  

Dear Sir/Madam,

Runnymede Additional Sites and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Runnymede Additional Sites and Options (ASO) Consultation. Surrey Heath Borough Council has now had the opportunity to consider this matter and has no comments to make over and above those set out in our response (dated 3rd August) to the earlier Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches Consultation. For clarity, our earlier response indicated:

Whilst SHBC does not object in principle to the DERA sites being released from the Green Belt it considers that in taking these sites forward through the Local Plan process there is a need to address both local and strategic transport impacts through further modelling work. To this end any Local Plan policy for the DERA North and South sites should include a requirement to address these transport issues. Improvements to the A320 should also be considered to deal with strategic growth within the area.

There should also be discussions with Highways England regarding the possible provision of a restricted access Junction (2a) of the M3 to allow separate entry and exit for local traffic to and from the West at the B386 Longcross Road over bridge.

Surrey Heath consider that these comments remain relevant in the development of the Runnymede Local Plan.

As per our previous response, Surrey Heath would welcome the opportunity, under Duty to Co-operate, to have further discussions with Runnymede in respect of seeking improvements to the strategic network as identified above. This will help facilitate sound and effective plan making.
Yours faithfully

Jane Ireland
Planning Policy and Conservation Manager
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Please find attached our response to your latest consultation.

Any questions please let me know.

Kind regards

Suzanne

Suzanne Parkes BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI, RICS, Dip CMI
Deputy Planning Policy Manager (Strategy & Policy)
Direct Line – 01372 474810
Email - sparkes@elmbridge.gov.uk

Please note I am out of the office on Wednesdays

Elmbridge Borough Council
Civic Centre
High Street, Esher
Surrey KT10 9SD
www.elmbridge.gov.uk

How do you rate the service we provided in this email?

riteria:

★ Good ★ Average ★ Poor

This email, and any attachments, is strictly confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended only for use by the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or other use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender and delete it from your system. The opinions expressed in this email are not necessarily those of Elmbridge Borough Council.

This message has been analyzed and no issues were discovered.
23rd June 2017

Dear Mr Ford,

Runnymede Local Plan 2035 – Regulation 18 – Additional Sites and Options Consultation

Thank you for consulting Elmbridge Borough Council on the Runnymede Local Plan 2035 – Regulation 18 – Additional Sites and Options Consultation.

As you know, we are keen to work with you and other authorities to meet the identified development needs of our areas, ensuring that the best and most suitable sites are brought forward for development and that other cross-boundary and strategic planning matters are continuously addressed with the key principles of sustainable development at the forefront.

Given the focused nature of this latest consultation, this response is made at an officer level. As requested comments made in response to the previous Regulation 18 Consultation (summer 2016) have not been repeated unless they also extend to any additional site(s) now proposed for allocation or relate to the identified preferred option.

Spatial Vision, Objectives and Strategy

As with many other local authorities we recognise the difficulties in delivering sustainable growth and the challenge of effectively balancing competing environmental, social and economic pressures. The Council previously commented that we are supportive of the pragmatic approach being taken by Runnymede Borough Council in seeking to meet their identified needs. Once again it is not necessarily considered appropriate for the Council to comment on how best other Boroughs and Districts achieve this however, we welcome the continued and increased effort to identify additional sites for future delivery in order to meet needs.

In terms of the preferred spatial option (SS5) concern remains however, that this still refers to any unmet housing need arising from an OAN based on economic needs being met by
neighbouring HMAs. Whilst it is recognised that the level of unmet need could be between 0 to 69 dwellings per year, the Council’s previous response stated that the significant development needs within Elmbridge Borough when balanced against the absolute constraints to development and also consideration of the Green Belt, would mean that it is highly improbable that we will also meet our objectively assessed development needs. Elmbridge Borough Council will therefore not be able to accommodate any residual development needs from neighbouring authorities or HMAs.

Given that this statement remains within the preferred spatial option, the Council would like to be reassured that no allowance has been made for Elmbridge Borough Council meeting any residual housing need.

**Transport & Infrastructure**

The Council previously expressed concern regarding the increased pressure of development on infrastructure provision and in particular on the strategic and local road network. A key concern was raised regarding the A317 St. Peter’s Way roundabout junction with A318 Chertsey Road and A317 Woburn Hill. An area which is recognised as a ‘hot spot’. Given the additional 420 residential units and 70-bed care home now proposed at St. Peter’s Hospital (231 (new)), the Council would like to reiterate this point.

The Council remains interested therefore to see the detailed modelling for the Borough-wide plan alongside that for the proposed development sites / allocations and the comprehensive travel plans put forward for each including, the mitigation measures proposed to reduce impacts.

I hope you find these comments useful in progressing work on the Local Plan.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if any of the points raised requires further explanation.

Yours sincerely,

Suzanne Parkes
Interim Planning Policy Manager
Elmbridge Borough Council
Hi Georgina,

Apologies for the delay in coming back to you.

As discussed, please find attached comments from Spelthorne Borough Council on the Runnymede Additional Sites and Options consultation.

Kind regards,

Hannah Cook
Senior Planning Officer (Policy)

Spelthorne Borough Council,
Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 1XB
01784 446405

Spelthorne Means Business

Disclaimer
The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a safer and more useful place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more Click Here.
Dear Planning Policy and Strategy Team,

**Runnymede Local Plan - Additional Sites and Options Consultation**

Thank you for consulting Spelthorne Borough Council on the Runnymede Additional Sites and Options. Please note that the comments made in this response are at officer level only.

Firstly we are pleased to note that a number of suggestions within our previous response made in August 2016 to the IPOA consultation have been considered, with potential housing numbers increased to 408-427 dwellings per annum.

We still however observe that Table 8 on page 42 notes that there is a short term lack of developer interest for industrial/storage floorspace. If there is a lack of market interest, we still query the robustness of evidence regarding the deficit of industrial floorspace (71,500sqm). Spelthorne would wish to be advised that the impact of a possible Heathrow Airport expansion has been considered, including the implications for industrial space within the Borough.

If you require any more information on the points raised please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Hannah Cook
Senior Planning Officer (Policy)
Appendix 8 – Letters sent to officers and members 2017 re unmet need in Neighbouring Authorities
25 August 2017

Cllr Shweta Kapadia  
Chairman of Planning Committee  
Elmbridge Borough Council  
Civic Centre, High Street  
Esher  
Surrey  
KT10 9SD  

Dear Cllr Kapadia

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The Additional Sites and Options consultation document was recently the subject of statutory public consultation. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16680&p=0](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16680&p=0).

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, officers in my Planning Department have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016, again in August, and most recently in November), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, you were asked as to whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that our Councils had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; B8 employment uses; and Green Belt.

I understand that a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the aim of which is to set out how required policy processes in respect of the matters highlighted above might be agreed between us, has been passed to your officers. Runnymede officers are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority is the best way of ensuring that a common position can be agreed on relevant matters, which should prove to be of benefit to both our authorities.

I appreciate that you may not feel able to set out your detailed position until you have established the strategic options for your Local Plan. However, that should not prevent our authorities from agreeing a MoU at this time, albeit that its content would be limited. What is essential is that the position between us in respect of the identified matters is set out clearly and unequivocally, so that there is no ambiguity concerning these matters when our respective plans come to be scrutinised at examination.

In view of the need to make continued progress with our Local Plans, I believe that we should be looking for the MoU to be agreed between us by the end of September.

I am therefore asking my Planning Policy Manager, Richard Ford 01932 425278 richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk to revert to your officers, so that they are able to work together to find a mutually acceptable way to make progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities.
In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact Mr Ford if any clarification is required.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Mrs Gail M Kingerley
Chairman of Planning Committee
16 December 2016

Ms Alison Alexander
Chief Executive
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Town Hall, St Ives Road
Maidenhead
SL6 1RF

Dear Alison,

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches document was recently the subject of statutory public consultation. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/localplanconsultation.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, officers in my Planning Department have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016, and most recently in August), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, you were asked as to whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that our Councils had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; B8 employment uses; and Green Belt. Our most recent communication with you included a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the aim of which is to set out how required policy processes in respect of the matters highlighted above might be agreed between us.

The response (dated 1 September) to us from Russell O'Keefe, Strategic Director of Corporate and Community Services, confirms that your Council “is unable to offer any practical assistance in helping you to meet your needs with regards to housing, Gypsies and Travelers, employment of Green Belt until such time as your actual requirements are more clearly stated”. However, he confirms that “the proposed Memorandum of Understanding is an appropriate way of taking forward those matters on which we agree and indeed on which we might disagree”, and advises that a draft, annotated MoU that “will enable us to further engage in meaningful discussions to arrive at an agreed position without undue delay” has been drawn up.

I understand that a meeting between our respective Planning Policy Managers to review the draft MoU’s has recently been arranged for next week. We should certainly take encouragement from the co-operation that has been, and is currently being, achieved, although we will need to ensure that progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities does not falter.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Yours sincerely

Paul Turrell
25 August 2017

Cllr Colin Barnard
Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economic Development
Spelthorne Borough Council
Knowle Green
Staines-upon-Thames
TW18 1XB

Dear Cllr Barnard

**Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate**

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The **Additional Sites and Options** consultation document was recently the subject of statutory public consultation. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16680&p=0](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16680&p=0).

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, officers in my Planning Department have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016, and then again in August 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, you were asked as to whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that our Councils had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; B8 employment uses; and Green Belt.

Our authorities have of course been liaising very well for some time on the matter of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). However, we do need to continue to engage on all the issues referred to above, on account of where we are with formulating our Local Plan.

I understand that a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the aim of which is to set out how required policy processes in respect of the matters highlighted above might be agreed between us, has been passed to your officers. Although Runnymede officers are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority is the best way of ensuring that a common position can be agreed on relevant matters, I am aware that your Council’s position has been that there is no need for a MoU between our authorities. I would urge that you reconsider that position, as it is essential that the position between us in respect of the identified matters is set out clearly and unequivocally, so that there is no ambiguity when our respective plans come to be scrutinised at examination.

In view of the need to make continued progress with our Local Plans, I believe that we should be looking for the MoU to be agreed between us by the end of September.

I think that we should certainly take strong encouragement from the co-operation that has already taken place. However, we need to ensure that we find a mutually acceptable way to enable us to continue to make progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities. I am therefore asking my Planning Policy Manager, Richard Ford 01932 425278 [richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk) to revert to your officers, so that they are able to work together to find a mutually acceptable way to make progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities.
In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact Mr Ford if any clarification is required.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Mrs Gail M Kingerley
Chairman of Planning Committee
25 August 2017

Cllr Alan McClafferty
Regulatory Portfolio Holder
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Knoll Road
Camberley
Surrey
GU15 3HD

Dear Cllr McClafferty

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, 'Runnymede 2035'. The Additional Sites and Options consultation document was recently the subject of statutory public consultation. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages [https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16680&p=0].

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, officers in my Planning Department have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016, again in August, and most recently in November), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, you were asked as to whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that our Councils had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Employment; Gypsies and Travellers; and Green Belt.

Our authorities have of course been liaising recently very well on the matter of the A320 Study. However, we do need to continue to engage on the issues referred to above, on account of where we are with formulating our Local Plan.

We have previously forwarded to you a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the aim of which is to set out how required policy processes in respect of the matters highlighted above might be agreed between us. Runnymede officers are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority is the best way of ensuring that a common position can be agreed on relevant matters, which should prove to be of benefit to both our authorities. What is essential is that the position between us in respect of the identified matters is set out clearly and unequivocally, so that there is no ambiguity concerning these matters when our respective plans come to be scrutinised at examination.

In view of the need to make continued progress with our Local Plans, I believe that we should be looking for the MoU to be agreed between us by the end of September.

I think that we should take encouragement from the co-operation that has already taken place. However, we need to ensure that we find a mutually acceptable way to enable us to continue to make progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities. I am therefore asking my Planning Policy Manager, Richard Ford 01932 425278 richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk to revert to your officers, so that they are able to work together to find a mutually acceptable way to make progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities.
In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact Mr Ford if any clarification is required.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Mrs Gail M Kingerley
Chairman of Planning Committee
25 August 2017

Cllr Ashley Bowes
Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy
Woking Borough Council
Civic Offices, Gloucester Square
Woking
Surrey
GU21 6YL

Dear Cllr Bowes

Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Runnymede Borough Council is in the course of preparing its new Local Plan, ‘Runnymede 2035’. The Additional Sites and Options consultation document was recently the subject of statutory public consultation. The consultation document can be found on the Council’s planning policy webpages https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16680&p=0.

In line with our Duty to Co-operate responsibilities under the Localism Act 2011, officers in my Planning Department have previously written to your authority (initially in March 2016, and most recently in August 2016), requesting information as to whether your Council would be able to assist us with specific provisions of our Local Plan. In particular, you were asked as to whether you would be able to help in respect of matters that our Councils had previously agreed were of mutual interest, namely: Housing; Gypsies and Travellers; B8 employment uses; and Green Belt.

Our authorities have of course been liaising recently very well on the matter of the A320 Study. However, we do need to continue to engage on the issues referred to above, on account of where we are with formulating our Local Plan.

We have previously forwarded to you a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the aim of which is to set out how required policy processes in respect of the matters highlighted above might be agreed between us. Runnymede officers are of the opinion that agreeing and signing a MoU with your authority is the best way of ensuring that a common position can be agreed on relevant matters, which should prove to be of benefit to both our authorities. What is essential is that the position between us in respect of the identified matters is set out clearly and unequivocally, so that there is no ambiguity concerning these matters when our respective plans come to be scrutinised at examination.

In view of the need to make continued progress with our Local Plans, I believe that we should be looking for the MoU to be agreed between us by the end of September.

I think that we should take encouragement from the co-operation that has already taken place. However, we need to ensure that we find a mutually acceptable way to enable us to continue to make progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities. I am therefore asking my Planning Policy Manager, Richard Ford 01932 425278 richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk to revert to your officers, so that they are able to work together to find a mutually acceptable way to make progress on this subject of great importance to both our authorities.
In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact Mr Ford if any clarification is required.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Mrs Gail M Kingerley
Chairman of Planning Committee
Appendix 8 – Letters sent to officers and members 2017 re unmet need in Other Authorities

Other Authorities

Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
Guildford Borough Council
Hart District Council
London Borough of Hillingdon
London Borough of Hounslow
London Borough of Kingston
Mole Valley Council
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
London Borough of Richmond
Rushmoor Borough Council
Slough Borough Council
South Bucks District Council
Tandridge District Council
Waverley Borough Council
Appendix 9 - Suggested SOCG to Neighbouring Authorities and responses
Karen Merredew

From: Richard Ford  
Sent: 15 September 2017 16:10  
To: tplan@elmbridge.gov.uk  
Cc: Cllr Gail Kingerley  
Subject: RE: Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate  
Attachments: Draft MoU Runnymede-Elmbridge 1.docx

Good afternoon,

Further to my recent email to you as below, please now find attached a draft Memorandum of Understanding for your consideration.

It would be helpful if you could complete the details in respect of your authority so that we can complete and sign the document by the end of September/early October.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council  
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk
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Draft Memorandum of Understanding between Runnymede Borough Council and Elmbridge Borough Council on Strategic Planning and the ‘Duty to Co-operate’ on Planning Matters

Background

In the light of the Duty to Co-operate, Runnymede Borough Council and Elmbridge Borough Council have agreed this Memorandum of Understanding for issues of shared strategic concern. These topics include Housing, Gypsies and Travellers, B8 Employment, and Green Belt.

This Memorandum of Understanding builds on long established joint working between the two local authorities and acknowledges where issues are unlikely to be resolved, based on engagement to date.

The following schedules identify those matters where agreement has been reached and also where further co-operation will be undertaken to seek resolution of outstanding issues.

Schedule A: Housing Market Area and Functional Economic Market Area

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough is within a Housing Market Area referred to as the ‘Runnymede-Spelthorne Housing Market Area’. This comprises the administrative areas of Runnymede Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council. This is based on the findings of the Runnymede BC & Spelthorne BC Strategic Housing Market Assessment published in November 2015.

2. Runnymede Borough is considered to sit on the edges of two different FEMA’s. The northern part of the Borough is assessed as sitting within a Wider FEMA that focusses on Heathrow airport at its centre, with the strongest relationships being with Spelthorne, Hounslow and the southernmost part of Hillingdon, due to the location of Heathrow Airport. The southern parts of Runnymede Borough are considered to set on the edge of a South West London/M3/A3 corridor market. The analysis carried out indicates that in this wider FEA, Runnymede’s strongest links are with Woking and Elmbridge.

Both the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA (November 2015) and the Council’s Functional Economic Area Analysis (2015) were the subject of consultation with Duty to Co-operate partners, including Elmbridge Borough Council, prior to being published.

Elmbridge Borough Council

1. 

Agreement

It is agreed that Runnymede Borough and Elmbridge Borough lie in separate Housing Market Areas, but that part of Runnymede Borough shares a Functional Economic Market Area with Elmbridge.
Schedule B: Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for Housing and Employment

Runnymede Borough Council

1. The joint SHMA with Spelthorne shows that Runnymede has an OAN of between 466 and 535 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The lower end of the range is based on demographic trends with adjustment to reflect increased out-commuting from London and improvements to affordability. The upper end reflects the level of housing that could be required to meet the needs of the local economy and also has an adjustment to improve affordability. The figures include the provision of affordable homes. Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils commissioned an update to their SHMA in September 2017.

2. The Employment Land Review identifies Runnymede’s gross employment floorspace requirements for B class floorspace between 2015 and 2035, according to three different scenarios. The Council is supporting the labour supply (466 dpa) scenario based on the OAN figure to ensure that the indigenous growth potential (i.e. from its resident workforce) is not constrained by a lack of space. This scenario identifies a shortfall in industrial floorspace of 105,842 sq.m., but an oversupply of office space through pipeline schemes of 30,957 sq.m. The forecasts within the Council’s Employment Land Review are likely to be refreshed prior to the Examination in Public.

Elmbridge Borough Council

1. 

2. 

Agreement

Runnymede Borough Council and Elmbridge Borough Council will keep each other informed of any changes to their respective OAN’s for housing and employment. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule C: Unmet Housing Need

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council is currently uncertain of being able to meet its full objectively assessed housing need of even the bottom end of its OAN range at 466 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The Additional Sites and Options consultation (May/June 2017) recognised that the preferred strategy would deliver between 87% and 100% of Runnymede’s OAN (and 36% of the OAN of the HMA as a whole). The level of unmet need would be between 0 to 69 dwellings per year.
Elmbridge Borough Council

1.

Agreement

At this stage Runnymede Borough Council and Elmbridge Borough Council are unlikely to be able to take any of each other’s unmet need. The authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule D: Unmet Need for Employment Floorspace

Runnymede Borough Council

1. The strategy being pursued would result in a surplus of up to 31,000 sq.m. of office floorspace, but a deficit of up to 80,000 sq.m. of industrial floorspace, specifically for storage and distribution uses, translating into a need for 18.5 hectares of land for these uses. The need is for modern, small to medium sized units in particular. There are, however, only limited suitable sites for additional provision. It may be that the surplus of office floorspace in Runnymede could be used to assist other areas in the FEMA to meet their office floorspace needs, with those areas reciprocating by helping to meet Runnymede’s unmet storage and distribution needs. This would require agreement under the Duty to Co-operate.

2. The final provision of employment growth will in part depend on decisions about Heathrow.

Elmbridge Borough Council

1.

Agreement

At this stage Runnymede Borough and Elmbridge Borough Council are unlikely to be able to take any of each other’s unmet need. The authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule E: Green Belt

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council’s Issues and Options documents include options for releasing Green Belt land for housing.

Elmbridge Borough Council
Agreement

The authorities will keep each other informed of the approach taken to Green Belt.

Schedule F: Provision for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation (GTTS)

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council has recently commissioned a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment, to assess the level of need for pitches and plots in the Borough when assessed against the new definition of a traveller as contained in ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’.

Elmbridge Borough Council

1. Agreement

Neither authority is currently requesting the other authority to accommodate unmet needs for travellers. However this position will be reviewed once the evidence has been produced. If it transpires that one or both Councils are requesting assistance with meeting unmet needs for travellers, an initial meeting will be held to discuss the identified issues followed by a review of each authority’s position every six months.

This Memorandum of Understanding provides a framework for joint working between Runnymede Borough Council and Elmbridge Borough Council.

Signed:

Runnymede Borough Council

Signed:

Elmbridge Borough Council
Good afternoon,

Further to previous correspondence between us, please now find attached a draft Memorandum of Understanding for your consideration.

It would be helpful if you could complete the details in respect of your authority so that we can complete and sign the document by the end of September/early October.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford
Draft Memorandum of Understanding between Runnymede Borough Council and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council on Strategic Planning and the ‘Duty to Co-operate’ on Planning Matters

Background

In the light of the Duty to Co-operate, Runnymede Borough Council and RBWM Council have agreed this Memorandum of Understanding for issues of shared strategic concern. These topics include Housing, Gypsies and Travellers, B8 Employment, and Green Belt.

This Memorandum of Understanding builds on long established joint working between the two local authorities and acknowledges where issues are unlikely to be resolved, based on engagement to date.

The following schedules identify those matters where agreement has been reached and also where further co-operation will be undertaken to seek resolution of outstanding issues.

Schedule A: Housing Market Area and Functional Economic Market Area

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough is within a Housing Market Area referred to as the ‘Runnymede-Spelthorne Housing Market Area’. This comprises the administrative areas of Runnymede Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council. This is based on the findings of the Runnymede BC & Spelthorne BC Strategic Housing Market Assessment published in November 2015.

2. Runnymede Borough is considered to sit on the edges of two different FEMA’s. The northern part of the Borough is assessed as sitting within a Wider FEMA that focusses on Heathrow airport at its centre, with the strongest relationships being with Spelthorne, Hounslow and the southernmost part of Hillingdon, due to the location of Heathrow Airport. The southern parts of Runnymede Borough are considered to set on the edge of a South West London/M3/A3 corridor market. The analysis carried out indicates that in this wider FEA, Runnymede’s strongest links are with Woking and Elmbridge.

Both the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA (November 2015) and the Council’s Functional Economic Area Analysis (2015) were the subject of consultation with Duty to Co-operate partners, including RBWM Council, prior to being published.

RBWM Council

1.

Agreement

It is agreed that Runnymede Borough and RBWM lie in separate Housing Market Areas and Functional Economic Market Areas.
Schedule B: Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for Housing and Employment

Runnymede Borough Council

1. The joint SHMA with Spelthorne shows that Runnymede has an OAN of between 466 and 535 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The lower end of the range is based on demographic trends with adjustment to reflect increased out-commuting from London and improvements to affordability. The upper end reflects the level of housing that could be required to meet the needs of the local economy and also has an adjustment to improve affordability. The figures include the provision of affordable homes. Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils commissioned an update to their SHMA in September 2017.

2. The Employment Land Review identifies Runnymede’s gross employment floorspace requirements for B class floorspace between 2015 and 2035, according to three different scenarios. The Council is supporting the labour supply (466 dpa) scenario based on the OAN figure to ensure that the indigenous growth potential (i.e. from its resident workforce) is not constrained by a lack of space. This scenario identifies a shortfall in industrial floorspace of 105,842 sq.m., but an oversupply of office space through pipeline schemes of 30,957 sq.m. The forecasts within the Council’s Employment Land Review are likely to be refreshed prior to the Examination in Public.

RBWM Council

1.

2.

Agreement

Runnymede Borough Council and RBWM Council will keep each other informed of any changes to their respective OAN’s for housing and employment. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule C: Unmet Housing Need

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council is currently uncertain of being able to meet its full objectively assessed housing need of even the bottom end of its OAN range at 466 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The Additional Sites and Options consultation (May/June 2017) recognised that the preferred strategy would deliver between 87% and 100% of Runnymede’s OAN (and 36% of the OAN of the HMA as a whole). The level of unmet need would be between 0 to 69 dwellings per year.

RBWM Council

1.
Agreement

At this stage Runnymede Borough Council and RBWM Council are unlikely to be able to take any of each other’s unmet need. The authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule D: Unmet Need for Employment Floorspace

Runnymede Borough Council

1. The strategy being pursued would result in a surplus of up to 31,000 sq.m. of office floorspace, but a deficit of up to 80,000 sq.m. of industrial floorspace, specifically for storage and distribution uses, translating into a need for 18.5 hectares of land for these uses. The need is for modern, small to medium sized units in particular. There are, however, only limited suitable sites for additional provision. It may be that the surplus of office floorspace in Runnymede could be used to assist other areas in the FEMA to meet their office floorspace needs, with those areas reciprocating by helping to meet Runnymede’s unmet storage and distribution needs. This would require agreement under the Duty to Co-operate.

2. The final provision of employment growth will in part depend on decisions about Heathrow.

RBWM Council

1.

Agreement

At this stage Runnymede Borough and RBWM Council are unlikely to be able to take any of each other’s unmet need. The authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule E: Green Belt

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council’s Issues and Options documents include options for releasing Green Belt land for housing.

RBWM Council

Agreement
The authorities will keep each other informed of the approach taken to Green Belt.

Schedule F: Provision for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation (GTTS)

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council has recently commissioned a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment, to assess the level of need for pitches and plots in the Borough when assessed against the new definition of a traveller as contained in ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’.

RBWM Council

1. Agreement

Neither authority is currently requesting the other authority to accommodate unmet needs for travellers. However this will be kept under review once the evidence has been produced. If it transpires that one or both Councils are requesting assistance with meeting unmet needs for travellers, an initial meeting will be held to discuss the identified issues followed by a review of each authority’s position every six months.

This Memorandum of Understanding provides a framework for joint working between Runnymede Borough Council and RBWM Council.

Signed:

Runnymede Borough Council

Signed:

RBWM Council
Good afternoon,

Further to my recent email to you as below, please now find attached a draft Memorandum of Understanding for your consideration.

It would be helpful if you could complete the details in respect of your authority so that we can complete and sign the document by the end of September/early October.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print

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

From: Richard Ford
Sent: 25 August 2017 15:57
To: planning.policy@spelthorne.gov.uk
Cc: Cllr Gail Kingerley
Subject: Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Good afternoon,

Please now find attached a copy of a letter from Cllr. Mrs Kingerley, Runnymede's Planning Committee Chairman, to the equivalent member of your Council, which I am intending to dispatch on behalf of Mrs Kingerley early next week.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk
Please Think Before You Print

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

Background

In the light of the Duty to Co-operate, Runnymede Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council have agreed this Memorandum of Understanding for issues of shared strategic concern. These topics include Housing, Gypsies and Travellers, B8 Employment, and Green Belt.

This Memorandum of Understanding builds on long established joint working between the two local authorities and acknowledges where issues are unlikely to be resolved, based on engagement to date.

The following schedules identify those matters where agreement has been reached and also where further co-operation will be undertaken to seek resolution of outstanding issues.

Schedule A: Housing Market Area and Functional Economic Market Area

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough is within a Housing Market Area referred to as the ‘Runnymede-Spelthorne Housing Market Area’. This comprises the administrative areas of Runnymede Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council. This is based on the findings of the Runnymede BC & Spelthorne BC Strategic Housing Market Assessment published in November 2015.

2. Runnymede Borough is considered to sit on the edges of two different FEMA’s. The northern part of the Borough is assessed as sitting within a Wider FEMA that focusses on Heathrow airport at its centre, with the strongest relationships being with Spelthorne, Hounslow and the southernmost part of Hillingdon, due to the location of Heathrow Airport. The southern parts of Runnymede Borough are considered to set on the edge of a South West London/M3/A3 corridor market. The analysis carried out indicates that in this wider FEA, Runnymede’s strongest links are with Woking and Elmbridge.

Both the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA (November 2015) and the Council’s Functional Economic Area Analysis (2015) were the subject of consultation with Duty to Co-operate partners, including Spelthorne Borough Council, prior to being published.

Spelthorne Borough Council

1.

Agreement

It is agreed that Runnymede Borough and Spelthorne Borough lie in the same Market Housing Area, and that part of Runnymede Borough shares a Functional Economic Market Area with Spelthorne.
Schedule B: Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for Housing and Employment

Runnymede Borough Council

1. The joint SHMA with Spelthorne shows that Runnymede has an OAN of between 466 and 535 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The lower end of the range is based on demographic trends with adjustment to reflect increased out-commuting from London and improvements to affordability. The upper end reflects the level of housing that could be required to meet the needs of the local economy and also has an adjustment to improve affordability. The figures include the provision of affordable homes. Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils commissioned an update to their SHMA in September 2017.

2. The Employment Land Review identifies Runnymede’s gross employment floorspace requirements for B class floorspace between 2015 and 2035, according to three different scenarios. The Council is supporting the labour supply (466 dpa) scenario based on the OAN figure to ensure that the indigenous growth potential (i.e. from its resident workforce) is not constrained by a lack of space. This scenario identifies a shortfall in industrial floorspace of 105,842 sq.m., but an oversupply of office space through pipeline schemes of 30,957 sq.m.. The forecasts within the Council’s Employment Land Review are likely to be refreshed prior to the Examination in Public.

Spelthorne Borough Council

1.

2.

Agreement

Runnymede Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council will keep each other informed of any changes to their respective OAN's for housing and employment.

Schedule C: Unmet Housing Need

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council is currently uncertain of being able to meet its full objectively assessed housing need of even the bottom end of its OAN range at 466 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The Additional Sites and Options consultation (May/June 2017) recognised that the preferred strategy would deliver between 87% and 100% of Runnymede’s OAN (and 36% of the OAN of the HMA as a whole). The level of unmet need would be between 0 to 69 dwellings per year.

Spelthorne Borough Council

1.
Agreement

At this stage Runnymede Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council are unlikely to be able to take any of each other’s unmet need. The authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule D: Unmet Need for Employment Floorspace

Runnymede Borough Council

1. The strategy being pursued would result in a surplus of up to 31,000 sq.m. of office floorspace, but a deficit of up to 80,000 sq.m. of industrial floorspace, specifically for storage and distribution uses, translating into a need for 18.5 hectares of land for these uses. The need is for modern, small to medium sized units in particular. There are, however, only limited suitable sites for additional provision. It may be that the surplus of office floorspace in Runnymede could be used to assist other areas in the FEMA to meet their office floorspace needs, with those areas reciprocating by helping to meet Runnymede’s unmet storage and distribution needs. This would require agreement under the Duty to Co-operate.

2. The final provision of employment growth will in part depend on decisions about Heathrow.

Spelthorne Borough Council

1. 

Agreement

At this stage Runnymede Borough and Spelthorne Borough are unlikely to be able to take any of each other’s unmet need. The authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule E: Green Belt

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council’s Issues and Options documents include options for releasing Green Belt land for housing.

Spelthorne Borough Council
Agreement

The authorities will keep each other informed of the approach taken to Green Belt.

Schedule F: Provision for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation (GTTS)

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council has recently commissioned a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment, to assess the level of need for pitches and plots in the Borough when assessed against the new definition of a traveller as contained in 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites'.

Spelthorne Borough Council

1.

Agreement

Neither authority is currently requesting the other authority to accommodate unmet needs for travellers. However this position will be reviewed once the evidence has been produced. If it transpires that one or both Councils are requesting assistance with meeting unmet needs for travellers, an initial meeting will be held to discuss the identified issues followed by a review of each authority’s position every six months.

This Memorandum of Understanding provides a framework for joint working between Runnymede Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council.

Signed:

Runnymede Borough Council

Signed:
A “thanks but no thanks” ...

Dear Richard,

Thank you for your email regarding a Memorandum of Understanding.

Spelthorne is currently preparing its evidence base to support its Local Plan and is yet to commence or complete a number of studies. This includes a need to update our SHMA to take account of the recently published DCLG guidance and to also set out our land availability through the SLAA.

We therefore feel that a MoU is not necessary at present given that we are compiling our evidence base and many sections of the memorandum, setting out our position, would remain outstanding until our evidence base is more complete.

We therefore consider that a MoU is not necessary for joint working until both authorities are at a stage to set out a robust and informed approach.

Kind regards,

Hannah

Hannah Cook
Senior Planning Officer (Strategic Planning)
Good afternoon,

Further to my recent email to you as below, please now find attached a draft Memorandum of Understanding for your consideration.

It would be helpful if you could complete the details in respect of your authority so that we can complete and sign the document by the end of September/early October.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print

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

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

Spelthorne Means Business

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a safer and more useful place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more Click Here.
Good afternoon,

Further to my recent email to you as below, please now find attached a draft Memorandum of Understanding for your consideration.

It would be helpful if you could complete the details in respect of your authority so that we can complete and sign the document by the end of September/early October.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk

Please Think Before You Print

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

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

Background

In the light of the Duty to Co-operate, Runnymede Borough Council and Surrey Heath
Borough Council have agreed this Memorandum of Understanding for issues of shared
strategic concern. These topics include Housing, Gypsies and Travellers, B8 Employment,
and Green Belt.

This Memorandum of Understanding builds on long established joint working between the
two local authorities and acknowledges where issues are unlikely to be resolved, based on
engagement to date.

The following schedules identify those matters where agreement has been reached and also
where further co-operation will be undertaken to seek resolution of outstanding issues.

Schedule A: Housing Market Area and Functional Economic Market Area

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough is within a Housing Market Area referred to as the ‘Runnymede-
Spelthorne Housing Market Area’. This comprises the administrative areas of
Runnymede Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council. This is based on the
findings of the Runnymede BC & Spelthorne BC Strategic Housing Market Assessment
published in November 2015.

2. Runnymede Borough is considered to sit on the edges of two different FEMA’s. The
northern part of the Borough is assessed as sitting within a Wider FEMA that focusses
on Heathrow airport at its centre, with the strongest relationships being with Spelthorne,
Hounslow and the southernmost part of Hillingdon, due to the location of Heathrow
Airport. The southern parts of Runnymede Borough are considered to set on the edge of
a South West London/M3/A3 corridor market. The analysis carried out indicates that in
this wider FEA, Runnymede’s strongest links are with Woking and Elmbridge.

Both the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA (November 2015) and the Council’s Functional
Economic Area Analysis (2015) were the subject of consultation with Duty to Co-operate
partners, including Surrey Heath Borough Council, prior to being published.

Surrey Heath Borough Council

1.

Agreement

It is agreed that Runnymede Borough and Surrey Heath Borough lie in separate Housing
Market Areas and Functional Economic Market Areas.
Schedule B: Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for Housing and Employment

Runnymede Borough Council

1. The joint SHMA with Spelthorne shows that Runnymede has an OAN of between 466 and 535 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The lower end of the range is based on demographic trends with adjustment to reflect increased out-commuting from London and improvements to affordability. The upper end reflects the level of housing that could be required to meet the needs of the local economy and also has an adjustment to improve affordability. The figures include the provision of affordable homes. Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils commissioned an update to their SHMA in September 2017.

2. The Employment Land Review identifies Runnymede’s gross employment floorspace requirements for B class floorspace between 2015 and 2035, according to three different scenarios. The Council is supporting the labour supply (466 dpa) scenario based on the OAN figure to ensure that the indigenous growth potential (i.e. from its resident workforce) is not constrained by a lack of space. This scenario identifies a shortfall in industrial floorspace of 105,842 sq.m., but an oversupply of office space through pipeline schemes of 30,957 sq.m.. The forecasts within the Council’s Employment Land Review are likely to be refreshed prior to the Examination in Public.

Surrey Heath Borough Council

1.

2.

Agreement

Runnymede Borough Council and Surrey Heath Borough Council will keep each other informed of any changes to their respective OAN’s for housing and employment. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule C: Unmet Housing Need

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council is currently uncertain of being able to meet its full objectively assessed housing need of even the bottom end of its OAN range at 466 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The Additional Sites and Options consultation (May/June 2017) recognised that the preferred strategy would deliver between 87% and 100% of Runnymede’s OAN (and 36% of the OAN of the HMA as a whole). The level of unmet need would be between 0 to 69 dwellings per year.

Surrey Heath Borough Council

1.
Agreement

At this stage Runnymede Borough Council and Surrey Heath Borough Council are unlikely to be able to take any of each other’s unmet need. The authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

**Schedule D: Unmet Need for Employment Floorspace**

**Runnymede Borough Council**

1. The strategy being pursued would result in a surplus of up to 31,000 sq.m. of office floorspace, but a deficit of up to 80,000 sq.m. of industrial floorspace, specifically for storage and distribution uses, translating into a need for 18.5 hectares of land for these uses. The need is for modern, small to medium sized units in particular. There are, however, only limited suitable sites for additional provision. It may be that the surplus of office floorspace in Runnymede could be used to assist other areas in the FEMA to meet their office floorspace needs, with those areas reciprocating by helping to meet Runnymede’s unmet storage and distribution needs. This would require agreement under the Duty to Co-operate.

2. The final provision of employment growth will in part depend on decisions about Heathrow.

**Surrey Heath Borough Council**

1.

**Agreement**

At this stage Runnymede Borough Surrey Heath Borough are unlikely to be able to take any of each other’s unmet need. The authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

**Schedule E: Green Belt**

**Runnymede Borough Council**

1. Runnymede Borough Council has recently commissioned a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment, to assess the level of need for pitches and plots in the Borough when assessed against the new definition of a traveller as contained in ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’.

**Surrey Heath Borough Council**
Agreement

The authorities will keep each other informed of the approach taken to Green Belt.

Schedule F: Provision for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation (GTTS)

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council has recently commissioned a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment.

Surrey Heath Borough Council

1.

Agreement

Neither authority is currently requesting the other authority to accommodate unmet needs for travellers. However this position will be reviewed once the evidence has been produced. If it transpires that one or both Councils are requesting assistance with meeting unmet needs for travellers, an initial meeting will be held to discuss the identified issues followed by a review of each authority’s position every six months.

This Memorandum of Understanding provides a framework for joint working between Runnymede Borough Council and Surrey Heath Borough Council.

Signed:

Runnymede Borough Council

Signed:

Surrey Heath Borough Council
Good afternoon,

Further to my recent email to you as below, please now find attached a draft Memorandum of Understanding for your consideration.

It would be helpful if you could complete the details in respect of your authority so that we can complete and sign the document by the end of September/early October.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford

Richard Ford | Policy and Strategy Manager | Runnymede Borough Council
richard.ford@runnymede.gov.uk | 01932-425278 (direct line) | www.runnymede.gov.uk
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Draft Memorandum of Understanding between Runnymede Borough Council and Woking Borough Council on Strategic Planning and the ‘Duty to Co-operate’ on Planning Matters

Background

In the light of the Duty to Co-operate, Runnymede Borough Council and Woking Borough Council have agreed this Memorandum of Understanding for issues of shared strategic concern. These topics include Housing, Gypsies and Travellers, B8 Employment, and Green Belt.

This Memorandum of Understanding builds on long established joint working between the two local authorities and acknowledges where issues are unlikely to be resolved, based on engagement to date.

The following schedules identify those matters where agreement has been reached and also where further co-operation will be undertaken to seek resolution of outstanding issues.

Schedule A: Housing Market Area and Functional Economic Market Area

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough is within a Housing Market Area referred to as the ‘Runnymede-Spelthorne Housing Market Area’. This comprises the administrative areas of Runnymede Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council. This is based on the findings of the Runnymede BC & Spelthorne BC Strategic Housing Market Assessment published in November 2015.

2. Runnymede Borough is considered to sit on the edges of two different FEMA’s. The northern part of the Borough is assessed as sitting within a Wider FEMA that focusses on Heathrow airport at its centre, with the strongest relationships being with Spelthorne, Hounslow and the southernmost part of Hillingdon, due to the location of Heathrow Airport. The southern parts of Runnymede Borough are considered to set on the edge of a South West London/M3/A3 corridor market. The analysis carried out indicates that in this wider FEA, Runnymede’s strongest links are with Woking and Elmbridge.

Both the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA (November 2015) and the Council’s Functional Economic Area Analysis (2015) were the subject of consultation with Duty to Co-operate partners, including Woking Borough Council, prior to being published.

Woking Borough Council

1.

Agreement

It is agreed that Runnymede Borough and Woking Borough lie in separate Housing Market Areas, but that part of Runnymede Borough shares a Functional Economic Market Area with Woking.
Schedule B: Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for Housing and Employment

Runnymede Borough Council

1. The joint SHMA with Spelthorne shows that Runnymede has an OAN of between 466 and 535 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The lower end of the range is based on demographic trends with adjustment to reflect increased out-commuting from London and improvements to affordability. The upper end reflects the level of housing that could be required to meet the needs of the local economy and also has an adjustment to improve affordability. The figures include the provision of affordable homes. Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils commissioned an update to their SHMA in September 2017.

2. The Employment Land Review identifies Runnymede’s gross employment floorspace requirements for B class floorspace between 2015 and 2035, according to three different scenarios. The Council is supporting the labour supply (466 dpa) scenario based on the OAN figure to ensure that the indigenous growth potential (i.e. from its resident workforce) is not constrained by a lack of space. This scenario identifies a shortfall in industrial floorspace of 105,842 sq.m., but an oversupply of office space through pipeline schemes of 30,957 sq.m.. The forecasts within the Council’s Employment Land Review are likely to be refreshed prior to the Examination in Public.

Woking Borough Council

1.

2.

Agreement

Runnymede Borough Council and Woking Borough Council will keep each other informed of any changes to their respective OAN’s for housing and employment. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule C: Unmet Housing Need

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council is currently uncertain of being able to meet its full objectively assessed housing need of even the bottom end of its OAN range at 466 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The Additional Sites and Options consultation (May/June 2017) recognised that the preferred strategy would deliver between 87% and 100% of Runnymede’s OAN (and 36% of the OAN of the HMA as a whole). The level of unmet need would be between 0 to 69 dwellings per year.

Woking Borough Council
1.

Agreement

At this stage Runnymede Borough Council and Woking Borough Council are unlikely to be able to take any of each other’s unmet need. The authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule D: Unmet Need for Employment Floorspace

Runnymede Borough Council

1. The strategy being pursued would result in a surplus of up to 31,000 sq.m. of office floorspace, but a deficit of up to 80,000 sq.m. of industrial floorspace, specifically for storage and distribution uses, translating into a need for 18.5 hectares of land for these uses. The need is for modern, small to medium sized units in particular. There are, however, only limited suitable sites for additional provision. It may be that the surplus of office floorspace in Runnymede could be used to assist other areas in the FEMA to meet their office floorspace needs, with those areas reciprocating by helping to meet Runnymede’s unmet storage and distribution needs. This would require agreement under the Duty to Co-operate.

2. The final provision of employment growth will in part depend on decisions about Heathrow.

Woking Borough Council

1.

Agreement

At this stage Runnymede Borough and Woking Borough Council are unlikely to be able to take any of each other’s unmet need. The authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule E: Green Belt

Runnymede Borough Council

Runnymede Borough Council’s Issues and Options documents include options for releasing Green Belt land for housing.

Woking Borough Council
Agreement

The authorities will keep each other informed of the approach taken to Green Belt.

Schedule F: Provision for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation (GTTS)

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council has recently commissioned a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment, to assess the level of need for pitches and plots in the Borough when assessed against the new definition of a traveller as contained in ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’.

Woking Borough Council

1.

Agreement

Neither authority is currently requesting the other authority to accommodate unmet needs for travellers. However this position will be reviewed once the evidence has been produced. If it transpires that one or both Councils are requesting assistance with meeting unmet needs for travellers, an initial meeting will be held to discuss the identified issues followed by a review of each authority’s position every six months.

This Memorandum of Understanding provides a framework for joint working between Runnymede Borough Council and Woking Borough Council.

Signed:

Runnymede Borough Council

Signed:

Woking Borough Council
Richard

I hope you are keeping well and slowing down until the end of the month. I am not sure who will be taking this on to conclusion, so I have copied in Georgina and Ian for their information and action in your absence. As you requested, I have inserted the relevant sections for Woking in bold. I have also suggested some possible amendments to your draft ‘agreements’ for consideration. These are in track changes (red). See attached. I have sent it in advance for us to use it as basis for discussion next week when you are back in the office. I will emphasise that the final draft will have to be agreed by our CMG.

I am sorry, I do not intend to load any more work unto what might be your busy week, but I thought I should send you the comments so that you are aware of my thoughts.

My regards.

Ernest

From: Planning Policy
Sent: 15 September 2017 16:34
To: Ernest Amoako
Subject: FW: Runnymede Local Plan: Duty to Co-operate

Good afternoon,

Further to my recent email to you as below, please now find attached a draft Memorandum of Understanding for your consideration.

It would be helpful if you could complete the details in respect of your authority so that we can complete and sign the document by the end of September/early October.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is required.

Kind regards,

R. Ford
Good afternoon,

Please now find attached a copy of a letter from Cllr. Mrs Kingerley, Runnymede's Planning Committee Chairman, to the equivalent member of your Council, which I am intending to dispatch on behalf of Mrs Kingerley early next week.

Kind regards,

R. Ford
please notify the sender immediately. All Public Services Network (PSN) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

**********************************************************************
Draft Memorandum of Understanding between Runnymede Borough Council and Woking Borough Council on Strategic Planning and the ‘Duty to Co-operate’ on Planning Matters

Background

In the light of the Duty to Co-operate, Runnymede Borough Council and Woking Borough Council have agreed this Memorandum of Understanding for issues of shared strategic concern. These topics include Housing, Gypsies and Travellers, B8 Employment, and Green Belt.

This Memorandum of Understanding builds on long established joint working between the two local authorities and acknowledges where issues are unlikely to be resolved, based on engagement to date.

The following schedules identify those matters where agreement has been reached and also where further co-operation will be undertaken to seek resolution of outstanding issues.

Schedule A: Housing Market Area and Functional Economic Market Area

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough is within a Housing Market Area referred to as the ‘Runnymede-Spelthorne Housing Market Area’. This comprises the administrative areas of Runnymede Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council. This is based on the findings of the Runnymede BC & Spelthorne BC Strategic Housing Market Assessment published in November 2015.

2. Runnymede Borough is considered to sit on the edges of two different FEMA’s. The northern part of the Borough is assessed as sitting within a Wider FEMA that focusses on Heathrow airport at its centre, with the strongest relationships being with Spelthorne, Hounslow and the southernmost part of Hillingdon, due to the location of Heathrow Airport. The southern parts of Runnymede Borough are considered to set on the edge of a South West London/M3/A3 corridor market. The analysis carried out indicates that in this wider FEA, Runnymede’s strongest links are with Woking and Elmbridge.

Both the Runnymede-Spelthorne SHMA (November 2015) and the Council’s Functional Economic Area Analysis (2015) were the subject of consultation with Duty to Co-operate partners, including Woking Borough Council, prior to being published.

Woking Borough Council

1. Woking Borough Council working in partnership with Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which defines its Housing Market Area. Based on the available evidence Woking, Guildford and Waverley Boroughs form a Housing Market Area called the West Surrey Housing Market Area. This definition reflects the strong migration and commuting links between the three authorities and their similar housing market characteristics. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) require local planning authorities to use their evidence base to ensure that their local plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in
the housing market area. In this regard, the priority for Woking Borough Council is to work with Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils to meet the identified housing needs arising within the West Surrey Housing Market Area. The Council is in the process of preparing its Site Allocations DPD to identify specific sites to enable the delivery of its housing requirement. Woking Borough Council recognises the complex interactions between the West Surrey Housing Market Area and other districts and borough including Runnymede, and under the duty to cooperate will work in partnership with them to address strategic cross boundary matters such as housing.

2. **Woking, Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils have produced evidence to demonstrate that the three authorities form the West Surrey Functional Economic Market Area. Whilst the Council is confident that the three authorities combine to form a FEMA, the complexity of cross boundary issues including with a degree of economic relationship with Runnymede Borough Council is acknowledged.**

**Agreement**

It is agreed that Runnymede Borough and Woking Borough lie in separate Housing Market Areas and separate Functional Economic Market Areas, but under the duty to cooperate will work together to address strategic housing and economic matters of cross boundary significance. that part of Runnymede Borough shares a Functional Economic Market Area with Woking.

**Schedule B: Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) for Housing and Employment**

**Runnymede Borough Council**

1. The joint SHMA with Spelthorne shows that Runnymede has an OAN of between 466 and 535 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The lower end of the range is based on demographic trends with adjustment to reflect increased out-commuting from London and improvements to affordability. The upper end reflects the level of housing that could be required to meet the needs of the local economy and also has an adjustment to improve affordability. The figures include the provision of affordable homes. Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils commissioned an update to their SHMA in September 2017.

2. The Employment Land Review identifies Runnymede’s gross employment floorspace requirements for B class floorspace between 2015 and 2035, according to three different scenarios. The Council is supporting the labour supply (466 dpa) scenario based on the OAN figure to ensure that the indigenous growth potential (i.e. from its resident workforce) is not constrained by a lack of space. This scenario identifies a shortfall in industrial floorspace of 105,842 sq.m., but an oversupply of office space through pipeline schemes of 30,957 sq.m.. The forecasts within the Council’s Employment Land Review are likely to be refreshed prior to the Examination in Public.

**Woking Borough Council**

1. **Woking Borough Council has an adopted Core Strategy that post dates the publication of the NPPF. Its provisions were examined against the**
requirements of the NPPF and found sound. It has an adopted average housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year. This is against the backdrop of a current objectively assessed housing need of 517 dwellings per year. There is significant unmet need arising from Woking Borough that has to be met within the West Surrey Housing Market Area. Woking Borough Council has agreed a Statement of Common Ground with Guildford and Waverley about how they can work together in the future to meet any unmet housing need with the West Surrey Housing Market Area.

2. The Woking Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 28,000sq.m of office floorspace, 20,000sq.m of warehouse floorspace and 93,900 sq.m of retail floorspace. In accordance with the spatial strategy for the borough, the delivery of the above economic needs will be met within the urban area, and specific sites are being identified by the Site Allocations DPD to enable the delivery.

Agreement

Runnymede Borough Council and Woking Borough Council will keep each other informed of any changes to their respective OAN’s for housing and employment. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position at the beginning of every year after they have published their Annual Monitoring Reports every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

Schedule C: Unmet Housing Need

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council is currently uncertain of being able to meet its full objectively assessed housing need of even the bottom end of its OAN range at 466 homes per annum for the 2013 – 2033 period. The Additional Sites and Options consultation (May/June 2017) recognised that the preferred strategy would deliver between 87% and 100% of Runnymede’s OAN (and 36% of the OAN of the HMA as a whole). The level of unmet need would be between 0 to 69 dwellings per year.

Woking Borough Council

1. Woking Borough has a housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year. Its current objectively assessed housing need is 517 dwellings per year. In this regard, it has significant unmet housing need that it is working in partnership with Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils to address.

Agreement

At this stage, based on the available evidence, Runnymede Borough Council and Woking Borough Council are unlikely to be able to take any part of Woking’s each other’s unmet housing need. However, this will be confirmed after the Runnymede Local Plan is adopted. Woking Borough Council is unable to meet any part of Runnymede’s potential unmet housing need as it cannot be able to meet its own need and is presently working with Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils to address unmet need arising from Woking.
authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

### Schedule D: Unmet Need for Employment Floorspace

Runnymede Borough Council

1. The strategy being pursued would result in a surplus of up to 31,000 sq.m. of office floorspace, but a deficit of up to 80,000 sq.m. of industrial floorspace, specifically for storage and distribution uses, translating into a need for 18.5 hectares of land for these uses. The need is for modern, small to medium sized units in particular. There are, however, only limited suitable sites for additional provision. It may be that the surplus of office floorspace in Runnymede could be used to assist other areas in the FEMA to meet their office floorspace needs, with those areas reciprocating by helping to meet Runnymede’s unmet storage and distribution needs. This would require agreement under the Duty to Co-operate.

2. The final provision of employment growth will in part depend on decisions about Heathrow.

Woking Borough Council

1. Woking Borough has an adopted Core Strategy that sets out its economic growth requirements. The Core Strategy requires the Council to prepare a Site Allocations DPD to identify specific sites to enable the delivery of the requirements. The Council is in the process of preparing its Site Allocations DPD and will seek to identify sites to meet this objective. The Council is unlikely to be able to meet any part of Runnymede’s unmet employment need. Similarly, the Council will not be expecting Runnymede to meet any part of its needs.

### Agreement

At this stage, based on the available evidence, Runnymede Borough Council and Woking Borough Council are unlikely to be able to take any part of Woking's employment needs. Woking Borough Council is not expecting Runnymede Borough Council to meet any part of its employment needs. The authorities will keep each other informed of the proportion of any unmet need in housing required in the plan period. The two Councils will advise each other of the up-to-date position every six months, and more frequently when circumstances require it.

### Schedule E: Green Belt

Runnymede Borough Council
Runnymede Borough Council’s Issues and Options documents include options for releasing Green Belt land for housing.

Woking Borough Council has carried out a Green Belt boundary review, and in accordance with the Woking Core Strategy is seeking to release Green Belt land through the Site Allocations DPD to meet future development needs.

Agreement

The authorities will continue to keep each other informed of the approach taken to Green Belt.

Schedule F: Provision for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation (GTTS)

Runnymede Borough Council

1. Runnymede Borough Council has recently commissioned a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment, to assess the level of need for pitches and plots in the Borough when assessed against the new definition of a traveller as contained in ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’.

Woking Borough Council

1. In accordance with the Core Strategy, Woking Borough Council has carried out a Travellers Accommodation Assessment to identify the accommodation needs of Travellers in the Borough. A need for 19 pitches has been identified to be met by 2027. The Council is preparing its Site Allocations DPD and will be seeking to allocation land to meet this need. The TAA uses a common Surrey-wide methodology agreed by the local authorities in Surrey. The Council is planning to meet its own identified need.

Agreement

Neither authority is currently requesting the other authority to accommodate unmet needs for Travellers accommodation. However this position will be reviewed after the adoption of the Runnymede Local Plan, once the evidence has been produced. If it transpires that one or both Councils are requesting assistance with meeting unmet needs for travellers, an initial meeting will be held to discuss the identified issues followed by a review of each authority’s position every six months.

This Memorandum of Understanding provides a framework for joint working between Runnymede Borough Council and Woking Borough Council.

Signed:
Runnymede Borough Council

Signed:

Woking Borough Council

Date
Appendix 9 - Suggested SOCG to Other Authorities

Other Authorities

Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
Guildford Borough Council
Hart District Council
London Borough of Hillingdon
London Borough of Hounslow
London Borough of Kingston
Mole Valley Council
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
London Borough of Richmond
Rushmoor Borough Council
Slough Borough Council
South Bucks District Council
Tandridge District Council
Waverley Borough Council