Dear Mrs Pacey

Housing Infrastructure Fund: A320 Corridor (Ottershaw – Chertsey)

As you are aware Richborough Estates is promoting land at Ottershaw East (Brox Road – site SL12) through your emerging Local Plan. The site is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development.

We understand that the Borough Council and Surrey County Council are jointly preparing a bid for monies from the Housing Infrastructure Fund to undertake works to the A320 corridor between Ottershaw and Chertsey. We support this bid being made by the two authorities.

Runnymede, Surrey Heath, and Woking Borough Councils jointly appointed Arcadis to undertake the A320 Corridor Study to assess the impacts of cumulative development culminating in their Feasibility Report of April 2018. The study objectives were to:

- Identify capacity constraints;
- Identify the volume of movements that need to be accommodated or the volume that can be accommodated; and
- Produce strategic mitigation measures, including sustainable measures, to accommodate all or some of the additional movements and enable development led growth.

The study took account of all key developments in the study area including 290 dwellings off Brox Road, Ottershaw. Of these, 250 dwellings are attributed to the Ottershaw East draft allocation. We consider at least 230 dwellings can be delivered from our site and this therefore falls within the scope of the Feasibility Report; indeed it actually leaves some flexibility when considering with the Brox End Nursery site which has extant planning permission for up to 40 dwellings.

The study identified several necessary key improvements along the A320 corridor including schemes in Runnymede at the A320 Ottershaw Roundabout (Guildford Rd/Murray Rd/Chobham Rd), and the
A320/Brox Road junction. The Runnymede Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) Schedules identifies these improvements as coming forward in the period 2020/2021 to 2024/2025; and both are identified within the IDP for HIF contributions. The early delivery of these improvements in particular, and in the A320 corridor generally, is likely to be dependent upon HIF funding.

In respect of our own proposals, we have undertaken a number of technical studies on and around our site. These have informed the evolution of our masterplan and as you are aware we have held pre-application discussions with the Borough Council in advance of a planning application being submitted.

Our residential proposals are viable and deliverable. As to be expected, as well as open market dwellings, we will also be providing much needed affordable housing in an area that has very clear affordability issues.

Whilst the Examination of your emerging Local Plan is yet to be concluded, we expect this to happen in the coming months and the Plan adopted later this year. We expect to time our planning application to coincide with the receipt of the Inspector’s Report and adoption of the Plan (when the site will be removed from the Green Belt). Our aim is to seek a resolution to grant as close to post- adoption as possible.

By way of an example of how we approach site delivery, we have very recently been involved in a similar situation in South Staffordshire where we were successful in having two Green Belt sites allocated for residential development. The Inspector’s Report was published in May 2018 and we submitted our outline planning applications in June and July. South Staffordshire DC adopted their Site Allocations Plan on the September 2018 and resolved to granted permission on both our sites in November; just two months after the adoption of the Plan and the sites removed from the Green Belt. Both sites now have development partners (one an SME housebuilder and one a PLC housebuilder); and reserved matters pre-application discussions have also taken place for both developments. This is a very recent example of how we approach the delivery of our sites, and is particularly relevant to our Brox Road site because of their Green Belt status.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Mitchell
Senior Regional Manager
Our Ref: MHC1414/18

1st March 2019

C/O The Planning Officer,
Runnymede Borough Council,
Civic Centre,
Station Road,
Addlestone,
Surrey.
KT15 2AH.

Without Prejudice

To whom it may concern.

Dear Sirs,

**A320 North of Woking bid**

& **Runnymede Borough Local Plan – Policy SL6**

Chilsey Green Farm, Pyrcroft Road, Chertsey, Surrey, KT1 9ER

We act for the Gribble family who are the owners of a large portion of the above site. The site is allocated for housing development in the Emerging Runnymede Local Plan 2015-2030 (SLAA site reference 60). Policy SL6 identifies 6.8 hectares of land for residential development incorporating a minimum of 275 dwellings and 5 traveller pitches. Most of the site is either an allocated housing site from the previous Local Plan or brownfield land and is therefore clearly developable.

We consider the site to be viable and deliverable. The site is located to the north west of Chertsey town centre with access from the south side of Pyrcroft Road. It is approximately 800 metres to the north west of Chertsey Railway Station, close to bus stops and within 2 kilometres of Junction 11 of the M25, which is located to the south east of the site. There are numerous shops, schools and other community facilities within 1 kilometre of the site. Therefore, the site is in a very sustainable location and being on the edge of Chertsey fully accords with the Council’s Spatial Strategy as a location for new development.

We are aware both from our representations and attendance at the recent Local Plan Examination that the Council (with Surrey County Council) is currently preparing a Housing Infrastructure Fund bid for works along the A320 corridor. We further understand that this HIF bid, if successful, would enable much needed improvements to the A320 between Ottershaw and Chertsey to be delivered quickly to support growth in Runnymede.
The purpose of this letter is to support the Council in their HIF bid.

We understand, from our promotion of Site SL6 the Pycroft Road site in Chertsey, that the Council consider that some traffic may feed indirectly on to the A320 corridor.

As know from our pre application discussions this Company is well advanced in the master planning and pre application process for the site and is keen to secure planning permission quickly to enable the delivery of the minimum 275 dwelling units within the next three years.

Our Clients would not want the delivery of the site to be held back due to any delays in improving the A320 corridor.

We are confident that our site is deliverable and viable and will bring forward much needed homes (including affordable homes) in an area with significant, and well documented affordability issues. Also the Emerging Runnymede Local Plan requires the Council to provide a minimum of 7,480 net additional dwellings over the plan period, or 498 dwellings per annum. The Council’s housing land supply position has been below five years for an extended period of time and with the 20% buffer applied the Council would be required to provide 706 dwellings per annum. The Council's housing land supply projections rely on the delivery of allocated sites.

In conclusion our proposed housing development would appear to be deliverable, sustainable and residential development would comply with current planning policies and, whilst standing on its own merits, could also be assisted by the HIF bid.

Yours faithfully,

Mark Carter for
Carter Planning Limited
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Statement of Common Ground

Constituent parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- Runnymede Borough Council
- Surrey County Council

Geographical area covered by this Statement of Common Ground

This is an annex Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) which should be read in conjunction with the primary Runnymede-Spelthorne SoCG. The Runnymede-Spelthorne SoCG provides detailed information on the Runnymede-Spelthorne Housing Market Area (HMA) and its linkages with other boroughs. Both Runnymede and Spelthorne are located in Surrey. There is a two tier system of local government in Surrey, the county council and the 11 district and borough councils. As such, both Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils have significant engagement in relation to a range of matters with Surrey County Council during the preparation of their Local Plans. Generally, the county council is responsible for the provision of services such as education, highways and social care whereas the districts and boroughs provide more local services.

Key strategic cross boundary matters between the constituent parties to this agreement

Surrey County Council has responsibility for the following strategic functions which are particularly relevant to the development of the Runnymede Local Plan:

- In its role as the local highway authority, providing advice and ensuring the delivery of highway improvements to support development sites;
- Ensuring that there are sufficient school and early years places to support growth in Runnymede;
- The disposal of household waste and provision of suitable local infrastructure to support recycling such as community recycling facilities; and
- In its role as the minerals & waste planning authority, providing advice regarding the safeguarding of important minerals resources and the provision and safeguarding of strategic waste infrastructure - this particularly with regard to the location of new housing development.

Surrey County Council and Runnymede Borough Council through the production of the Runnymede Local Plan have worked, and continue to work in partnership in relation to the following matters:

- Flooding - in particular on matters relating to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and the delivery of the River Thames Scheme by the Environment Agency; and
- Heathrow Airport expansion - through the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group to assist essential Duty to Cooperate processes for plan making authorities, to engage in early discussions regarding the Development Consent Order prepared by Heathrow Airport Limited, and to provide a collective point of communication with Government on issues of common concern around the processes, resources, wider infrastructure and other implications of growth at Heathrow Airport upon the sub-region.
Surrey County Council has worked, and continues to work in an advisory capacity to Runnymede Borough Council during the development of the Runnymede Local Plan on matters related to:

- Public health and wellbeing
- Heritage

**Evidence base and Local Plan development**

Surrey County Council is satisfied that Runnymede Borough Council has engaged with them proactively and on an ongoing basis during the preparation of the Runnymede Local Plan with the objective of both parties being to achieve positive outcomes in relation to strategic cross boundary issues identified and to support sustainable growth.

Surrey County Council acknowledges the findings of the following evidence base studies and assessments:

- Transport Assessment (June 2016)
- Strategic Highway Assessment Report (October 2017)
- A320 Corridor Study (April 2018)
- Scoping Water Cycle Study (January 2018)
- Outline Water Cycle Study (March 2018)
- Longcross Garden Village-Infrastructure and Viability Study (December 2017)
- Infrastructure Needs Assessment (August 2017)
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan (December 2017)
- Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (January 2018)
- Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (January 2018)

Surrey County Council did not raise any objections to the content of the draft Runnymede 2030 Local Plan which was published for consultation in January 2018.

**Highway infrastructure to support growth in the Borough of Runnymede**

In relation to highway infrastructure specifically, Runnymede Borough Council and Surrey County Council are committed to working together in partnership with the aim of ensuring the necessary highways improvements to support sustainable growth are delivered in a timely manner over the period of the Runnymede Local Plan, particularly the first phase of highway improvement works required, including along the A320 corridor in the vicinity of St Peter’s Hospital.

Runnymede Borough Council and Surrey County Council recognise that securing sufficient funding to deliver highway improvement schemes is an important priority. The two parties are committed to working together to secure the necessary funding.

The types of schemes anticipated to be the focus of this first phase are included in appendix A to this statement.
These schemes will either be provided in their entirety by developers or funded by contributions from developers which are secured through the planning application process, the Community Infrastructure Levy (once adopted) and accessible grant funding that Runnymede Borough Council and/or Surrey County Council are eligible to bid for. This includes, but is not limited to:

- Funding through the Housing infrastructure Fund (HIF)
- Funding through the Enterprise M3 LEP Local Growth Fund.

Runnymede Borough Council and Surrey County Council are committed to continued partnership working on the submission of joint bids to unlock funding to support sustainable growth in the Borough over the period of the Runnymede Local Plan.

Surrey County Council will work with Runnymede Borough Council to produce a Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme of transport infrastructure to support the growth set out in the Local Plan, subject to funding. It will form part of the Local Transport Plan and provide an evidence base for funding bids.

Runnymede Borough Council agrees to keep Surrey County Council informed of any changes to the phasing and/or amount of growth to be delivered in Runnymede over the period of its Local Plan to enable Surrey County Council to properly plan for and prioritise supporting highways infrastructure.

Other infrastructure to support growth in the Runnymede Local Plan

Surrey County Council understands the amount of growth and phasing of growth (particularly housing growth) which is anticipated to come forward in Runnymede Borough up to 2030 as set out in the Runnymede 2030 draft Local Plan (January 2018). In line with its statutory duty, Surrey County Council will ensure that sufficient school spaces are provided to support growth. Surrey County Council will also factor the level of growth in Runnymede into any future plans relating to the provision of library services across the County.

Runnymede Borough Council agrees to keep Surrey County Council informed of any changes to the phasing and/or amount of growth to be delivered in Runnymede over the period of its Local Plan to enable Surrey County Council to properly plan for and prioritise the provision of supporting infrastructure.

Governance arrangements

It is agreed that informal discussions will occur between the two authorities on an ongoing basis in relation to the cross boundary issues referred to in this SoCG. A formal officer level meeting will occur at least once every 6 months with escalation of matters to member level where necessary. At these meetings, the primary focus will be related to the funding and delivery of infrastructure to support sustainable growth in Runnymede Borough.

It is agreed that this Statement of Common Ground will be reviewed by the two authorities at a joint Duty to Co-operate meeting which will be held on an annual basis. Until otherwise agreed Runnymede Borough Council will act as the Chair and Secretariat for this meeting.
Signatories

Councillor Nick Prescot
Leader of Runnymede Borough Council

Dominic Forbes
Planning Group Manager, Surrey County Council

15th May 2018.
## Appendix A

### Schedule of Infrastructure Projects – Phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway enhancement schemes in phase 1</th>
<th>Estimated scheme cost (£)</th>
<th>Development schemes supported (and site phasing)</th>
<th>Funding Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A320 Guildford Road / Holloway Hill and Guildford Road / Green Lane roundabouts - delivery of highway improvement scheme (Source: A320 corridor study -referred to as junction 6a and 6b).</td>
<td>5.2 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A320 Guildford Road (Holloway Hill to Bittams Lane). Carriageway widening to provide additional lane and wider shared use footway/cycleway (Source: A320 corridor study-referred to as link 2).</td>
<td>1.7 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A320 Guildford Road- delivery of highway improvement scheme at the St Peter’s Hospital/Bittams Lane/A320 roundabout (Source: A320 corridor study-referred to as junction 8).</td>
<td>1.7 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening of High Street and Station Road and adjustment to Church Road and Crouch Oak Lane, Addlestone (Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
<td>Addlestone East, Station Road, Addlestone (2020-2023)</td>
<td>Local Growth Fund Developer Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction improvements at Station Road/High St/Church Rd, Addlestone (Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td>3.5 million</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Growth Fund Developer Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction of Chobham</td>
<td>5.5 million</td>
<td>Longcross Garden Village</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane with Longcross Station (Improvement of Burma Road)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B386 Longcross Road. Link hotspot which requires mitigation</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
<td>Longcross Garden Village (2016-2030)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction improvements at the Staple Hill/Longcross Road junction to improve current</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Longcross Garden Village (2016-2030)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and mitigate future congestion (Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New multi user route along northern boundary of the former DERA site</td>
<td>Up to 50,000</td>
<td>Longcross Garden Village (2016-2030)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSIBLE: Trumps Green Road, Wellington Avenue, Virginia Water: signalisation of</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Longcross Garden Village (2016-2030)</td>
<td>Already secured through S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing priority w junction (Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSIBLE: Chobham Lane/Burma Road, Longcross-carriageway widening at round about</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Longcross Garden Village (2016-2030)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to increase capacity (Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverlands Close, Chertsey. Link hotspot which requires mitigation</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
<td>St Peters Hospital, Chertsey (2019-2022)</td>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Avenue, Virginia Water. Link hotspot identified for mitigation</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
<td>Longcross Garden Village (2016-2030)</td>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Road/Weir Road capacity and pedestrian improvements (Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>Benefits active travel in Chertsey</td>
<td>Funding Secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough wide cycle network improvements including Chertsey-cyclist right hand turn lane. Missing links to be filled in, improvements made to the existing network and provision of links to neighbouring authorities (Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td>Up to 6 million</td>
<td>Benefits borough wide</td>
<td>Local Growth Fund, M25 Access &amp; Integration Study, Developer Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a multi user route from A320 through Homewood Park to Stonehill Road, Chertsey (Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td>Up to 55,000</td>
<td>Longcross Garden Village (2016-2030) St Peters Hospital, Chertsey (2019-2022)</td>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of two existing pedestrian bridges and installation of 3 new pedestrian and cyclist crossing on the A30 London Road, Englefield Green (Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>To support the delivery of the Royal Holloway Master plan</td>
<td>Secured through S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station travel plans (Borough wide) (Source: Infrastructure Delivery Plan).</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Benefits borough wide</td>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that this is not a comprehensive list of schemes/projects.
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DfT/ Homes England

SCC Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport

Runnymede Borough Council

Housing Delivery

A320 North of Woking – Project Governance Structure

Project Board

Project Sponsor

Programme Management Team

Project Management Team

Design Consultants and External Advisory team

Project Delivery Team

Highways England

Highway Infrastructure Delivery Contractor
A320 North of Woking E2E Process Phases & Stages

**Phase 0**
Issue / Opportunity Identification, Definition & Prioritisation

**Stage 0.1** Identify Needs

**Stage 0.2** Packages to Meet Needs

**Stage 0.3** Prioritise & Submit EOI

**Phase 1**
Scheme Development
Result is - Business Case for HIF Bid

**Stage 1.1** Project Planning

**Stage 1.2** Concept Development & Pre-Feasibility

**Stage 1.3** Feasibility Design

**Stage 1.4** Finalise Modelling & Economic Appraisal

**Stage 1.5** Options Consultation

**Stage 1.6** Develop & Finalise Outline Design

**Stage 1.7** Business Case Development & Submission

**Stage 1.8** Preferred Option Identified

**Phase 2**
Scheme Delivery and Monitoring

**Stage 2.1** Detailed Design

**Stage 2.1A** Public Enquiry Process (If necessary)

**Stage 2.2** Procurement & Award

**Stage 2.3** Mobilisation

**Stage 2.4** Construction

**Stage 2.5** Post Scheme Monitoring & Feedback

**SCC Highways**

**Stage 2.2** Procurement & Award

**Stage 2.3** Mobilisation

**Stage 2.4** Construction

**Stage 2.5** Post Scheme Monitoring & Feedback

**HE Network**

**Stage 2.2** Procurement & Award

**Stage 2.3** Mobilisation

**Stage 2.4** Construction

**Stage 2.5** Post Scheme Monitoring & Feedback
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Please see pages 216 to 219 of the 24th January 2019 Corporate Management Committee report which can be accessed at: https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/14737/Corporate-Management-Committee-Agendas-2019
Longcross Garden Village: The Council’s approach to ensure early delivery

All of the approaches to planning conditions outlined in the response to question 7.3.3 are being applied as part of the pre application discussions at Longcross and draft conditions have been shared with the developers well in advance of formal application submission. This is not only to flag the condition wording and trigger points, but to highlight to the developer the work required to potentially avoid the imposition of some conditions. This is particularly the case in securing early approval of area masterplans for the different character areas of the village and benchmarking the design quality and distinctiveness of those areas at the Outline approval stage. The Council is keen to optimise early delivery, yet equally conscious of its role in securing exemplary design quality for the village, so it is actively engaged with the developers, jointly with Design South East, to agree these parameters early.

The early drafting of conditions, in particular those which the Council describe as ‘structural conditions’ (those that set out the weight to be applied to approved documents/strategies and post-Outline approval stages) has also helped to flag to the developer the strategies and documents that must be prepared to support the application and the weight that will be attached to them in subsequent reserved matters applications. It has facilitated early focus of the developer team and their expert consultancy team to draft these Strategies in consultation with the Council. Ultimately, this is about setting a sound framework of parameter plans, strategies, design codes etc that put the developer in a position to move swiftly to the detail of reserved matters.

The issue of planning conditions is of course only one aspect of speeding up the planning process and securing early delivery. Other avenues being actively pursued by the Council are as follows:

1. There has been early discussion with the developers and respective parties’ legal advisers as to the s.106 Heads of Terms. Early drafting of the text of the Agreement has already commenced, the aim being that the draft Agreement would be signed immediately following the grant of permission by the Council’s Planning Committee. This is being progressed jointly with the County Highway Authority and in consultation with potential third parties to the Agreement, such as rail operators, County Education Authority and the CCG. Cross-referencing the Borough’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan; already produced through extensive consultation with relevant statutory undertakers as part of the emerging Local Plan process, significantly improves the prospect for early agreement to these Heads of Terms.

2. Negotiations with the developer have been supported by Homes England who meet jointly with the Council and the developer to monitor the delivery programme and help to resolve any areas of dispute or constraints that arise. For example, Homes England has assisted in ensuring that South Western Railways and Network Rail support the delivery of an enhanced rail service at Longcross, following the loss of the South West Trains’ franchise (SWT being a key party in the original Longcross North planning permission where rail service enhancements were sought).

3. Specific workshops have been held with utility providers, statutory consultees (e.g. Environment Agency, Natural England) and the developers, chaired by the Council’s dedicated Major Projects team, highlighting key issues of concern early on to facilitate early resolution. This has helped to build one-on-one relationships between the planning project
officer for Longcross and utility providers. Where the programme for utilities infrastructure provision does not align with that of the developer, it has been possible for the Council to make direct contact with the utility provider and discuss solutions. This was successful in overcoming initial Environment Agency objections to the Local Plan by referencing direct dialogue with Thames Water in respect of necessary foul sewage treatment work upgrades. Thames Water confirmed satisfaction that given the 15-year phased delivery of the garden village, necessary upgrades at Chertsey Sewage Works could be achieved in a timely manner, so long as the Site Phasing Strategy was the subject of prior consultation with them and secured appropriately by planning condition.

4. The Planning Performance Agreement together with Garden Village capacity funding award, funds dedicated posts for the Longcross project (one expert officer at 100% allocated time, plus technical support and Major Projects Team Leader (at 75% allocated time). This secures expert knowledge of the project, direct and quick contact between the developer and the Council, swifter decisions on the approval of details (or notification of required amendments). It also secures regular direct engagement with local Members, Council Chief Executive, developer Board Directors, County Council and other key stakeholders via a ‘Steering Group’. This provides a critical forum for the interplay between project-level negotiations and the strategic and political context and to negotiate, secure or ‘steer’ high level decisions where required. For example, the Steering Group provides a forum to discuss delivery trajectories and the means by which this can be optimised, with proactive discussion about options for different models of delivery including multiple outlets for early construction, the role of private rented sector schemes, and modular construction techniques to maximise early delivery and ample choice of homes for local people.

5. Frequent (at least monthly) direct engagement between the Borough Council and County Highway Officers, both with and without developer attendance, to ensure all highway matters are aired at Officer level on a frequent basis.

6. The Council is shortly to commence engagement with local residents and other stakeholders, in conjunction with the developers, to agree the form of community stewardship for the garden village. Expert consultancy support will be secured to provide an optimal solution satisfactory to all parties and avoid protracted discussions and allow early delivery of community assets on site.

7. The Council has stated that it is willing to engage early with the developers on the details for their first phase of development, to potentially support a reserved matters submission swiftly following the grant of outline permission. This is dependent upon prior consideration of the site phasing strategy and how this ties in with key utility, green and blue infrastructure. The first draft Site Phasing Strategy is due to be discussed imminently alongside a draft Utilities Framework and Energy Strategy for the site.

These are just some examples of the efforts being pursued by the Council to ensure early delivery of the garden village whilst having regard to potential infrastructure or other constraints that exist.
Stakeholders Classification

**Level of Influence**

**Level of Interest**

**Keep Informed:**
- Direct Residents
- Direct Businesses
- Residents Associations
- Business Associations
- Community Groups

**Manage Closely:**
- Elected Members
- Runnymede Borough Council
- St Peter’s Hospital
- Ambulance Centre
- Highways England
- Land Owners
- Bus Operators

**Monitor:**
- All Road Users
- Indirect Residents
- Indirect Businesses
- Neighbouring LAs
- Statutory Undertakers
- Cycling and walking groups

**Keep Satisfied:**
- Surrey Police
- Environment Agency
- Emergency Services

Primary: Directly affected by the scheme
Secondary: Practical/professional interest in the scheme
Tertiary: General interest in the scheme
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk No.</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Programme Phase</th>
<th>Risk Area</th>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
<th>Service Impact</th>
<th>Reputation Impact</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Overall Risk Score</th>
<th>Mitigation Type</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Residual Risk</th>
<th>Residual Risk</th>
<th>Date Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Potential conflict of access</td>
<td>Delays to HIF works</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tolerate</td>
<td>Schedule coordination meetings with schemes and other stakeholders to prevent delays. SCC Project manager also to be appointed.</td>
<td>SCC/RBC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Doesn't deliver the desired housing as outlined in the bid</td>
<td>Opportunities are missed</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Procurement will be closely monitored through the Procurement Strategy.</td>
<td>SCC/RBC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>Additional cost/time of redesign</td>
<td>Programme delayed</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tolerate</td>
<td>Contact detailed review of project strategy following breach results to enable early decision making.</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>Change of strategy due to political appetite</td>
<td>Delay to or termination of projects</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tolerate</td>
<td>Programme to include sufficient contingency budgets to allow for secondary procurement route.</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>RBC local plan is delayed</td>
<td>There would be minimal risk for the project as the spatial strategy for HRC would remain unchanged</td>
<td>Delays to or termination of projects</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Time, Resource</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tolerate</td>
<td>Continue work with Highways England and professional advisors</td>
<td>RBC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>RBC Local Plan is withdrawn</td>
<td>This could result in delays to the plan preparation of between approximately 3-6 months</td>
<td>Delays to or termination of projects</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Time, Resource</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tolerate</td>
<td>Maintain close communication with RBC and program the bid work to reduce risk of being in contract phase prior to results being known</td>
<td>Ian Milgate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Highway England do not agree to M25 location in plan</td>
<td>Programme delayed</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Highway permissions to be sought as early as possible. Highway colleagues are included in the project board so can raise issues that.</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27/2/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Environmental constraint such as wildlife or protected species making a change to programme delivery</td>
<td>Delay or termination of projects</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>We have programmed all surveys at the earliest opportunity.</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27/2/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Project cannot be delivered within the required funding timelines</td>
<td>Full package funding would no longer be available</td>
<td>Additional funding would need to be found, or scopes changed</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Schedule additional meetings with schemes and other stakeholders, project output and plan in the programme</td>
<td>Lyndon Mendes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Root Thames scheme (RTS) (Flood alleviation channel) and Heathrow link in terms of construction layout/traffics/accesses conflict during latter part of works</td>
<td>Potential conflict on access</td>
<td>Causes delay to HM works</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>We have programmed all surveys at the earliest opportunity</td>
<td>SCC Project manager when appointed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Risk of LDCs</td>
<td>Delay or termination of projects</td>
<td>Delay or unexpected disruption to programme</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>We have programmed all surveys at the earliest opportunity</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Utility diversions result in either increased costs requiring additional utility works (as assessed)</td>
<td>Increased costs requiring</td>
<td>Delay or unexpected disruption to programme</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>We have programmed all surveys at the earliest opportunity</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Utilities for housing sites not being enabled</td>
<td>Project delayed as a result of additional utility works (as assessed)</td>
<td>Delay or unexpected disruption to programme</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Liaise with developer and management of work requests</td>
<td>RMG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Planning permission cannot be obtained for highways works from SCS as approving authority</td>
<td>Scheme would be cancelled or delayed</td>
<td>Loss of further funding or partial funding</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Meet developers with planning authority and seek update at earliest opportunity on strategic highway delivery plans</td>
<td>Lyndon Mendes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Risk of HM funding results not being forward funded and delays arising in our delivery programme</td>
<td>The programme delayed so much that it cannot be delivered within HM timelines</td>
<td>Project withdrawal</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Seek potential alternative funding sources</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Delivery of housing at the sites delayed due to resident failure</td>
<td>The housing market in southwest is buoyant and there is considerable demand for new housing. Letters of support from the developers and agents for the allocated sites. The A320 works affect their capability and intention to deliver the housing in an expedient manner if the necessary mitigation works to the A320 are expedited and completed</td>
<td>The rate of house building has reduced but this is not considered to be significant</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Continue close liaison with private sector developers to unblock delivery challenges</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Traffic flow to St Peter’s Hospital could be disrupted and/or cannot be fully maintained</td>
<td>Disruption and delay to works</td>
<td>Death or injury to patients trying to access St Peter’s Hospital</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Agree advanced traffic management plans with all stakeholders</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Cannot take O&amp;M (do not agree to programme and proposed methodology)</td>
<td>Disruption and delay to works</td>
<td>Programme cannot be delivered within the HM period</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Agree advanced traffic management and delivery with correct plus unyielding constraints</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Proposals for land cannot be obtained (delay to O&amp;M)</td>
<td>We have assumed that OPFs will be complete and land in possession to hand over to contractor in time of award</td>
<td>Development of programme</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Enter into discussions with landowners at earliest opportunity and agree purchase of land as proposed at O&amp;M</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Insufficient financial resource available to design the schemes (lack of appetite from professional services consultants due to resource required with HM funding)</td>
<td>Some schemes cannot be delivered in available time, or at all</td>
<td>Additional constraints of delay. This could impact on any of the package benefits, dependant upon scheme(s) affected</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Market testing at earliest opportunity</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Change of key personnel causing a delay to delivery</td>
<td>Resources are lost for the preparation of detailed design/ delivery</td>
<td>Schemes not completed in time.</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Monitor progress against programme and accelerate as necessary</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Major stakeholders not in agreement with plan</td>
<td>Aspects of the schemes may not be able to progress as planned</td>
<td>Change in scheme design possibly leading to reduced impacts</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver</td>
<td>Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Continue discussions re: remaining major stakeholders are on board with the programme, i.e. change plans as long as we are aware of required changes early in team. Final decisions will be made with all stakeholders</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Inability to develop a practicable traffic management scheme resulting in increased traffic congestion</td>
<td>Disruption and delay to works</td>
<td>Inconvenience to road users</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Agree advanced traffic management and delivery with correct plus unyielding constraints</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Acknowledged during construction design delay</td>
<td>Design management and additional construction work</td>
<td>Delay design completion and additional construction work.</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Agree advanced traffic management into works programme to allow for such issues</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Potential archeological finds delaying the programme</td>
<td>Scheme could need to be redesigned or occupied</td>
<td>Additional costs/impact of re-design. This could impact on any of the package's benefits</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver</td>
<td>Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>Undertake Preliminary Ecological Assessment to prior to scheme</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Active/Withdrawal</td>
<td>Risk Description</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Development Phase</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Risk Management Plan</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Poor contractor performance during delivery phase</td>
<td>Poor quality, increased costs or programme delays</td>
<td>Scheme(s) not completed on time and/or go over budget</td>
<td>Deliver, Finance, Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Treat scheme(s) under construction to achieve desired performance through robust construction management plans</td>
<td>27/2/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Withdrawal of political support from members</td>
<td>May impact upon the delivery of programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop &amp; Deliver, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Engage members through to inform and answer any concerns</td>
<td>27/2/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Public consultation unsuccessful with strong public opposition to A320 scheme</td>
<td>Schemes need to be redesigned or scrapped</td>
<td>Additional cost/time of redesign. This could impact on any of the package’s benefits, dependent upon scheme(s) affected.</td>
<td>Develop, Finance, Time, Resource, Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Treat scheme(s) under construction to achieve desired performance through robust construction management plans</td>
<td>27/2/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Delivery of housing on the site is delayed due to market failure – as set out in the bid the housing market in Revere is buoyant and there is considerable demand for new housing. Letters of support from the developers and agents for the allocated site/s dependent on the A320 works to their capability and intention to deliver the housing in an expedient manner if the necessary mitigation works to the A320 are supported by HIF and completed.
## Risk Register Updates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>What</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Version Number: V01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/02/2019</td>
<td>Collate existing risk registers into this single risk register, utilising new departmental format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version Number: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/02/2019</td>
<td>Added to risk register the RBC risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/2019</td>
<td>Final draft risk register for S151 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version Number: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/03/2019</td>
<td>HIF bid team update of risks for inclusion in bid submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version Number 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version Number 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A320 North of Woking Project

The Scheme

1. In broad terms, the scheme comprises works to eight key junctions and links to address key barriers to the large-scale delivery of housing within the borough of Runneymede.
2. Private developers and businesses will be involved in the tender process and subsequent delivery of the infrastructure.
3. The Council has requested legal advice from its legal department to ensure that State aid has been considered and addressed in relation to the infrastructure scheme.

State aid – relevant principles

4. Article 107 Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (ex Article 87 TEC) provides:

i) Save as otherwise provided in the Treaties, any aid granted by a Member State or through State resources in any form whatsoever which distorts or threatens to distort competition by favouring certain undertakings or the production of certain goods shall, in so far as it affects trade between Member States, be incompatible with the internal market.

ii) The following shall be compatible with the internal market:
   (a) aid having a social character, granted to individual consumers, provided that such aid is granted without discrimination related to the origin of the products concerned;
   (b) aid to make good the damage caused by natural disasters or exceptional occurrences;

iii) The following may be considered to be compatible with the internal market:
   (a) aid to promote the economic development of areas where the standard of living is abnormally low or where there is serious underemployment, and of the regions referred to in Article 349, in view of their structural, economic and social situation;
   (b) aid to promote the execution of an important project of common European interest or to remedy a serious disturbance in the economy of a Member State;
   (c) aid to facilitate the development of certain economic activities or of certain economic areas, where such aid does not adversely affect trading conditions to an extent contrary to the common interest;
(d) aid to promote culture and heritage conservation where such aid does not affect trading conditions and competition in the Union to an extent that is contrary to the common interest;
(e) such other categories of aid as may be specified by decision of the Council on a proposal from the Commission.

5. Therefore State aid is an advantage in any form, placed upon a selective undertaking by public authorities. To be considered State aid it must be:

a. An intervention by the State or through State resources in whatever form;
b. That gives an advantage to a particular recipient on a selective basis;
c. That distorts, or threatens to distort competition; and
d. That is likely to affect trade between Member States.

6. The Commission Notice on State aid (at Paragraph 211) provides the following: There are circumstances in which certain infrastructures do not face direct competition from other infrastructures of the same kind or other infrastructures of a different kind offering services with a significant degree of substitutability, or with such services directly. The absence of direct competition between infrastructures is likely the case for comprehensive network infrastructures that are natural monopolies, that is to say for which a replication would be uneconomical....The Commission considers that an effect on trade between Member States or a distortion of competition is normally excluded as regards the construction of the infrastructure in cases where at the same time i) an infrastructure typically faces no direct competition ii) private financing is insignificant in the sector and Member State concerned and iii) the infrastructure is not designed to selectively favour a specific undertaking or sector but provides benefits for society at large.

7. Further, at Paragraph 212: In order for the entire public funding of a given project to fall outside State aid rules, Member States have to ensure that the funding provided for the construction of the infrastructures in the situations mentioned in paragraph 211 cannot be used to cross-subsidise or indirectly subsidise other economic activities, including the operation of the infrastructure. Cross-subsidisation can be excluded by ensuring that the infrastructure owner does not engage in any other economic activity – by keeping separate accounts, allocating costs and revenues in an appropriate way and ensuring that any public funding does not benefit other activities.

8. Further at Paragraph 220:
...[R]oads made available for free public use are general infrastructures and their public funding does not fall under State aid rules...the construction as such of road infrastructure... typically fulfils the conditions set out in paragraph 211 and its financing therefore typically does not affect trade between Member States or distort competition. To ensure that the entire public funding of a given project is not subject to State aid rules Member States also have to ensure that the conditions set out in paragraph 212 are fulfilled.

**Application**

9. General road infrastructure is a typical case of a natural monopoly which is made available to potential users on an equal and non-discriminatory basis. There is an assumption that the infrastructure is not designed selectively to favour a specific undertaking or sector but provides benefits for society at large. In order for it to fall outside State aid rules, the local authority must be sure that the funding provided for the construction of road infrastructure cannot be used to cross-subsidise or directly subsidise other economic activities.

10. The starting point here is that roads are general infrastructures which fall outside the State aid rules. In this case, however, it is also necessary to consider whether, by extension, where roads are developed for the connection of commercially exploitable land, the same disapplication applies.

**Commission Decision (1st October 2014) SA. 36147**

11. The effect of the above decision is that where roads are developed with a commercial reason in mind, they are still considered general infrastructure and are not subject to State aid rules. The Commission concluded that the State aid rules were inapplicable in these circumstances because (among other reasons):

> (34) Activities which are part of the performance of public duties are non-economic in nature. The development and revitalisation of public land by local authorities (with the use of public funds) is not an economic activity, but part of their public tasks, namely the provision and supervision of land in line with local urban and spatial development plans.

**Conclusion**

12. In this matter, although the development does involve the use of public funds, it is our opinion that the rules of State aid do not apply. Public authorities, for the reasons set out above, can act in a way which is beneficial to the community as a whole.
Dear Housing Infrastructure Fund,

**Re: A320 North of Woking – HIF/FF/000600/BC/01**

As Section 151 Finance Officer for Surrey County Council, I approve the submission for this application.

I am satisfied that the bid meets the requirements set out in the guidance and relevant terms and conditions for the Housing and Infrastructure Fund.

I agree to account for the funds received.

Yours faithfully

Leigh Whitehouse
Executive Director of Finance

Signed on behalf of Surrey County Council