

Appendix F

Report to Council, 19 June 2017

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

Borough Local Plan 2017

Duty to Co-operate Compliance Statement

May 2017

Contents

1. Introduction and Strategic Context
2. Neighbouring Authorities and Prescribed Bodies
3. Consultation Process
4. Outcomes of Cooperation on Cross Boundary Strategic Priorities:
 - Housing and employment needs
 - Unmet need
 - Strategic transport
 - Flooding
 - Green Belt
 - Thames Basin Heaths SPA
 - Other issues
5. Memoranda of Understanding

Appendix 1 Chronology of DTC meetings and consultation responses

Appendix 2 Memoranda of Understanding

1. Introduction and Strategic Context

- 1.1 This statement lays out processes, actions and outcomes undertaken by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council (RBWM), to address the 'Duty to Co-operate' in relation to the Borough Local Plan. This statement identifies issues of strategic importance including localised cross boundary issues that would have a significant impact on at least two local planning authority areas and what processes and actions, if any, have influenced the preparation of the Plan.
- 1.2 The Duty to Co-operate (DtC), was introduced through Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 in November 2011. The Act inserted a new Section 33A into the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which requires local planning authorities to co-operate constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities, county councils and other prescribed bodies in planning for strategic cross boundary matters.
- 1.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in March 2012, provides guidance on planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 178-181). In particular this relates to paragraph 156 of the NPPF, which advises that local planning authorities should set out strategic priorities in the Local Plan including:
- the homes and jobs needed in the area;
 - the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
 - the provision of infrastructure
 - the provision of health, security, community and cultural services and facilities
 - climate change mitigation and adaptation and conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment.
- 1.4 The principles of the NPPF include the need to take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it.
- 1.5 Local authorities should also take account of travel-to work areas and will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively co-operated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when Local Plans are submitted for examination. The national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) introduced in March 2014 provides further guidance on undertaking the duty, which requires a proactive, ongoing and focused approach to strategic planning and partnership working.
- 1.6 The collaboration and engagement required by the DtC is additional to all other forms of statutory consultation, this Statement should be read in conjunction with the other documents submitted with the BLP, including the Consultation Statement. This sets out how and with whom the Council has consulted at each stage of the preparation of the BLP and shows how the consultations stages have influenced the Plan.
- 1.7 The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) lies west of London, with the towns of Reading, Wokingham and Bracknell to the south and west and Slough to the east. Beyond the M25 to the east are the London Boroughs of Hounslow and Hillingdon and parts of Buckinghamshire wrap around the Royal Borough to the east and north. The Thames runs through the Borough from west to east and major motorways pass through or close to the Royal Borough, with Heathrow airport to the east.

- 1.8 Rail services are also available to many parts of the Royal Borough including the main rail line to Bristol from Paddington passing through Maidenhead. Branch lines also serve many of the Borough's parishes and towns and Crossrail (Elizabeth Line) will also serve Maidenhead.
- 1.9 Over 80% of the Borough is designated as Metropolitan Green Belt for London with nationally and internationally renowned heritage and nature conservation assets including Windsor Castle and Windsor Great Park. The Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVBLEP) strategy states:

“Within this overall context – and based firmly on the available evidence – three distinctive, and inter-related, features of our economy stand out: the importance of technology-based (tech-based) activity; the significance of internationalisation; and the role of the corporates. All three are inherently related to our strong relationship with London”

Compliance Statement


- 1.10 The purpose of this Compliance Statement is to identify and explain how the Borough has collaborated, engaged and co-operated with public bodies, stakeholder and neighbouring authorities in accordance with the DtC throughout the preparation of the BLP. The primary aim of the Statement is to provide a comprehensive account of the collaboration and engagement undertaken by the Council and an explanation of how that co-operation has led to the shaping of the strategies and policies within the BLP, which the Council is submitting to the Secretary of State for independent examination under Section 20 of the 2004 Act and Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England)Regulations 2012.
- 1.11 Section 2 of this Statement describes the authorities and bodies with whom the Council has co-operated during the preparation of the BLP. Section 3 describes the processes of consultation and Section 4, in several sub-sections, focuses in greater detail on each of the strategic priorities for this co-operation, showing how the Council has complied with the DtC and how the BLP has been informed by the various consultations.
- 1.12 Appendix 1 sets out the dates of each relevant engagement, with whom the Council engaged, and the purpose and outcome of the activity. As the engagement required by the DtC is additional to other forms of statutory consultation, this Statement should be read in conjunction with the other documents submitted with the BLP, including the Consultation Statement which sets out how and with whom the Council has consulted at each stage of preparing the Local Plan.

2. Neighbouring Authorities and Prescribed Bodies

2.1 The local planning authorities and other bodies prescribed by the Local Planning Regulations that are relevant to the Borough's Duty to Cooperate (DtC) are listed below:

2.2 Neighbouring Local Planning Authorities, with contiguous council areas listed in bold:

- **Bracknell Forest Council**
- **Buckinghamshire County Council**
- Chiltern District Council
- Reading Borough Council
- **Runnymede Borough Council**
- **Slough Borough Council**
- **South Bucks District Council**
- **Spelthorne Borough Council**
- **Surrey County Council**
- **Surrey Heath Borough Council**
- West Berkshire Council
- **Wokingham Borough Council**
- **Wycombe District Council**



- 103 Wokingham
- 104 Bracknell Forest
- 105 Windsor & Maidenhead
- 106 Runnymede
- 108 Spelthorne
- 109 Surrey Heath
- 112 South Bucks
- 113 Slough

Other Prescribed Bodies:

- Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Highways England
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Network Rail
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Thames Valley Berkshire Local Economic Partnership

3. Consultation Process

- 3.1 The preparation of the Borough Local Plan (BLP) has included extensive public and stakeholder consultations since 2009, together with continuing dialogue with neighbouring authorities and prescribed bodies throughout the plan-making process. This followed the unsuccessful inquiry into the Core Strategy in 2007 which resulted in a significant re-orientation of the Council's approach.
- 3.2 The Council decided to initiate the preparation of a Borough Local Plan (BLP) and, prior to submission to the Secretary of State, there will have been six separate stages of consultation as well as regular participation and responses to neighbouring authorities' and agencies' consultation programmes. Details of the Borough's consultation activities are presented in the RBWM Consultation Statement accompanying the BLP Publication.
- 3.3 The legislative and policy framework for strategic planning has changed fundamentally during the preparation of the BLP, including the requirement to cooperate with neighbouring authorities and prescribed bodies which was introduced in 2011. Responding to this requirement, as revealed by successive judicial decisions, the experience of independent examination and Planning Practice Guidance, the Council has adopted a proactive and structured approach to cooperation.
- 3.4 Detailed Duty to Co-operate activities related to the RBWM BLP started effectively in 2012 and gradually increased in intensity during 2014 and 2015 up to the present. Simultaneously, RBWM responded to the increasing calls for participation by neighbouring authorities and agencies as they developed their own plans and programmes.
- 3.5 Throughout the second part of 2012 and 2013, the Council engaged constructively with its neighbouring authorities through a series of DtC meetings where proceedings were reported on a proforma to ensure a consistent record. Agreed topics for discussion at this stage comprised:
- background and scope of RBWM BLP
 - strategic housing market assessment
 - population data and models
 - affordable housing
 - employment land review
 - land supply
 - housing need
 - scenarios
 - other issues.
- 3.6 Key inputs from these early meetings (between August and October 2012) included agreement to work jointly on the assessment of housing need for housing and employment, including the determination of Housing Market and Functional Economic Areas in Berkshire. A meeting between the Berkshire authorities in July 2013 initiated joint consideration of a Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMAA).

- 3.7 Further meetings coincided with the publication of the RBWM Local Plan Preferred Options consultation in early 2014, and joint Berkshire authorities agreed a brief for consultants to work on a SHMAA. This provided the basis for identifying two sub-areas for Berkshire in terms of housing need; West and East Berkshire Housing Market Areas, which itself formed the basis for the delineation of Functional Economic Market Areas (FEMA) for the county. At this stage, the joint working also included South Bucks District Council.
- 3.8 Neighbouring authorities stated their positions regarding the likelihood of being able to accommodate housing need within their own boundaries in general terms, and other common areas of interest were identified in a series of meeting and consultation responses throughout 2014. Meetings were also held with neighbouring counties, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire, primarily with regard to housing and employment land needs methodologies, and strategic infrastructure issues.
- 3.9 In April 2015, RBWM issued a Duty to Cooperate Scoping Issues document to neighbouring authorities and prescribed bodies and received a large number of responses which generally agreed the list of issues, and commented on amendments and additions to joint areas of interest. Further consultation responses were published and received during 2015, and an initial Infrastructure Delivery Plan was commissioned to accompany the Community Infrastructure Levy Schedule preparation.
- 3.10 Additionally, a partial consultation took place on a limited range of specific policy proposals in mid 2015 following a decision not to progress with a full Second Preferred Option consultation but responses were limited. Work continued on a full draft Borough Local Plan with the intention of publishing a full document for a final public consultation in early 2016.
- 3.11 In early 2016, a new round of engagement with neighbouring authorities and prescribed bodies was undertaken, and it was clear that Duty to Co-operate partners were unclear as to the Borough's position with regard to a number of major issues, including the allocation of sites to address jointly assessed need for housing and employment space. It was clear that communication between authorities needed to be improved, and consequently a programme of meetings was set up by RBWM to clarify the issues which needed consideration.
- 3.12 Simultaneously, decisions were made both to seek a opinion on the legal compliance of the draft BLP and the status of the Duty to Cooperate, and to review the draft BLP with regard to the need for a further full public consultation under Regulation 18 of the Local Planning Regulations. Meetings were convened at the Windsor Guildhall for both officers and Members in June and July 2016, and responses were received from several Berkshire authorities indicating areas of joint concern.
- 3.13 Specific further technical meetings addressed the issues of methodology and definitions with regard to the assessment of need, site allocations and the magnitude and location of unmet needs. Generally, this indicated where cross boundary issues are likely to occur and a specific case concerns the change of direction of South Bucks DC with regard to the definition of housing market and economic functional economic areas.
- 3.14 Where specific issues have been raised that required further engagement, the Council has engaged with its neighbouring authorities through further discussions and simultaneously has reviewed the allocation of sites so that the objectively assessed need for housing is satisfied in

full for the plan period. This means that no request to accommodate unmet needs will be made of neighbouring authorities at this stage.

- 3.15 In 2016, specific Duty to Co-operate meetings were convened in January, April, June, July, August, September, November and December meetings coinciding with the redrafting of the BLP. Clarification of the processes of assessment and allocation as described in the draft BLP have assisted the process of consultation considerably. It is proposed to codify cross boundary issues and positions in a series of Memoranda of Understanding with several local authorities which are specifically designed to demonstrate that the Duty to Co-operate has been satisfied (see Section 5 below).
- 3.16 The fully revised draft BLP was published for public consultation between Friday 2nd December 2016 and Friday 13th January 2017) and responses from neighbouring authorities have been reviewed and assessed. Appropriate amendments and alterations have been made for the BLP Publication, under Regulation 19, which is scheduled for Spring 2017.
- 3.17 Engagement with infrastructure providers and statutory consultees has also been an ongoing process, in particular as the shifting picture of housing need and supply throughout the period 2014 to 2016 has created the need for review. The outcomes of this co-operation have therefore shaped the BLP and its supporting evidence.
- 3.18 The process and outcomes of the above meetings and consultations will be presented in the succeeding sections of this Statement, and a comprehensive listing of them is collected in Appendix 1. The signed Memoranda of Understanding concluded with neighbouring authorities are described in Section 5.
- 3.19 There are several established cross organisational working groups and partnerships in operation at a number of different levels involved in the Duty to Co-operate process. Whilst these may reach agreement on particular issues, formal Member decision making processes remain vested in each individual authority.

Forms and methods of co-operation

- 3.20 The forms and methods of co-operation undertaken to shape the development of the BLP include:
- Joint evidence base studies
 - DtC meetings with officers from adjoining Local Planning Authorities
 - DtC workshops and project specific workshops
 - Formal consultation on the various stages of the BLP
 - Regular meetings with officers from neighbouring authorities and with stakeholders, for example, infrastructure providers
 - Meetings of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Board
 - On-going meetings, email, letters and telephone correspondence with neighbouring authorities and key stakeholders to discuss and progress strategic issues.
- 3.21 The Council has adopted a proactive and structured approach to engagement with neighbouring authorities and other prescribed bodies through a variety of means and an ongoing basis to discuss and address the strategic priorities set out in the NPPF. Although the timetables of neighbouring authorities' own emerging plans have not synchronised well with

the BLP, a series of joint evidence studies and strategies provide an effective framework for the BLP to respond to strategic matters in a co-ordinated manner.

- 3.22 The BLP proposes to meet the objectively assessed needs for development within the Borough during the plan period (2013-33), and the Council's neighbouring authorities have either confirmed their support for this approach, or have not raised significant concerns. Clearly, the Duty to Co-operate is ongoing and such issues as are raised, frequently concerned with the adequacy of the evidence base and related matters, will continue to be addressed.
- 3.23 The substantive issues raised during the period of DtC are presented in the succeeding section and comprise several cross boundary concerns. In many cases, specific institutional arrangements have been set up to address these issues, and they form schedules within the respective Memoranda of Understanding referred to above (para. 3.15 seq).

4. Outcomes of Co-operation on Cross Boundary Strategic Priorities

- 4.1 The outcomes of strategic co-operation are relevant to a wide range of topics relating to the preparation of the Borough Local Plan (BLP). In many cases, the key areas for joint strategic consideration under the Duty to Co-operate have been addressed through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the local authority concerned and these are described in more detail in Section 5 below.
- 4.2 The key areas where BLP policies are affected by cross-boundary and strategic considerations include:
- Housing need
 - Employment need
 - Unmet need
 - Strategic transport
 - Flooding
 - Green Belt
 - Thames Basin Heaths SPA
 - Heathrow
 - Gypsies and Travellers
- 4.2 Additionally, specific concerns are identified with individual neighbouring authorities where a joint position is mutually beneficial. These may concern specific transport issues or school catchments, for example, and are addressed through communication and consultation where a MoU is not concluded.

Housing needs

- 4.3 The Council recognises that both the scale and distribution of housing development are key strategic issues for the Royal Borough and its neighbouring authorities. It is often important to consider issues of housing need and supply at a wider spatial scale than single authorities, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear that local authorities should work together at a housing market area (HMA) level, to plan strategically for housing provision.
- 4.4 The former Berkshire County Council area provides a geographical starting point for the strategic context for the assessment of housing market areas and paragraph 5.21 of the Planning Advisory Service Technical Advice Note 13 supports this, concluding that:
- “it is best if HMAs, as defined for the purpose of needs assessments, do not straddle local authority boundaries. For areas smaller than local authorities data availability is poor and analysis becomes impossibly complex.....On this basis we consider that HMAs should be defined based on the ‘best fit’ to local authority boundaries; albeit that SHMAs can (and should) recognise cross-boundary influences and interactions.*
- 4.5 This approach is widely accepted and a practical and pragmatic response to data availability. In practical terms, towards the edges of most housing markets, there are likely to be influences in two directions with some overlap between HMAs.
- 4.6 Prior to 2014, regular meetings took place, primarily with Berkshire local authorities but also with Buckinghamshire and Surrey district and county councils, regarding the methodology for

assessing housing need, including affordable housing, processing of population data and delivery issues. Various options were considered for joint working and the Berkshire Leaders' Group in July and September 2014 considered papers regarding joint initiatives for the assessment of housing need and related topics.

- 4.7 Since 2014, RBWM has worked jointly with the five other Berkshire unitary authorities, together with the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVB LEP), in developing an understanding of future housing needs through a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The purpose of the SHMA is to develop a robust understanding of housing market dynamics and to provide an assessment of the future needs for both market and affordable housing, together with the housing needs of different groups within the population.
- 4.8 RBWM has worked with the other authorities within the defined housing market area (HMA) to test what level of development can be accommodated sustainably in the area, with the objective of meeting the objectively assessed need (OAN) for housing as far as is consistent with national policies, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In December 2014, the Berkshire Councils and the LEP commissioned consultants GL Hearn to prepare a SHMA for the relevant housing areas which produced figures for the objectively assessed need (OAN) for housing.
- 4.9 A sound figure for the Borough's full OAN is now available which has led to a revised and longer term housing requirement following effective cooperation on the spatial distribution with other local planning authorities across the Housing Market Area and beyond. A series of five meetings took place between the Berkshire Councils and the LEP during 2015 to review and discuss the SHMA as it was being prepared.
- 4.10 These were used as a basis for a series of cross boundary discussions and meetings to try and resolve issues around trying to meet the OAN for each Council. Officer and Member engagement with South Buckinghamshire District Council was considered once it was identified as part of the area covered by the Berkshire SHMA, and South Bucks Council was invited to be part of the commissioning of the second part of the SHMA once the Housing Market Areas had been defined, but ultimately declined.
- 4.11 Since the draft version of the Berkshire SHMA was produced, South Bucks District Council has agreed to produce a joint local plan with Chiltern District Council. Preliminary work on a Buckinghamshire Housing and Economic Development Needs Analysis (HEDNA) concluded that South Bucks would now form part of a "best fit" for a Central Bucks HMA together with Aylesbury Vale and Wycombe Councils. This decision does not change the functional HMAs identified in the Bucks SHMA (i.e. South Bucks falling into a Berkshire-wide HMA) but provides a pragmatic arrangement for South Bucks in establishing the evidence for its own developing policies.
- 4.12 A significant meeting took place on 19th January 2016 when the results of the SHMA study were reported to officers and Members of the Berkshire authorities. Discussion took place on how to deal with cross boundary issues and several issues were raised on housing need. RBWM indicated that it would proceed with preparing policy based on the Eastern SHMA results.
- 4.13 A later meeting was held on 29th June 2016 when RBWM presented a draft Borough Local Plan (BLP) document and sought responses from neighbouring authorities. A meeting was held on 14th July 2016 to discuss in more detail the specific technical issues raised by

neighbouring authorities with regard to the housing and employment allocations identified in the BLP and potential unmet needs. The key outcomes were recorded and these provide a positive way forward for the BLP in the coming months

Outcomes

- 4.14 The result of the cooperation of the Councils noted above in the joint commissioning of the SHMA has resulted in two Housing Market Areas (HMAs) being defined for Berkshire (East and West). RBWM is in an Eastern HMA which includes Slough BC and formerly South Bucks DC and the western area comprises Reading, Bracknell Forest, West Berkshire and Wokingham Council areas.
- 4.15 Working on the SHMA has led to constructive working relationships being developed across the Berkshire area and with the TVB LEP, which has led to discussions and joint working arrangements being put in place to manage the SHMA and its outcomes in terms of housing need and the publication by consultants of a report "Housing Market Areas and Functional Economic Market Areas in Buckinghamshire and the surrounding areas" in March 2015.
- 4.16 RBWM has referred to the results of the report, in terms of the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) figures for the Eastern HMA, and incorporated these into policy. A specific issue arises with regard to the composition of the East Berkshire HMA which originally comprised Slough BC and South Bucks DC.
- 4.17 In July 2016, as noted above, an update to the study was published which found that the functional relationship between the markets was unchanged, but suggested that the best fit to the plan making geography had altered due to the decision to produce a joint plan by South Bucks and Chiltern District Councils. South Bucks DC indicated that it wished to align market areas with what it regarded as a best fit to its plan making area which, with the Chiltern DC area, favoured the Central Buckinghamshire HMA and FEMAs which now comprises Aylesbury Vale, Wycombe and South Bucks/Chiltern DCs.

Employment needs

- 4.18 The balance between housing growth and the economy is fundamental and, whereas in self-contained city regions it can be relatively straightforward to assess employment need, in areas between major towns and cities, there are overlapping market areas for both housing and employment land needs which require a more pragmatic approach. Joint studies with neighbouring authorities of employment needs have arisen from the work done on housing need which demonstrates the strong linkages between these areas.
- 4.19 Prior to this joint working, an Employment Land Review was commissioned by RBWM from consultants Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners in 2009 which projected employment space requirements for the main economic sectors and provided a basis for proposals in the Maidenhead Area Action Plan. The Action Area Plan was found sound in examination and did not identify a major need for additional employment site allocations.
- 4.20 Following this, joint work in 2012 with Slough Borough Council took place through the East Berkshire Local Economic Assessment which examined key issues for the east Berkshire economy, and key findings were that the local economy is underpinned by a strong and well established business services and financial sector, and tourism is a key sector. The local work force is relatively highly skilled and there are key linkages between Windsor and Maidenhead

and Slough; the former providing Slough with labour, and Slough providing Windsor and Maidenhead with jobs.

- 4.21 A series of meetings were held during the period of this work to review progress and outcomes results. The methodology and definitions of FEMAs were discussed initially in late 2014 with the Berkshire authorities, led by Bracknell Forest, and simultaneously meetings were held with Buckinghamshire, led by Wycombe BC (September 2014), which presaged the reorientation of South Bucks towards Buckinghamshire functional market areas rather than Berkshire.
- 4.22 More recent joint working on the Housing Market Areas has been described above and led to additional work to identify Functional Economic Market Areas (FEMA) being commissioned from Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners in 2015 between the six unitary authorities of RBWM, Bracknell Forest, Reading, Slough, West Berkshire, and Wokingham, and the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVBLEP). The study established three Functional Economic Market Areas (FEMAs) that operate across the Berkshire sub-region and the economic development needs that local authorities should be planning for within these FEMAs.
- 4.23 Of the three FEMAs identified (Central, Western and Eastern Berkshire), the Eastern Berkshire FEMA has the greatest degree of relationship and influence with areas beyond Berkshire, with South Bucks consistently standing out as sharing strong economic linkages with eastern parts of Berkshire. The consultant's work developed appropriate methodologies for undertaking the study, and then used these methodologies to identify economic development needs to 2036, reflecting the fact that the geographical extent of local economies does not necessarily adhere to administrative boundaries, as recognised in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
- 4.24 The Eastern Berkshire FEMA comprises the two Berkshire authorities of Slough and Windsor and Maidenhead, alongside South Bucks. This area is consistent with the Slough and Heathrow Travel To Work Area (TTWA) as defined by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) which also comprises a number of other authority areas outside Berkshire. Within this FEMA, economic relationships with adjoining Buckinghamshire and West London are just as strong as they are with the rest of Berkshire and this is reflected in commercial property terms through the identification of a Slough & West London property market area.
- 4.25 RBWM sits across two FEMAs (Central and Eastern Berkshire) due to the varied characteristics and economic role associated with different parts of the Borough. The Borough's position within two FEMAs reflects the equally strong relationships that Windsor and Maidenhead exhibits with both more central parts of Berkshire and areas within South Bucks.
- 4.26 A steering group meeting of the Berkshire authorities took place in October 2015 which reviewed the results of the NLP study, and employment space projections were prepared for each local authority based on scenarios according to past trends of space provision, future labour supply and future labour demand. Concerns were raised, particularly with regard to future light industrial uses and the land use class definitions used, but these have been raised with the consultant by individual authorities.
- 4.27 The second part of the evidence comprises an Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) for each of the FEMAs identified in the first part. It uses the methodology developed as part of this work to identify the future quantity of land or floor space that will be required

for economic development uses over the period to 2036 in each local authority area and in each of the defined FEMA(s). This includes both quantitative and qualitative assessments of the need for new development and the consultants reported in February 2016.

- 4.28 In late 2016, the TBVLEP, which commissioned the work on behalf of the Berkshire authorities, published the FEMA studies as a common basis for the assessment of employment space need throughout the county area. A joint press release was agreed and the Borough has incorporated projections for employment space based on past trends of provision into the draft BLP; other authorities will choose which scenario reflects their own circumstances best.
- 4.29 While South Bucks DC, acting with Chiltern DC as a partner in a joint Local Plan, has made clear that they do not regard the FEMA studies for Berkshire as relevant to their circumstances, discussions between the Borough and South Bucks/Chiltern in December 2016 have clarified this position which will be incorporated in a Memorandum of Understanding between the authorities. The implications of this situation are that the Borough and Slough BC constitute the Eastern Berkshire FEMA and accept the outcomes of the FEMA studies as providing the objectively assessed need for future employment space as required by the NPPF.

Unmet needs

- 4.30 The principal issue facing authorities bound by the Duty to Co-operate (DtC) with regard to both housing and employment needs assessment is that of meeting any unmet needs following the allocations of sites for various land uses within their respective Local Plans. Berkshire wide SHMA and FEMA studies have provided the context for Duty to Co-operate meetings to continue and develop as described above.
- 4.31 Throughout 2014 and 2015 it was not possible to quantify unmet needs as joint studies were assessing overall requirements. Also, whereas in strategic terms the Borough Local Plan Preferred Options in summer 2014 indicated potential locations for future development which were consulted on widely with neighbouring authorities as well as the public, specific site allocations were limited and seen as unlikely to be adequate to meet requirements.
- 4.32 A Consultation Statement was prepared on the 2014 Preferred Options and as a result of the representations received, work began on a Second Preferred Options document. Initial work was undertaken on site allocations, including the proposed release of Green Belt land, and co-operation with neighbouring authorities was limited at this stage due to the lack of specific results.
- 4.33 A major circulation regarding Duty to Cooperate was initiated by the Borough between April and May 2015 through a DtC Scoping of Issues and Bodies document which clearly included how to deal with housing and employment needs as well as many other topics. Written responses were requested to indicate the scope of topics which should constitute future co-operation.
- 4.34 There was a positive and comprehensive reaction to this consultation, and no major objections were raised to the topics identified in correspondence received in April and May. More detailed work on site selection took place later in the year with the intention of relating emerging housing and employment requirements to potential sites so that any unmet need could be identified for further discussion.
- 4.35 In the event, the Second Preferred Options document was not proceeded with, and detailed allocations for the BLP were deferred. Neighbouring authorities expressed their concerns with regard to the methodology being used to the Borough but an important meeting took place in

January 2016 between the Berkshire authorities, the Local Economic Partnership and South Bucks/Chiltern.

- 4.36 The major business of this meeting, when Members were present, was to report the results of the Berkshire SHMA and the implications of cross boundary issues for the authorities represented. This was followed by a more technical meeting in April 2016 which included Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Surrey authorities and a number of prescribed bodies.
- 4.37 In responding to concerns raised by neighbouring authorities, the Borough convened a meeting on 29th June 2016 at the Windsor Guildhall to present a further draft of the Borough Local Plan to neighbouring authorities in the County area and this comprised Reading BC, Wokingham BC, Bracknell Forest BC, Slough BC, West Berkshire Council, and South Bucks/Chiltern. At this stage, the draft BLP was indicating that site allocations could satisfy approximately 80% of the objectively assessed need for housing and employment space within the plan period
- 4.38 The meeting was to seek responses and explore methodological and other technical inconsistencies which gave rise to the neighbouring authorities' concerns. These were articulated clearly and subsequent correspondence from Bracknell Forest, Slough and West Berkshire Councils provided further elaboration on issues which were widely shared, and linked to perceived gaps in the evidence base with regard to how site allocation decisions had been made.
- 4.39 A further meeting on 4th July 2016 covered similar ground with prescribed bodies; the Environment Agency, Crossrail, Thames Water and the TVB LEP. A follow up session with officers from the Berkshire authorities on 14th July completed this review of the draft BLP which it was anticipated would comprise the submission draft (under Regulation 19 of the Local Planning Regulations).
- 4.40 Mainly due to concerns regarding the possibility of unmet need being identified, legal and further technical advice from the Planning Inspectorate was sought and Borough Members then decided to revert to a further public consultation on a full draft of the BLP (Regulation 18). This permitted a comprehensive review of the Borough's position and for further work to be completed on the evidence base relating to site allocations.
- 4.41 At a further meeting on 8th August 2016 with Berkshire authorities, the Borough was able to indicate that the draft BLP would seek to satisfy 100% of its objectively assessed housing needs, and would thus not be identifying any unmet housing needs. The methodological basis for this position is based on the results of the Borough's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and Edge of Settlement Study which provide a rigorous base for site allocations.
- 4.42 During the process of the elaboration of the Borough's position, adjoining authorities have indicated their own situations with regard to unmet need, at the meetings noted above and in bilateral correspondence.
- 4.43 The greatest unmet need is apparent in Slough and other authorities are in a similar position or have not yet got to a stage where they can quantify the projected provision due to the stage of their Local Plan preparation.
- 4.44 It is apparent that the previous concerns regarding the Borough's position on unmet need have largely dissipated, and it is not anticipated that there will be an objection by a

neighbouring authority to the Borough's policy proposals. Strategic issues in this continue to be discussed at the county-wide Development Planning Group and with the TVB LEP.

- 4.45 There will be further engagement by Berkshire Heads of Planning if there is an issue that requires their input and unresolved issues can then be reported to meetings of the Berkshire Chief Executives and the Berkshire Leaders as necessary. Ongoing work on capacity and distribution is managed by a Member Reference Group consisting of a Member from each of the six Berkshire authorities.

Strategic transport

- 4.46 The Council has worked constructively with key transport infrastructure providers throughout the development of the BLP to assess the implications of planned growth on the delivery of their services, and to identify effective solutions to transport issues. Where the identified need for infrastructure raises cross-boundary concerns, the Council has worked with neighbouring authorities to address these.
- 4.47 The primary means by which collaboration with infrastructure providers has been undertaken is through joint working on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which accompanies the BLP and sets out the infrastructure schemes required to support planned growth. The content of the IDP has been shaped by the outcomes of this process and taken account of infrastructure providers' own plans and strategies for the delivery of infrastructure.
- 4.48 Consultants AECOM (then URS) prepared a draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the Council's CIL Schedule in 2015 which identified aggregated funding gaps for specific projects including strategic transport provision. This was not a comprehensive exercise but it provided the evidence for the successful CIL Schedule Examination in March 2016 and enabled the Council to initiate CIL collections from September 2016.
- 4.49 With regard to strategic transport provision, RBWM is the highways authority and other transport stakeholders are Highways England, Network Rail, Great Western Railway, local bus operating companies and neighbouring planning authorities. There are two major forums which meet regularly for the consideration of major transport issues in Berkshire.
- 4.50 The Berkshire Strategic Transport Officers Forum (BSTOF) comprises senior officers from the councils which meets at six weekly intervals to identify significant issues relating to strategic highways, public transport, cycling and walking. The Berkshire Local Transport Body meets quarterly and comprises both Members and officers, and is administered by the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Economic Partnership and considers issues such as the Growth Deal Capital Programme. RBWM participates in both these forums and cross boundary issues are identified for joint action where appropriate.

Highways

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

approximately 600 units in Bracknell Forest. Pressure points affecting neighbouring authorities include the A404 Bisham roundabout and through road routes.

- 4.53 A new model is being developed to reflect present conditions and the results are anticipated in the near future. The results of these latest studies will be shared with neighbouring authorities and will include similar assumptions regarding future development in Bracknell Forest and Wokingham.
- 4.54 The Berkshire Local Transport Body, serviced by the TVB LEP, identifies and monitors the Growth Deal Capital Programme for strategic transport investment. The only project in the Local Growth Deal affecting the Borough in the present programme is improvements to the Maidenhead station approach, in preparation for the introduction of Crossrail (The Elizabeth Line).
- 4.55 Highways England is the national body with responsibility for the M4 which runs through the Borough. Junction 8/9 lies in the Borough and is subject to significant congestion at peak hours. Discussions with Highways England are continuing with regard to the draft BLP and inputs into the existing and new transport models and the impact of planned development on the strategic highway network, including the M4.

Rail

- 4.56 Discussions with Network Rail and Great Western Railway have previously taken place under the auspices of the Thames Valley Regional Working group and responses to the Wessex Route Study which has limited impacts for Maidenhead as a main line rail station. Limited improvements have been made to Maidenhead station recently,
- 4.57 The introduction of the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail) with a key station at Maidenhead will have some impact on the town centre and surrounding areas. A meeting in June 2016 with Crossrail indicated that they did not anticipate a major increase in rail usage in Maidenhead as a result of the introduction of The Elizabeth Line, which will increase capacity and convenience but is not expected to impact significantly on commuter travel times.
- 4.58 A specific area of co-operation in the future may be the joint promotion of improvements to the Maidenhead to Marlow (via Bourne End) railway line with Wycombe District Council. The Memorandum of Understanding with Wycombe DC mentions specifically the aspiration to improve this service which may help to reduce congestion on main road routes in both authorities' areas.

Other transport issues

- 4.59 Limited progress has been made on the promotion of sustainable transport policies in the BLP and there is a need for an Integrated Transport Strategy which takes account of national government objectives to reduce the use of private vehicles.

Flooding

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

- 4.61 Previous work was undertaken by consultants WSP in summer 2014 prior to consultation on the First Preferred Options document. More recent work has been completed in summer 2016 but has not yet been published, with regard to sites identified for potential development during the plan period.
- 4.62 The Environment Agency responded initially in July 2016 to an informal draft of the BLP and latterly to the Regulation 18 draft BLP, seeking evidence of the SFRA and Sequential Testing of Sites to steer development to areas at lowest risk of flooding. The BLP takes account of strategic flood risk as part of the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA).
- 4.63 The Borough has been represented at Member level in the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (TRFCC) which reviews cross boundary issues throughout the Thames Basin. The Borough is also a partner in the Lower River Thames Scheme.

Green Belt

- 4.64 Over 80% of the Borough is designated Metropolitan Green Belt which provides a major constraint to potential development and is passionately defended. Both RBWM and most neighbouring authorities have been concerned with identifying the possible release of Green Belt, notwithstanding the Government's intention to strengthen its protection.
- 4.65 The Green Belt has been a regular item for discussion at DtC meetings between neighbouring authorities since 2012. Various methodologies are used by neighbouring authorities seeking to categorise Green Belt in terms of several criteria, often including landscape character and quality, and their contribution to the objectives of the Green Belt.
- 4.66 More recently, the most significant discussion of Green Belt release methodology took place with Slough BC in early 2014 when it became apparent that there would need to be de-designation of most of its Green Belt in the light of the objectively assessed need for housing land. This was reflected in discussions with neighbouring authorities, specifically West Berkshire and Bracknell Forest Councils.
- 4.67 The Council proceeded with an Edge of Settlement Study, in two parts, during 2015 and 2016, following the decision to concentrate future development in Maidenhead and the existing larger settlements. Previously, neighbouring authorities had expressed concern about the lack of transparency with regard to the methodology and results of the study, and these were promoted at the Duty to Co-operate meetings for the Berkshire authorities and Chiltern/South Bucks DCs organised by the Borough in June and July 2016.
- 4.68 Discussions are continuing with DtC authorities, accepting the variations in methodology employed and the results achieved for each authority. In most cases, a schedule in the specific memorandum of understanding addresses this issue with the intention of accepting these variations in approach.

Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

- 4.69 The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) extends across eleven local authority areas in southern England and comprises largely heathland that supports three species of protected bird; the Dartford warbler, nightjar and woodlark, which are vulnerable to disturbance from human activity. No net increase in the number of dwellings is legally possible

within five kilometre of the SPA unless there is evidence that the development would not cause harm to the SPA.

- 4.70 The SPA comes from the Saved Policy from the South East Plan: Policy NRM6: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area which states:

'New residential development which is likely to have a significant effect on the ecological integrity of Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) will be required to demonstrate that adequate measures are put in place to avoid or mitigate any potential adverse effects. Such measures must be agreed with Natural England'...

- 4.71 The eleven Special Protection Area local authorities, plus the relevant county councils, Natural England and nature conservation bodies, work together to implement an avoidance and mitigation package that will ensure there are no adverse effects on the SPA arising from development. A Joint Special Planning Board and officer group enables a joint policy approach to be developed and the approach involves providing Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) mitigation. A formal legal agreement between all local authorities codifying the SAMM approach was agreed in 2011.
- 4.72 The Joint Strategic Partnership Board (JSPB) also undertakes research into the effectiveness of SANGs. Local authorities implement agreed SANG policy and are formalising the policy at a local level as their Local Plans are reviewed. When all authorities have adopted such a policy, the 'saved policy' of the South East Plan (Policy NRM6) can be rescinded.
- 4.73 The JSPB and officer group both meet approximately twice a year with e-mail correspondence as required. Progress will be monitored through the following:
- in policy terms, BLP monitoring e.g. number of housing completions within five kilometres of the SPA
 - in environmental terms Natural England implements the SAMM approach under instruction from the Joint, regular surveys of the numbers of breeding pairs of birds within the SPA and surveys of visitor behaviour on the SPA and on SANGs.
- 4.74 There is continuing concern that the pressure for development increases the need for SANG and there is insufficient appropriate land available within the SPA authorities. Accordingly, in terms of DtC, there is the need for neighbouring authorities to request provision in order for planning permissions to be compliant.

Other issues

- 4.75 Concerns relating to the provision of accommodation and sites for Gypsies and Travellers have been raised at DtC meetings since 2012 and are identified in Appendix 1. The Borough has indicated that it will prepare a specific Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan following adoption of the BLP and this has been transmitted to neighbouring authorities. A Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) has been commissioned from Arc4 who have also undertaken similar work for two adjoining authorities.
- 4.76 The specific positions adopted by neighbouring authorities are addressed within the Memorandum of Understanding with that authority, where appropriate. Generally, local authorities are making or intending to make provision for their own assessed need for sites.

- 4.77 Increasingly important in the future will be the impact of Heathrow airport and its planned expansion. The Borough attends the Heathrow Strategic Planning Board as a local authority directly affected, together with neighbouring authorities and major transport, business and resident stakeholders.
- 4.78 Impacts are likely to include infrastructure and housing effects and at present these are subject to further analysis. Responses by neighbouring authorities relate to their respective positions regarding the construction of the third runway; whereas Slough is supportive, the majority of neighbouring local authorities are opposed.

5. Memoranda of Understanding

- 5.1 To reflect the complex and varied nature of the status and issues to be reflected in the Duty to Co-operate, especially where local authorities necessarily take differing positions but are willing to co-operate in finding the most appropriate position for mutual benefit, or at least the reduction in detrimental effects, Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) are a useful way of identifying common concerns and outlining potential solutions or areas where further work may be needed to reach an appropriate solution.
- 5.2 The publication of draft MoU between the Borough and neighbouring authorities was discussed initially at the DtC meetings convened by the Borough in June and July 2016, and it was generally agreed that this was a useful mechanism to identify outstanding issues and areas of agreement where possible. This is also a useful mechanism where there have been historical issues between local authorities, enabling a review to take place and positions to be articulated which reflect the current situation, and demonstrate that an appropriate level of co-operation has occurred as required by legislation.
- 5.3 Schedules within the Memorandum reflect the major issues which have been the subject of this Statement as described above. Areas of agreement, or divergence, are then described and any further concerns noted for subsequent attention.
- 5.4 A key element of MoU is the involvement of elected Members to ensure the appropriate level of commitment at political as well as technical levels. For the Borough, Lead Member for Planning, Councillor Derek Wilson has signed the memoranda.
- 5.5 The Borough has concluded a MoU with Wycombe DC and is progressing discussions with the following local planning authorities:
- Bracknell Forest
 - Chiltern/South Bucks
 - Reading
 - Runnymede
 - Slough
 - Spelthorne
 - West Berkshire
 - Wokingham
- 5.6 Correspondence has taken place with Surrey Heath Borough Council which is equivalent to a MoU and demonstrates the level of agreement on the various issues covered with other neighbouring authorities. The Council has recently responded to a letter from Surrey Heath BC in relation to its unmet housing need.

Table 1: Summary of Duty to Cooperate outcomes on strategic issues discussed with neighbouring authorities

Strategic issue	Partners, arrangements	Format/evidence	Outcomes/subject matter	Ongoing
Sub regional development strategy	LEP, neighbouring authorities		LEP and lead members joint working group established Jan 2014 LEP published strategy in March 2014	
Housing				
Housing need and demographics: SHMA Housing and development distribution	Bracknell Forest BC Reading BC Slough BC South Bucks DC West Berks CI Wokingham BC Thames Valley Berkshire Local Economic Partnership (TVB LEP) Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Bucks CC Oxford CC Runnymede BC Spelthorne B C Surrey CC Surrey Heath BC Wycombe D C	Formal meetings Head of Planning meetings Reporting to elected Members Evidence: Joint Berks and S Bucks SHMA. RBWM Edge of Settlement Study. (Maidenhead) Town Centre Capacity Study. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). National Planning Practice Guidance	Joint SHMA commissioned in 2014 and finished 2016 Meetings on 18th and 22nd Dec Inc S Bucks. <i>Outcome: Draft findings regarding the geography of housing markets were tested through a Stakeholder Event held on 19th May 2015. The event included a presentation of emerging findings by GL Hearn, followed by a Question and Answer Session. Two sessions were held – one with Duty to Cooperate Partners; and a second including wider stakeholders.</i> Summit between, RBWM, S Bucks and Slough inc politicians 19th Jan 2016 Eastern Housing Market Area Duty to Cooperate Meeting 21 September 2016 at Legoland Windsor	
Gypsies and Travellers	Berkshire Councils HCA	Meeting with HCA, Berks Councils	Need for cross boundary working. Further meetings to take place	
Employment and Economic				

Job and floorspace requirements	Bracknell Forest BC Reading BC Slough BC South Bucks DC TVB LEP West Berks C Windsor 2030 Business Forum Wokingham BC	Joint FEMA commissioned by LEP & Berks las N Lichfield Feb 2016	Joint Berks FEMA commissioned by the Berks authorities and LEP 2015	
FEMA & resultant employment land requirement, allocations and policies			FEMA study helps identify where partners are needed for more detailed study. Provides evidence for policy development, and areas of possible contention	
Retail	Bracknell Forest BC Reading BC I Slough BC South Bucks DC West Berks C Wokingham BCI Chiltern DC		Formal Duty to Co-operate letter agreeing there are no cross border strategic issues for retail.	
Infrastructure				
Transport	Bracknell Forest BC Bucks CC Civil Aviation Authority Crossrail DB Schenker First Great Western Freightliner Highways England LB of Hillingdon Network Rail Office of Rail Regulation Oxford CC Reading BC Runnymede BC Slough BC South Bucks DC South West Trains Spelthorne B C Surrey C C Surrey Heath B C TVB LEP West Berks CI Wokingham BC Wycombe DC	The transport model needs updating and this needs to be done before useful co-operation can take place, A range of issues need to be resolved on a bi-party basis as well as across all these authorities. Initially this may be by formal correspondence, but formal meetings will also be needed.	The Berkshire Strategic Transport (Officer) Forum (BST(O)F) meets every 6 weeks. This discusses: funding bids for major transport schemes; progress on funded schemes; relevant projects and policies affecting strategic transport, and consultations on policies and proposals that affect the strategic network or which have a cross-boundary impact.	
Rail proposals and policy	Network Rail Crossrail	Discussions are on-going in	Development of an agreed scheme to form the basis	

	Great Western Railway	relation to the development of proposals for a multi-modal transport interchange at Maidenhead Station, which affect the Maidenhead Station Opportunity Area identified in the Maidenhead Town Centre Area Action Plan	of a Local Growth Deal Funding bid to the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership	
Strategic Transport Schemes and Policies / Major transport scheme funding	Highways England, Network Rail Bucks C C Civil Aviation Authority Crossrail DB Schenker First Great Western Freightliner Highways England London Borough of Hillingdon Network Rail Office of Rail Regulation Oxfordshire C C Reading B C Runnymede BC Slough B C South Bucks DC South West Trains Spelthorne BC Surrey C C Surrey Heath BC TVB LEP West Berkshire Wokingham BC Wycombe DC	The Berkshire Strategic Transport (Officer) Forum meets every 6 weeks. This discusses: funding bids for major transport schemes; progress on funded schemes; relevant projects and policies affecting strategic transport, and consultations on policies and proposals that affect the strategic network or which have a cross-boundary impact.	Securing funding for local major transport schemes	
Flooding Flood relief infrastructure	Environment Agency (EA) Natural England Runnymede BC	Initially formal letter correspondence asking for any	Correspondence with parties to agree how we will deal with the issue in the Local Plan. Initially by	

	Spelthorne BC	issues that need considering.	letter/email, a formal meeting may be necessary.	
Water supply	Thames Water EA	A meeting has already taken place. Further meetings are planned when we know more of the detail of the scale of development. Initially formal letter correspondence asking for any issues that need considering.	An agreed way forward which may include information in the supporting text to the policies, some wording in policies or in an SPD.	
Environmental				
Green Belt	Bracknell Forest C Reading BC Slough BCI South Bucks DC West Berks CI Wokingham BC Chiltern DC	Notes of meetings	Part one and Edge of Settlement methodology consulted on and discussed with other councils 2014 to 2016	
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	Joint Strategic Partnership Board (JSPB): Bracknell Forest BCI Elmbridge BC Guildford BC Hart DC RBWM Runnymede BC Rushmoor BC Surrey Heath BC Waverley BC Woking BC Wokingham BC Hampshire CC Surrey CC	In addition an officer group exists to discuss and implement SPA policy. Membership consists of officers from the authorities above, plus Natural England, the RSPB and various other conservation bodies Evidence: Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Delivery Framework	Agreed approach to avoidance and mitigation has enabled housing development to proceed in the SPA authorities, where before there was a moratorium on development. In RBWM this has been achieved by leasing land to form a SANG, which was formally designated in 2012. A policy has been drafted that will incorporate the SPA approach into the Borough Local Plan. This has been based on NRM6 and similar policies from other authorities.	

		(February 2009) The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the Habitats Regulations)		
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 1: Chronology of DTC meetings and consultation responses

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
Surrey Heath BC	23/9/10	Consult resp by RBWM	Re SH CS. No objection to Core Strategy. Need more detail on Longcross DERA site
Wycombe DC	20/8/12	Meeting	Agreed DtC topics (initial proforma): -Bisham roundabout
Runnymede BC	20/8/12	Meeting	Agreed DtC topics (initial proforma): -SHMA; RBWM methodology agreed, no appetite by R'mede for shared SHMA. Both constrained auths. -pop'n data: R'mede using SEPlan figs, ok with RBWM using POPCORN -afford hg; studies to be updated -employ and retail; no concerns -RBWM no opinion on DERA site
Spelthorne BC	21/8/12	Meeting	Agreed DtC topics (initial proforma): SHMA, housing need, popn data, affordable housing, ELR, SHLAA. No major issues of concern.
South Bucks DC	22/8/12	Meeting	Agreed DtC topics (initial proforma): -SHMA; no real appetite for joint SHMA, Bucks auths at different stages of LP prep. -afford hg; similar trends for both auths. -housing need; both auths. constrained -scenarios; S Bucks believe scenarios too narrow -infra; concerns over A4 Slough to Maidenhead capacity, traffic modelling needed -Gs and Ts; auths to liaise
Wokingham BC	6/9/12	Meeting	Agreed DtC topics (initial proforma): -SHMA, housing need, pop'n data, affordable housing, ELR, SHLAA. No major issues of concern.
Reading BC	11/9/12	Meeting	Agreed DtC topics (initial proforma): -SHMA; update of Berks SHMA required, RBWM will need to look at GB -afford housing; will continue to be an issue -employ and retail; existing ELR likely to be robust. Reading's Sites & Detailed Pols DPD found sound.
Surrey Heath BC	13/9/12	Meeting	Agreed DtC topics: -housing shortfall; RBWM considering target below need. SHBC target in Core Strat; meeting need -Traveller provision; Atkins study for RBWM and Berks auths; minor provision by RBWM. SHBC undertook own GTAA – 19 pitches required -SANGs; Allen's Field capac 400 units. Need more in Sunningdale area, potential SANG in SHBC for RBWM -education; RBWM Charters school popular and full, potential use by SHBC children -Sunningdale station; affected by neighbourhood plan. SHBC wish to be consulted.

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
Wycombe DC	27/9/12	Corres to RBWM	Request for more info on various technical aspects of the BLP prior to Cab report.
W Berks C	3/10/12	Meeting	Agreed DtC topics (proforma): -SHMA and need; concern about discrepancy with Census -employ/ELR; growth rates unrealistic -Green Belt; need for review
Slough BC	15/10/12	Meeting	Agreed DtC topics (proforma): -SHMA; assessment should be beyond the two borough boundaries -ELR; SBC office market is struggling, past projections too high
Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (TRFCC) (Cllr Grey)?	14/1/13	Meeting	Agreed to support an increase in the Thames Levy by 5% for 2013/14 to £10.5 million. Agreed to support an above inflation increase each year for the next five years.
Berks/Bucks/Oxon authorities and prescribed bodies	30/4/13	Meeting	PAS workshop on DtC
TRFCC (Cllr Grey)	26/6/13	Meeting	EA and LLFA teams working closely together to draw up the Thames Programme bid for projects proposed by risk management partners throughout the Thames area. Questioned need to strengthen links with LEPS.
Runnymede BC	3/10/13	Consult resp by RBWM	Objected to Longcross policy
Runnymede BC	7/10/13	Consult resp by RBWM	RBWM noted unable to accept housing needs from other auths. and will aim to satisfy OAN. No issues relating to G and Ts and infrastructure.
TRFCC (Cllr Grey)	16/10/13	Meeting	Berkshire and North Hants to continue to work together on strategic elements of local flood risk.
Wycombe DC	22/10/13	Meeting	Discussion of the extent of HMA. Ability to meet housing need. Scale of need much higher than identified capacity. Note (21.10.13)
South Bucks DC	13/11/13	Meeting	DtC topics agreed: -housing need; methodology for SHMA, S Bucks in HMA but not all districts equally relevant -housing delivery; h'hold increase in SHMA exceeds delivery, will need GB release, S Bucks can take no excess from RBWM, looking to others for housing. -infra; traffic issues relating to A4 -education; overflow from Slough for both auths.
South Bucks DC	1/1/14	Consult resp by RBWM	Wilton Park SPD. Brief for site near Beaconsfield
TRFCC (Cllr Grey)	13/1/14	Meeting	Discussion with Thames Water regarding 6 year investment programme. Focus on surface water flooding alleviation via sewer upgrade.
Spelthorne BC	14/1/14	Meeting	DtC topics agreed:

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
			-lack of strategic framework for cooperation. -HMA and impact of Aylesbury Vale decision letter. -signif. of housing overspill from London. -Spelthorne cannot take RBWM housing need. -release of GB will be needed in RBWM
Surrey Heath BC	20/1/14	Meeting	Proforma mins. Re housing numbers, SH BC cannot take any excess housing from RBWM. Traffic on A30 – cumulative effects. Both councils object to DERA proposal at Longcross. SPA and efficiency of SANG. Effect of developing strategic sites eg Ascot High St, Sunningdale station.
Historic England	23/1/14	Contact	RBWM offered meeting re flooding policy
Runnymede BC	30/1/14	Meeting	Discussion of common topics wrt RBWM Preferred Options and Runnymede Core Strategy. Topics: Housing: Joint Berks SHMA being considered. RBWM objected to Runnymede Core Strategy on basis of constraints. R'mede understood the approach taken re HMA but would expect more refined approach after Census data is available. R'mede cooperating with 2 other Surrey authorities to prepare SHMA but no offers.
Highways England	3/2/14	Contact by RBWM	Concerns relating to Triangle site. Re evidence base
Elmbridge BC	7/2/14	Consult resp to RBWM	Response noted TBHSPA and Lower Thames Scheme as common interests. Mechanisms already in place to review.
Reading BC	17/2/14	Consult resp to RBWM	Agreed DtC topics (proforma): -housing need; Berks SHMA in operation -housing delivery: GB bound to be needed in RBWM, need will exceed present Reading unlikely to make up RBWM shortfall -afford housing; Reading concerned about RBWM pos'n -employ and retail; more AAP proposed.
Slough BC	26/2/14	Meeting	Topics covered: -housing need; in 2012 no neighbouring boros willing to work with RBWM; SHMA changed that -affordable housing; SBC major concern re RBWM manifesto commitment on equity stake only housing delivery; will need edge GB release in RBWM, SBC will be asking neighbours to help transport; SBC needs RBWM support for western rail access to Heathrow, and Slough-Windsor rly M and W; RBWM/SBC taking similar approach infra; no fundamental constraints, trans modelling required for RBWM
Bracknell For C	10/3/14	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC strategic issues: -fulfillment of DtC; lack of approach on trans, infra,

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
		Pref Options	housing and duty not fulfilled -housing need; significant concerns on unmet needs and shortfall; GB partial methodology -Gs and Ts; unclear methodology and results highway network impact; significant questions on model devel'd in 2009 at height of recession TBH SPA; SANGs need to be agreed -IDP; needed before comment can be made on infra. Mins and waste; needs comprehensive treatment thro Berks.
Thames Valley Berks Local Econ P'ship (TVBLEP)	11/3/14	Meeting	Discussion on items of common interest. LEP supports M'head regen, higher densities for development. Strategic Econ Plan being prepared. Crossrail and Heathrow seen by LEP as positive.
W Berks C	12/3/14	Meeting	Agreed DtC topics (proforma): -SHMA and need; commitment to joint approach - housing deliv; GB and PDL land key to supply -no other major strategic issues.
Wokingham BC	14/3/14	Consult resp by RBWM	Re WBC SCI. Support and willingness to work together.
W Berks C, Reading BC, S Oxon DC, Vale of White Horse DC	18/3/14	Meeting	Oxon SHMA consultation at W Berks; relationship with surrounding SHMAs
Berkshire auths, TVBLEP, South Bucks DC	20/3/14	Meeting	Discussion of SHMA brief
Windsor, Ascot and M'head CCG	14/4/14	Meeting	Part of Local Plan preparation process. Re key issues from BLP. Implications of new households. No proposals for super hospital or tertiary facility. More planning for healthy comm.
TTRFCC (Cllr Grey)	25/4/14	Meeting	Discussion of progress with schemes, forward planning of investment in flood defences and schemes and sharing best practice.
Spelthorne BC	1/5/14	Consult resp by RBWM	CIL
W Berks C	1/5/14	Consult resp by RBWM	Site allocations DPD, SCI and strategic issues
Wokingham BC	2/5/14	Meeting (Mems) (re-arr from 17/3/14)	DtC meeting. No minutes.
Hart, Rushmoor Surrey Heath BCs	18/5/14	Consult resp from RBWM	Regarding joint ELR methodology. No objection and wish to continue dialogue.
Natural England	19/5/14	Meeting	Cooperation regarding SPA and SANG issues. Input from NE on HRA screening
TFRCC (Cllr Grey)	4/6/14	Meeting	Establishment of common approach to

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
			environmental enhancement in TFRCC projects Biodiversity elements included could be supported by appropriate LEP.
S Oxon DC	16/6/14	Consult resp by RBWM	Response to LP Issues and Scope
Bracknell For C	1/7/14	Meeting	CIL and Planning Obligations SPD – comments submitted
Woking BC	1/7/14	Consult resp by RBWM	SCI and Design SPD – comments submitted
Hart DC	4/7/14	Consult resp by RBWM	FEA – comments submitted
West Berks DC	4/7/14	Consult resp by RBWM	Re: WBC SCI. No comments but seeking cooperation on joint issues
S Oxon DC	14/7/14	Consult resp by RBWM	S Oxon LP Issues and Scope. Mainly re housing issues and acceptance of Oxon HMA
Berkshire Leaders Group (W Berks, Bracknell For, Wokingham, Slough)	23/7/14	Meeting (Mems)	Discussion on Berks-wide strategic planning. RBWM seen as in a unique position, but work done seen as flawed due to lack of consultation. Joint SHMA discussed and supported by most auths. in principle.
Berkshire and North Hampshire Strategic Flood Partnership (BNHSFP)	29/7/14	Meeting	Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFA) particularly as regards to acting as SAB (SUDs approval body) Possibility of co-ordinated bylaws for riparian management.
Wokingham BC	1/8/14	Consult resp by RBWM	G and T issues
Hart DC	1/8/14	Consult resp by RBWM	Housing development and SA
Berkshire Heads of Planning/ Development Plans Group	14/8/14	Meeting	Discussion re joint SHMA, following decisions of Berkshire Leaders.
Bracknell For C	18/8/14	Consult resp by RBWM	Re: draft CIL schedule and obligations. No comment
Spelthorne BC, Runnymede BC	20/8/14	Meeting	Discussion of draft findings of Stage 1 SHMA and G and T issues. No substantive issues raised.
Bucks CC	1/9/14	Consult resp by RBWM	Parking guidance
S Oxon DC, Berks auths. (exc Slough BC)	2/9/14	Meeting	Update on status of all Berks plans. Discussion of Oxon SHMAs, infrastructure issues (full minute produced)
Berkshire Leaders Group (W Berks, Reading, Wokingham, Slough, Bracknell For)	22/9/14	Meeting (Mems)	General agreement to proceed with a joint SHMA. RBWM reluctant initially, but would await Wokingham decision.

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
Environment Agency	26/9/14	Corres.	Letter regarding RBWM Level 2 SFRA and sequential testing of sites. Concerns raised by EA regarding a number of site allocations, and clarifications and further descriptions requested. Deliverability is challenged with regard to safe egress for certain sites.
Bucks auths. (led by Wycombe BC)	29/9/14	Meeting	Methodology for HMA and FEMA study workshop
Hart DC Rushmoor DC Surrey Heath BC	1/10/14	Consult resp by RBWM	Joint ELR methodology – no objection
Runnymede BC, Spelthorne BC	15/10/14	Consult resp by RBWM	To joint Draft SHLAA methodology. General agreement with approach and results.
BNHSFP	24/10/14	Meeting	Sharing of progress and best practice in joint working to provide coordinated provision to manage flooding. Possibility of co-ordinated bylaws for riparian management.
Bracknell For BC	1/11/14	Consultation	FEMA definitions: methodology – comments submitted
Berks Leaders	17/11/14		
Berkshire auths. TVBLEP South Bucks DC	18/12/14	Meeting	Formal evaluation of SHMA tenders. Commissioning of consultants, identification of issues and policies
Spelthorne BC	1/1/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Regarding draft retail study
Surrey Heath BC	1/1/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Camberley SPD and Bagshot CA appraisal
Wycombe DC	1/1/15	Consult resp by RBWM	High Wycombe and reserve sites
NE, Bracknell For C	26/1/15	Meeting	Re SANG. Implications for planning permissions.
BNHSFP	29/1/15	Meeting	Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA, preparation of LFRMS on a district and catchment area basis.
Slough BC	1/2/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Local Plan (Reg 18) and Call for Sites
Berkshire Local Nature P'ship Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust Natural England	1/2/15	Meeting	Discussed approach to development near the SPA
Berkshire auths. TVBLEP	17/3/15	Meeting	Discussion of SHMA chapters
Bracknell For C	1/3/15	Consult resp by RBWM	FEMA definition draft report – comments submitted
Surrey Heath BC Rushmoor DC Hart DC	1/3/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Draft ELR – comments submitted

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
Slough BC	1/3/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Interim conclusions of retail study
Wycombe BC	30/3/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Re Central Bucks HELAA methodology. Several questions
Runnymede BC	2/4/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Re FEAA report. Methodology appears to follow national guidance
Bracknell For C	2/4/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Re FEA methodology. No objection
S Bucks DC	7/4/15	Corres. To Berks LPAs	Letter re 'best fit' geographies for HMA/FEMA delineation. S Bucks offer to co-operate with Berks but wants to reserve position.
Spelthorne BC	9/4/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Re DtC Scoping Statement and SCI. No comments on SCI. General agreement with Scoping State and issues raised.
BNHSFP	20/4/15	Meeting	Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA and preparation of LFRMS on a district and catchment area basis.
Elmbridge BC	21/4/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping of Issues and Bodies reaffirming TVHSPA and Lower Thames Scheme as common concerns.
Spelthorne BC	22/4/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. Issues agreed.
Bracknell For C	23/4/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Response on Berks FEA
Runnymede BC	23/4/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. Agreed issues.
South Bucks DC	24/4/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Re: S Bucks LP Reg 18 consultation. Generally no comment on specific topics; general request to continue to cooperate.
Historic England	24/4/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. Agreed as consultee.
Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust	27/4/15	Consult resp to RBWM	BBOWT keen to be involved in nature conservation and related issues in the BLP. Recommend contacting local nature partnership
Crossrail	27/4/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. No comment.
Highways England	27/4/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. HE appropriately listed for consultation.
Bracknell For BC	29/4/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. Detailed comments on housing, transport, FEA, environment, G and Ts, infra.
TBVLEP	30/4/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. Issues agreed. Acknowledged joint working in several areas
Wokingham BC	30/4/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. Issues agreed. Issues listed and acknowledged joint working.
Environment Agency	1/5/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. Add EA to Minerals and Waste policy section.
Natural England	1/5/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. Agreed issues.

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
Slough BC	1/5/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. Agreed list of issues.
Wycombe BC	1/5/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. Issues agreed. Add Green Belt and environ issues.
Runnymede BC	6/5/15	Consult resp by RBWM	DtC Scoping. Similar to RBWM scope so appropriate and correct.
South Bucks DC	11/5/15	Meeting	Cross boundary topics: -SHMA; ongoing, S Bucks engaged -Gs and Ts; common methodology -HELAA; common method. seen as beneficial -Green Belt etc. Shared methodologies with Bucks
S Bucks/Chiltern DCs	12/5/15	Consult resp to RBWM	DtC Scoping. Agreed issues. Need to be Core partner on G and Ts and natural environment.
Berkshire auths. TVBLEP Spelthorne BC Runnymede BC	15/5/15	Meeting	Discussion of SHMA chapters
Rushmoor BC, Hart DC, Surry Heath BC	18/5/15	Consult resp by RBHWM	To Joint ELR. General agreement and no objection raised.
Bracknell For BC	1/6/15	Correspond.	Invitation to attend workshop on landscape designations
Wokingham BC	1/6/15	Consult resp by RBWM	G and T issues
Berkshire auths TVBLEP	18/6/15	Meeting	Discussion of drafts of SHMA chapters
Woking BC	1/7/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Site allocations, SA and HRA - comments submitted
Technical Officers, Berks and Hants	17/7/15	Meeting	Discussion of common policy approach to catchment management for all Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFA) in Berkshire and Hampshire.
BNHSFP	27/7/15	Meeting	Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA and preparation of LFRMS on a district and catchment area basis.
Berkshire auths. TVBLREP	28/7/15	Meeting	Discussion of SHMA chapters
Slough BC S Bucks DC Chiltern DC TVBLEP Bucks Thames LEP	30/7/15	Meeting (with Mems)	LP Summit (W Berks auths. declined to attend): Principle of joint MoU between S Bucks and Berks auths. raised. Concerns over geographies and unmet need and lack of S Bucks support for an urban extn north of Slough.
Wycombe BC	14/8/15	Meeting	Strategic issues. Discussed SHMA and GB issues. Implications of S Bucks 'best fit' issue.
Berkshire auths. TVBLEP	10/9/15	Meeting	Discussion of SHMA chapters
Berkshire auths	15/9/15	Meeting (with Mems)	(SHMA Members Reference Group) - notes
Woking BC	1/10/15	Consul resp	DM policies – Reg 19

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
		by RBWM	
Bracknell For BC	1/10/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Parking Standards SPD. Scope of work on Local Plan, DtC framework
S Bucks DC	8/10/15	Consult resp. by RBWM	Regarding SHMA boundaries and 'best fit' issues. Consideration by S Bucks and Chiltern moving towards Bucks HMA. RBWM keen to see E Berks HMA remain
Berkshire auths.	12/10/15	Meeting (with Mems)	(SHMA Members Reference group) – notes. Project steering group for FEMA
Technical Officers	14/10/15	Meeting	Coordination of responses to applications between EA and LLFA re flooding issues
Reading BC	15/10/15	Consult resp by RBWM	DtC Scoping Paper. Issues appear appropriate.
Spelthorne BC, Runnymede BC	15/10/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Consult on SLAA method. Specific comments made. Agreed constraints.
BNHSFP	26/10/15	Meeting	Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA and preparation of LFRMS on a district and catchment area basis. Approach to managing risks arising across the catchment area, in particular in meeting costs.
Spelthorne BC	1/11/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Specification for Green Belt assessment
Wycombe BC	1/11/15	Consult resp by RBWM	Draft HEDNA and HEELA; no comment.
Thames Water, Environment Agency (EA)	1/11/15	Meeting	Agreed way forward for water supply; policy wording suggestions
Slough BC Chiltern/ S Bucks DC	3/11/15	Meeting	Slough, S Bucks, RBWM Reference Group. Topics: -initial meeting of Ref Grp for DtC to coincide with major milestones; RBWM to chair -update on Boro positions -discussion of SHMAs; new geography for Chiltern/S Bucks
Chiltern/S Bucks DCs, Slough BC,	18/12/15	Meeting	Officers meeting re housing need, delivery, FEMA and best fit geography, involvement of Mems.
Berkshire auths. Chiltern/S Bucks DCs	22/12/15	Meeting (with Mems)	DtC meeting chaired by RBWM. Topics: -HMA/FEMA boundary issue re Chiltern/S Bucks DCs now part of Bucks HMA -OAN and delivery discussed, constraints identified -HELAA methodology discussed (RBWM)
Chiltern/S Bucks DCs Slough BC	19/1/16	Meeting (with Mems)	DtC meeting chaired by Chiltern DC. Topics: -decision of Chiltern/S Bucks DCs to prepare a joint LP, Slough/RBWM regard geography as unchanged -key issue is accommodating unmet needs -implications of differing HMAs and geographies -disappointment expressed by Chiltern/S Bucks.
BNHSFP	26/2/16	Meeting	Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA and preparation of LFRMS on a

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
			district and catchment area basis.
Runnymede BC (host) Berks, Bucks, Surrey auths and prescribed bodies	22/4/16	DtC Workshop meeting	Comprehensive agenda. Full minute taken. Covered Green Belt, housing, G and Ts, economic development, flooding, Thames Valley Heaths SPA. Submission by Runnymede BC in Mar 2017.
Runnymede BC	2/6/16	Telecon	DtC Topics: -employ: common concerns re NLP study results credibility, need to engage with Heathrow -SPA: needed for RBWM proposals, ongoing issue -G and T: G and Ts, SFRA
Berkshire auths. TVBLEP Chiltern/S Bucks DCs Wycombe DC	29/6/16	Meeting (with Mems)	DtC meeting chaired by RBWM. Topics: -Edge of Settlement Study results re Green Belt study, consistency issues raised -presentation of draft BLP revision, significant comment from neighbouring auths. re evidence. LPAs do not want to object but concerns raised -RBWM presently satisfying 66% of OAN, LPAs sought further info sharing -issues raised re employment figures, infrastructure, unmet needs, methodologies, possible impact on timetable for submission -BCs/DCs updated LP progress.
Natural England (NE)	1/7/16	Consult resp to RBWM	Insufficient detail in draft BLP regarding SANG, leading to potential objection.
EA Crossrail Thames Water TVBLEP	4/7/16	Meeting	DtC meeting chaired by RBWM. Topics: -presentation of draft BLP revision draft; with allocated sites, employment figures, Green Belt issues and infrastructure.
Berkshire auths. Chiltern/S Bucks DCs Wycombe DC TVB LEP	14/7/16	Meeting	DtC meeting chaired by RBWM. Topics: -technical issues regarding housing, employment, Green Belt, infrastructure issues, unmet need in BLP arising from meeting of 29/6/16 -legal advice being sought -timetable issues.
Bracknell For BC West Berks C Wokingham BC Reading BC	18/7/16	Letter	Joint letter from HoP requesting further time prior to BLP submission; several issues raised
Bracknell For BC	19/7/16	Meeting	Discussion of anticipated outcomes from further discussions re DtC
Natural England	20/7/16	Meeting	General status discussion with regard to SPA and amendments to BLP Policy 52 suggested.
Berks HoP	21/7/16	Meeting	DtC issues discussed. Need to clarify how policy decisions are made. HoP meetings relevant
Highways England	26/7/16	Meeting	
Chiltern/S Bucks DCs	27/7/16	Corres.	Letter raising 'best fit' issue and HMA geographies etc and stating S Bucks position.

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
Wycombe DC	27/7/16	Meeting (with Mems)	Presentation of draft Local Plan. Identified joint transport issues and no call on RBWM for housing needs. (Slides)
BNHSFP	27/7/16	Meeting	Sharing of progress with schemes and best practice in the role of LLFA and preparation of LFRMS on a district and catchment area basis.
Environment Agency	29/7/16	Consult resp to RBWM	Detailed letter response to draft BLP (Jun 2016) indicating that EA finds the BLP unsound on several grounds.
Thames Water	27/7/16	Consult resp to RBWM	Detailed response to site allocations in the BLP
Berkshire authorities	9/8/16	Meeting	DtC meeting chaired by RBWM. Topics: -housing numbers; several LPAs challenged RBWM position. S Bucks not co-operating in Berks HMA, looking to Bucks (Aylesbury Vale mainly) -Green Belt, -spatial distribution
Slough BC Chiltern/S Bucks DCs TVBLEP	21/9/16	Meeting	DtC meeting chaired by LEP. Topics: -evidence base from HMA/FEMA studies; geographies discussed. Chiltern/S Bucks view that HMAs unsound -initial discussion on draft MoU template -each BC updated progress
Slough BC Chiltern/S Bucks DCs TVBLEP	10/11/16	Meeting	DtC meeting chaired by LEP. Topics: -HMA geography; draft DtC position statement produced by LEP for Berks auths. -EDNA results imminent -MoUs agreed as way forward -each BC updated progress
Runnymede BC	6/12/16	Meeting	Officer session; agreement on MoU schedules and drafting
W Berks C	19/12/16	Corres from WBC Leader	Welcoming 100% OAN and promising response to draft BLP. Not seeking Mem meeting.
S Bucks/Chiltern DC	21/12/16	Meeting	Officer session; discussion on MoU schedules and topics
Surrey Heath BC	22/12/16	Meeting	Officer session; SHBC not interested in MoU. Exchange of letters. Agreed minute issued identifying specific issues of concern to both authorities (02.02.17)
Runnymede BC	23/1/17	Consult resp by RBWM	No response
Wycombe DC	13/2/17	Meeting (Mems)	Signature of Memorandum of Understanding between the two Councils (Cllrs Wilson/Johncock). Covering housing, employment, Green Belt, transport, flooding issues.
Bracknell Forest C	21/2/17	Consult resp by RBWM	Consultation on Bracknell Forest Council Level 1 SFRA methodology statement. No comment.
Spelthorne BC	22/2/17	Meeting	Draft MoU tabled and discussed...
Slough BC	27/2/17	Consult resp by RBWM	Response to Slough BC Local Plan: Issues and Options (Regulation 18) Consultation. Noted unmet need and inclusion of RBWM sites.
Slough BC	28/2/17	Meeting	Draft MoU tabled and discussed...

Organisation	Date	Type of engagement	Purpose/topic/outcome of engagement
W Berks auths.	6/3/17	Corres.	Draft MoU circulated for comment.
W Berks C	15/3/17	Consult resp by RBWM	DtC approach on emerging West Berkshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. RBWM participating in joint M and W Plan; commissioned from Hants CC.
Bracknell Forest C	7/4/17	Consult resp by RBWM	Green Infrastructure Review (non statutory)
Bracknell Forest C	18/4/17	Consult resp by RBWM	Bracknell Forest Council Water Cycle Study Scoping
Surrey Heath BC	3/5/17	Consult resp by RBWM	Residential Design Guide SPD and Statement of Community Involvement. No comment.
Reading BC	3/5/17	Consult request to RBWM	Draft Local Plan. Response in preparation.

Appendix 2: Memoranda of understanding

Memoranda of understanding have been concluded with neighbouring authorities as follows:

- Wycombe District Council

Memorandum of Understanding between the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) and Wycombe District Council (WDC) on Strategic Planning and the "Duty to Co-operate" on Planning Matters.

The Localism Act 2011 brings significant changes to strategic planning in England. Strategic planning remains an essential part of the planning system. The Act provides for a bottom up approach to strategic planning in a local area through the "duty to co-operate "

The Act sets out that a local planning authority has a duty to co-operate by:

"engaging constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of development plan and other documents and in activities that can reasonably be considered to prepare the way for the preparation of such documents for strategic matters."

The requirements of the Localism Act are complemented by the guidance in paragraphs 178-181 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), although these are additional to those within the Act. The NPPF includes reference to local authorities considering agreements on joint approaches to the undertaking of activities and to considering whether to agree to prepare joint local development documents. The duty involves a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation. It should result in meeting development requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities, where it is practical to do so. Authorities should also consider producing plans or policies prepared as part of a joint committee, a memorandum of understanding or a jointly prepared strategy which is presented as evidence of an agreed position.

The Duty to Co-operate has become the first matter that is tested at a local plan examination. Failure to co-operate will result in delay and increased costs in bringing forward up to date local plans thereby increasing the risks at planning appeals.

In the light of the Duty to Co-operate, the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) and Wycombe District Council (WDC) have agreed this Memorandum of Understanding to identify areas and topics of common strategic concern.

The Memorandum of Understanding builds on long established joint working between local authorities and acknowledges where issues cannot be resolved by local authorities acting alone. The following schedules identify the current position between the authorities, and also where further cooperation will be undertaken to seek resolution of outstanding matters.

Schedule A: Housing Market Areas and Functional Market Areas

RBWM

1. RBWM's position is that functionally the whole of the Royal Borough lies within the Berkshire,

and specifically the East Berkshire Housing Market Area and Functional Economic Market Areas. This is based on joint studies that have defined functional areas and applied a best fit to these market areas based on plan making areas. These studies have been widely shared, including with WDC.

WDC

2. WDC's position is that functionally the whole of Wycombe District lies within the Buckinghamshire Housing Market Area and Functional Economic Market Areas. This is based on joint studies that have defined functional areas and applied a best fit to these market areas based on plan making areas. These studies have been widely shared, including with RBWM.

Agreement

It is agreed that Wycombe District and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead lie in separate but adjoining Housing Market Areas and Functional Economic Market Areas.

Schedule B: Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN)

RBWM

1. RBWM's position is that projections have been prepared jointly on a sub-regional basis, to provide a robust evidence base of the requirements for new housing for the period 2013-33 and forecasts undertaken to provide a robust evidence base of the requirements for employment for the period 2013-33. These studies have been commissioned jointly by the Berkshire local authorities to cover the former Berkshire county housing market area and functional economic market area and have been widely shared, including with WDC.
2. In relation to housing, the latest evidence indicates that RBWM's OAN is 14, 298 dwellings in the plan period to 2033.
3. In relation to employment, WDC's position is that the need is 43,320 square metres of employment floorspace, and up to 9,550 square metres of additional retail floor space in the plan period to 2033.

WDC

4. WDC's position is that projections have been prepared jointly on a sub-regional basis, to provide a robust evidence base of the requirements for new housing for the period 2013-33 and forecasts undertaken to provide a robust evidence base

of the requirements for employment for the period 2013-33. These studies have been commissioned jointly by the Buckinghamshire district councils to cover the Buckinghamshire housing market area and functional economic market area and have been widely shared, including with RBWM.

5. In relation to housing, the latest evidence indicates that WDC's OAN is 12,900 dwellings (2013-33)
6. In relation to employment, WDC's position is that the need is 54,000 sq metres of business floorspace, split between 68,000 sq metres of B1a/b use classes, 34,000 sq metres of B8 (201333) and minus 48,000 sq metres of B1c/B2. Forecasts for additional retail floorspace are currently being updated.

Agreement

RBWM and WDC will keep each other informed of any changes to their respective OANs for housing and employment.

Schedule C: Unmet Housing Need

RBWM

1. RBWM's position is that the Borough Local Plan will allocate sites to satisfy 100% of the Borough's OAN for housing.

WDC

2. WDC's position is that through discussions with the other authorities in their HMA and FEMA (Aylesbury Vale District Council, Chiltern District Council and South Bucks District Council) there is a Duty to Co-operate Agreement that in principle agrees that the unmet needs of the constrained south of the County will be planned for in the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan. As of 8th December 2016, WDC has a more detailed agreement that the identified unmet housing needs in Wycombe District of 1,700 dwellings will be accommodated in Aylesbury Vale district. As such, WDC is not seeking any of its unmet housing needs to be met in RBWM's emerging Local Plan, but will need to keep this under review

Agreement

That neither authority is requesting the other authority to accommodate unmet housing needs.

Schedule D: Unmet Need for Employment and Retail Space

RBWM

1. RBWM's position is that the Borough Local Plan will allocate sites to satisfy 100% of the Borough's OAN for employment and retail floorspace.

WDC

2. WDC's position is that it is likely to have some unmet need in relation to employment and retail floorspace provision and is exploring how this might be addressed within the Buckinghamshire Functional Economic Market Area.

Agreement

The authorities will inform each other of the amount of any unmet need in employment and retail floor space required in the plan period, and will explore jointly how this need may be met, initially seeking to accommodate it within their respective functional economic market area.

Schedule E: Green Belt

RBWM

1. RBWM has prepared an Edge of Settlement Study, in two parts, which provides criteria for the categorisation of potential development sites in terms of their contribution to the objectives of the Green Belt. This study is a key element of the evidence base for the selection of sites for allocation in the Borough Local Plan (BLP).

WDC

2. WDC's position is that it has undertaken a Green Belt review in two stages. The first part was a Bucks-wide assessment undertaken by Arup and commissioned by the four Bucks districts including WDC, and Bucks County Council. The second part took forward recommendations from the Part 1 assessment and other potential options.

Agreement

Whilst there may be differences in the detailed approach to the respective Green Belt reviews, the authorities do not dispute the findings of each other's Green Belt review.

Schedule F: Provision for Travellers

RBWM

1. RBWM is in the process of commissioning a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment prior to the preparation of a Gypsy and Travellers Local Plan which will follow adoption of the Borough Local Plan and take account of the recent Government changes in definitions. RBWM expects to accommodate its needs for travellers within the Royal Borough.

WDC

2. WDC's position is that it has jointly undertaken an assessment of the needs of travellers with the other Buckinghamshire districts. This has recently been updated to take account of the national changes in the definitions of travellers. WDC has consulted on different approaches and sites to meet this need. WDC expects to accommodate its needs for travellers within Wycombe District.

Agreement

That neither authority is requesting the other authority to accommodate unmet needs for travellers.

Schedule G: Strategic Transport Issues

RBWM

1. RBWM has commissioned new transport modelling which will assess the impact of planned development to 2033. The outputs of this exercise will identify where further investment may be necessary to alleviate the detrimental effects of proposed development location within the plan period.
2. RBWM is aware of concerns relating to the A404 and Bisham Junction and will cooperate with WDC and other appropriate agencies to seek improvements.
3. RBWM will continue to pursue improvements to the Maidenhead to Marlow line via Bourne End.

WDC

4. WDC's position is that it has undertaken and published transport modelling assessments of the impact of potential growth in Wycombe District and that further work is being undertaken

prior to the publication of the Local Plan including identification of appropriate mitigation work. This includes provision in relation to potential housing growth at Bourne End.

5. WDC, Bucks County Council and the Bucks Thames Valley Local Economic Partnership have submitted a funding bid to Highways England for improvements to access to Globe Park Business Park at Marlow. This includes improvements to the Westhorpe Junction which could assist with improving flows on the A404 itself.
6. WDC wishes to see improvements to the Bisham Junction on the A404, both to assist with improving flows on the A404 and to reduce the relative attractiveness of Cookham Bridge which is used as an alternative. WDC understands that Bisham is a Highways England rather than RBWM responsibility.
7. WDC wishes to improve rail connections to the Thames Valley by investigating the scope to reopen the former High Wycombe to Bourne End railway line for rail use, thereby closing the strategic rail gap between the Thames Valley and the south east Midlands — ie to connect to both the Elizabeth Line and East West Rail.

Agreement

RBWM and WDC agree to cooperate on matters concerning strategic transport networks which affect both local authorities and to consult on policies and proposals that affect the strategic network or which have cross boundary impacts. Working with Highways England, Bucks County Council and relevant rail companies, this will include seeking longer term strategic solutions to address:

- a. Congestion issues on the A404 including at the Bisham roundabout
- b. Congestion related to Cookham Bridge
- c. Rail connectivity between High Wycombe, Bourne End and the Thames valley.

Schedule H: Flooding

RBWM

1. RBWM has commissioned Level 1 and 2 assessments from consultants WSP, and these are being finalised on the basis of sites allocated in the draft Borough Local Plan. Any relevant implications of these studies will be shared fully with WDC.

WDC

2. WDC's position is that it has undertaken a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SERA) and is currently undertaking a Level 2 assessment which includes modelling to take account of the latest climate change allowances.

Agreement

RBWM and WDC agree to cooperate on matters concerning strategic flooding issues which affect both local authorities and to consult on policies and proposals that affect significant flooding risk or which have cross boundary impacts.

This Memorandum of Understanding provides a framework for joint working between RBWM and WDC. It allows refined Agreements to be agreed between individual authorities/infrastructure providers on specific areas where they consider it appropriate.

Signed:

Derek Wilson

Derek Wilson

Cabinet Member for Planning

Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Signed:



David Johncock

Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability

Wycombe District Council

13th February 2017