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1. Introduction

1.1 As part of a local authority’s Local Plan preparation the Government requires constructive and active engagement with relevant bodies, as part of an on-going process, to maximise effective working on the preparation of Plans in relation to strategic matters.

1.2 Strategic matters are by definition larger than local issues and therefore extend beyond administrative boundaries, the Government’s ‘duty to cooperate’ is considered to be the mechanism by which strategic planning takes place and strategic issues are taken into account at the local level.

1.3 The publication of the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012); National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (published March 2014) emphasise the importance of the duty. The NPPG includes detailed advice on the Duty¹. In particular, the following key messages are emerging:

- The duty is not a process driven ‘tick box’ exercise. Instead, local planning authorities should focus on the outcomes and maximising the effectiveness of their plans.
- The duty extends to the preparation of all evidence base documents which support the Local Plan – not just the plan itself.
- Consultation alone is not sufficient and a lack of response to a statutory consultation should not automatically be taken as another local authority or prescribed body agreeing that there are no strategic matters or that they have been sufficiently addressed.
- The duty is a legal requirement throughout the Local Plan preparation process. Once submitted to the Secretary of State the preparation of the plan formally stops. The duty cannot be applied retrospectively.
- The requirement for constructive and effective engagement also applies beyond the process of preparing a Local Plan e.g. the requirement for monitoring and continued joint working should be identified and implemented.
- Having an adopted Local Plan is not sufficient justification for a local authority to refuse to work with and engage constructively with another local authority. Particularly, where there is evidence to suggest that a strategic matter exists.

1.5 In practice a Local Plan Planning Inspector in a recent letter to a District Council² on the matter of the duty to cooperate itemised the following elements as being essential:

- Has engagement been constructive?
- Has engagement been active?
- Has engagement been ongoing?
- Has engagement been collaborative?
- Has engagement been diligent?
- Has engagement been of mutual benefit (the broad outcomes)?

1.6 In complying with the duty to cooperate, Government Guidance recommends that local planning authorities ‘scope’ the strategic matters of the Local Plan document at the beginning of the preparation process taking account of the ‘functional geography’ of the specific matter and identify those local authorities and prescribed bodies that need to be engaged. Guidance also recommends that consideration is given to preparing joint-evidence base documents, Local Development Documents and aligning the examination of Local Plan documents.


² Letter from Inspector to Mid-Sussex District Council dated 2nd December 2013.
2. **The Purpose of this Statement**

2.1 As recommended by Government Guidance, the Council has prepared this Scoping Framework as part of the background work required to prepare the Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (Review of Core Strategy) and the Travellers Site Allocations Document. It has been produced to assist the Council in meeting its duty to cooperate and ensure that the effectiveness of its planning policies are maximised.

2.2 The Scoping Statement serves four key functions:

- It ensures that the Council, from the outset of its plan preparation, has formally identified what it considers to be the strategic matters that could have a significant impact on two or more planning areas. This includes the identification of those authorities and prescribed bodies that the Council will need to engage and work with to seek to address the matter and how and when (in broad terms) it intends to do this.
- It provides the opportunity for other local authorities and prescribed bodies to highlight strategic matters that they consider relevant to the preparation of the Local Plan which Tandridge has not identified. This includes whether amendments need to be made to the list of local authorities and prescribed bodies that the Council intends to engage with on each strategic matter, and how and when it intends to do this.
- It will form the framework for an agreed approach and commitment from Tandridge District Council in how it will discharge its duty to cooperate on strategic matters and issues as far as they relate to the preparation of Local Plan documents.
- It identifies the issues that each local authority and/or prescribed body needs to consider and respond to when consulting on Local Plan documents. This should make best use of future resource requirements for all local authorities and prescribed bodies throughout the preparation of the Local Plan.

2.3 This Scoping Statement should be regarded as a ‘living document’ that may require updating as new issues arise or different bodies need to be involved in discussions. This initial version was adopted by the Council at the Planning Policy Committee meeting on 11th December 2014.

3. **Consultation Arrangements**

3.1 To ensure that the Council is taking the correct approach to meeting its duty to cooperate throughout the preparation of the Local Plan, comments on this Scoping Statement were invited from other Local Planning Authorities and other relevant bodies. To ensure a good response was received consultees were reminded of the Consultation on 1st and 7th October 2014, before and after the closing date of 6th October.

3.2 There were some specific questions relating to the strategic matters in the consultation draft the document, which asked: “The council would welcome views on whether there are likely to be any strategic or strategic cross boundary issues related to xxxxxxx and whether the above list of key matters (para. x.xx) in relation to xxxxxxx are the correct ones? Have the correct bodies for engagement been identified? Are the proposed methods for engagement the most appropriate? Also the following general questions were posed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has the Council correctly identified the strategic matters and those which could have a significant impact on at least two planning areas as part of the preparation of its Local Plan documents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the Council correctly identified the relevant authorities, prescribed bodies and other consultees that it needs to proactively engage and work with to maximise the effectiveness of its planning policies in regards to each strategic matter?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Where there are existing processes in place to consider/address strategic matters and those which could have a significant impact, are these sufficient?

4. Do you support the Council’s intended approach and broad timescales for engaging with the identified local authorities, prescribed bodies, and other consultees?

3.3 Responses were received from the following:

**Local Planning Authorities:**
- London Borough of Merton
- London Borough of Wandsworth
- London Borough of Sutton
- London Borough of Croydon
- London Borough of Bromley
- Reigate & Banstead BC
- Sevenoaks DC
- Horsham DC
- Wealden DC
- Crawley BC
- Mid-Sussex DC
- Elmbridge BC
- Epsom & Ewell BC
- Guildford BC
- Runnymede BC
- Spelthorne BC
- Surrey Heath BC
- Waverley DC
- Woking BC

**Other Bodies:**
- Civil Aviation Authority – Aerodrome Standards
- NHS England (Surrey & Sussex)
- East Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group
- Surrey County Council Public Health Team
- Highways Agency
- Environment Agency
- Natural England
- Southern Water
- Thames Water
- Surrey County Council
- West Sussex County Council
- East Sussex County Council
- Surrey Wildlife Trust (For Surrey Nature Partnership)
- Mobile Operators Association (Mono Consultants)
- Coast to Capital (LEP)

The responses made by the above Councils and bodies are set out in a separate Appendix together with the Council’s comments. The Scoping Statement has been amended where necessary to take into account the responses.
Despite two reminders responses were not received from:

- Mayor of London
- Transport for London
- London Borough of Kingston
- London Borough of Lambeth
- London Borough of Lewisham
- London Borough of Southwark
- South London Partnership
- Kent County Council
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Sport England
- English Heritage
- Office of Rail Regulator
- Network Rail
- Southern Railway
- Metrobus
- Medway Internal Drainage Board
- Sutton & East Surrey Water PLC
- Surrey Police
- South East Coast Ambulance Service
- National Grid (via Entec)
- Scotia Gas Networks (via Quod)
- West Sussex 5 Communities (representing CCGs in West Sussex)

3.4 Whilst it is regrettable that some of the key consultees, such as the Mayor of London did not respond to the consultation the District Council will continue to seek engagement under the Duty to Cooperate throughout the Local Plan process. It should also be noted that all bodies will be consulted in the normal course of events as part of the Local Plan preparation process.

4. Legislative Framework & National Guidance

4.1 Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 makes a number of amendments to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the effect of which is to place a legal duty on local planning authorities to co-operate with one another; county councils and other prescribed bodies to maximise the effectiveness within which certain activities are undertaken as far as they relate to a ‘strategic matter’.

4.2 Paragraph 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (as amended) states that ‘certain activities’ include:

- the preparation of development plan documents;
- the preparation of other local development documents; and
- activities that can reasonably be considered to prepare the way for the preparation of the above two points.

4.3 For the purpose of the Government’s duty to cooperate, ‘strategic matters’ relate to sustainable development or the use of land that has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas, including (in particular) sustainable development or use of land for or in connection with infrastructure that is strategic and has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas. Strategic matters also include sustainable development or use of land in a two-tier area if the development or use is a county matter.
e.g. minerals, waste, education, or has or would have a significant impact on a county matter.

4.4 The duty imposed on local planning authorities requires the Council to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in any process by means of which the activities listed above are undertaken. The engagement required by local authorities will vary depending on the nature of the issues being addressed. These can range from consulting on an issue through to the development of a joint local development document.

4.5 Further Government guidance on the duty to cooperate is set out in paragraphs 178 to 181 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012). Paragraph 178 states:

“Public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to the strategic priorities set out in paragraph 156. The Government expects joint working on areas of common interest to be diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities”.

4.6 Strategic priorities which local planning authorities should seek to deliver as part of the Local Plan are:

- homes and jobs needed in the area;
- the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
- the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);
- the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and
- climate change mitigation and adaption, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.

4.7 As part of the examination process of a plan, local planning authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts. This could be by way of 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.

4.8 Failure to meet the duty to cooperate will:

- lead to less sustainable development and/or plans being found ‘unsound’;
- reduce the ability to deliver infrastructure and inward investment; and
- undermine confidence in the ability of councils to deliver growth and development.

4.9 The duty to cooperate is the first thing that the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) will look at during the examination of the Local Plans. They will need to see sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the duty has been undertaken appropriately for the plan being examined. The evidence presented should be:

- succinct;
- flow from the issues that have been addressed jointly; and
- highlight the practical policy outcomes that have resulted.

4.10 Local authorities will need to show how the duty is being taken forward on an on-going basis through the Authority’s Monitoring Report (AMR).

5. The Planning Policy Context Tandridge District

5.1 Tandridge District is the eastern most District in Surrey and adjoins several other Districts, Boroughs and Counties. It adjoins London to the north, Kent to the east, East Sussex and West Sussex to the south, as well as other parts of Surrey to the west.
5.2 The District covers has a population of 83,000 residents, the majority of whom live in the built up areas of Caterham, Whyteleafe and Warlingham north of the M25 and Oxted/Limpfield/Hurst Green south of the M25. There are also a number of villages of varying size in the rural areas.

5.3 94% of the District is currently designated as Green Belt (this includes many of the villages). There are two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the Surrey Hills in the north which extends from the east boundary where it adjoins the Kent Downs AONB to the west where the Surrey Hills AONB continues across the county. The High Weald AONB covers the most south easterly part of the District. The High Weald then continues into Kent, West Sussex and East Sussex.

5.4 The District is highly accessible with good train services to London and the M25 (with Junction 6 at Godstone) and M23 motorways crossing the area. Commuting to London for work is a significant feature of the economy.

5.5 Tandridge is the middle tier of a three tier Local Government system, with Surrey County Council (SCC) providing education, highways and social services. SCC is also the minerals and waste planning authority. The whole of Tandridge is parished, with Parish Councils providing some local services and representing the community at the local level.

The Tandridge Local Plan

5.6 The Council’s Core Strategy was adopted in 2008 and provides the strategic policies and spatial plan for the District up until 2026. However it was adopted prior to the introduction of the NPPF. Flowing from the Core Strategy is the ‘Local Plan Part 2 - Detailed Policies’ which was adopted by the Council on 24th July 2014; the 2001 Local Plan saved policies were superseded.

5.7 The Council has resolved to commence a review of the Core Strategy (to be known as the Local Plan Part 1). The decision to review the Core Strategy is because of the requirements of the NPPF to have an up to date plan and in view of an initial study Locally-Generated Housing Needs (GL Hearn 2013) which, whilst not determining a final level of need provided sufficient evidence to justify commencing the review.

5.8 The Council has set out a programme for the Core Strategy Review in a revised Local Development Scheme which sets out the key areas of work:

Key areas:
The key areas of work required to produce a new Local Plan are:

Step 1a
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment (including public consultation on methodology) and assessment of need for affordable housing.

Step 1b
- Economic Assessment.

Step 2a
- Review of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (including call for new sites – this could include Green Belt sites being proposed by land owners, but these would be treated as being undeliverable in policy terms subject to the outcome of Step 4).

Step 2b
- Strategic Employment Land Availability Assessment/Employment Land Review.
Step 3
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- Updated Community Infrastructure Levy.

Step 4 (if justified by steps 1a and 2a)
- Assessment of Green Belt.
- Landscape Character Appraisal.
- Call for sites outside built up area boundary.
- Sustainability appraisal of broad locations.
- Potential detailed site allocations/reserve sites assessments.

Other issues
- Retail needs study.
- Green Infrastructure study and plan/Recreation and Sport Issues.
- Heritage Strategy (may follow Local Plan Part 1).

Viability testing
- To ensure plan is deliverable.
- To ensure affordable housing policy does not result in development being unviable.

Travellers Site Allocations
5.9 In addition to the above the Council has commenced work on a Traveller site allocations document. In 2013 the Council prepared a Traveller Accommodation Assessment which found that there is a need for 63 Gypsy and Traveller Pitches and 26 Travelling Showmen’s Pitches between 2013-2028. In early 2014 the Council has carried out a ‘call for sites’ by writing to landowners, developers, agents, consultants and Parish Councils to try to identify suitable land, however there has been a very limited response to this. The Council needs to consider how it can find additional sites so it can move to the next step of undertaking a sustainability appraisal of sites prior to preparing a site allocations document to try to meet the identified need.

Defining Tandridge’s Duty to Cooperate Bodies
6.1 In order to maximise the effectiveness of its plan making, the Localism Act 2011 places a duty on the Council to co-operate with other Local Planning Authorities on cross-boundary strategic planning issues that could significantly impact on both their planning areas. Examples, from other local authorities are that the duty has been interpreted to mean that all neighbouring boroughs and districts that share a border should be engaged with as part of each consultation stage. In the case of Tandridge this would result in the Council engaging with:
- London Borough of Croydon
- London Borough of Bromley
- Sevenoaks District Council
- Wealden District Council
- Mid-Sussex District Council
- Crawley Borough Council
- Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
- Mayor for London/Greater London Authority
6.2 Whilst the NPPF states that public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, this does not necessarily mean that only those local authorities listed above should be engaged. By only engaging with adjoining authorities the Council runs the risk of not addressing certain cross-boundary strategic issues which impact on authorities wider than those simply adjoining the borough’s boundary. For example, flooding; flood risk and; housing market areas are cross-boundary issues which impact on local authorities far wider than those adjoining authorities. In addition, just because a local authority neighbours the borough boundary does not mean that they automatically share a strategic issue with Tandridge.

6.3 In the process of ensuring that the Council proactively engages and works with the appropriate local authorities, each of the initially identified strategic planning issues has been noted in Section 7 of this statement.

6.4 As part of its plan-making preparation and the duty to cooperate, the Council is also required to cooperate with a list of bodies which has been prescribed by the Government\(^3\). They comprise:

- Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs)\(^4\)
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- Highway Authorities
- Highways Agency
- Integrated Transport Authorities (there is no ITA covering Tandridge)
- Marine Management Organisation (not relevant to Tandridge)
- Natural England
- The Civil Aviation Authority
- The Homes and Communities Agency
- The Mayor of London
- The National Health Service Commissioning Board (NHS England)
- The Office of the Rail Regulator
- Transport for London

6.5 In addition to those planning authorities and prescribed bodies listed above, the Council is required to proactively engage with other partnerships as part of the preparation of the Tandridge Local Plan. These include:

- Local Enterprise Partnership – Coast to Capital.

6.6 As with the neighbouring and other local authorities, the Council only intends to proactively engage and work with those prescribed bodies and partnerships where their organisations remit covers particular strategic matters. As the Council prepares its Local Plan it may be the case that additional local authorities and/or prescribed bodies need to be engaged with as a strategic matter emerges and in response to the consultation on this Scoping Statement. The list of local authorities/bodies and mechanisms for engagement will therefore be subject to regular review. It may be that some bodies not specifically noted for contact under the

\(^3\) Regulation 4 of Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

\(^4\) Established under Section 14D of the National Health Service Act 2006.

\(^5\) Local Enterprise Partnerships and Local Nature Partnerships are not subject to the requirements of the duty. But local planning authorities and the public bodies that are subject to the duty must cooperate with Local Enterprise Partnerships and Local Nature Partnerships and have regard to their activities when they are preparing their Local Plans, so long as those activities are relevant to local plan making.
Duty to Cooperate will still receive consultations on the Local Plan as part of more widespread consultation activity.

**Existing Mechanisms**

6.7 The Council has a strong history of engagement and partnership working with other authorities, stakeholders and public bodies. It is presently involved with several working groups and partnerships, some of which were established before the formal duty to cooperate came into existence through the Localism Act 2011.

6.8 Partnership working and co-operation on key issues is embedded in the way plans are prepared by Tandridge and across Surrey. There are a range of strategic partnerships and working groups in operation that provide the necessary forums for discussion on strategic matters and issues of duty to cooperate. These include:

- East Surrey Local Plan Working Group (Elmbridge, Epsom & Ewell, Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead, Tandridge).
- Surrey Planning Working Group (PWG).
- The Surrey Planning Officers Association (SPOA).
- Transport for Surrey.
- Gatwick Diamond.

Some of the existing mechanisms exist primarily for information sharing rather than for discussing and resolving strategic cross boundary issues and therefore it may not be possible to rely on these to meet the Duty to Cooperate. However they may be useful to alert participants to emerging issues.

6.9 Particular mention should be made of the Gatwick Diamond. The Gatwick Diamond Initiative set up in 2003 and now a well established public/private partnership, has provided a forum within which the local authorities could debate the strategic issues which link their communities together. The Gatwick Diamond does not have any formal boundaries but is broadly defined by a diamond-shaped area stretching between London and Brighton and extending west to Horsham and east to East Grinstead. It includes parts of two counties (West Sussex and Surrey), incorporating the Boroughs of Crawley and Reigate and Banstead. Epsom & Ewell and large parts of Horsham, Mid Sussex, Mole Valley and Tandridge Districts.
6.10 Tandridge has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with other Gatwick Diamond Authorities. The memorandum of understanding establishes a framework for co-operation between the eight 'Gatwick Diamond' local authorities with respect to strategic planning and development issues. It was framed within the context of the Localism Bill (as it was at that time) and the duty to cooperate. It sets out the way in which the authorities will consult one another and work together on matters which affect more than one local authority area.

6.11 The Memorandum has been agreed by the following Councils:

- Surrey County Council
- West Sussex County Council
- Crawley Borough Council
- Horsham District Council
- Mid Sussex District Council
- Mole Valley District Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Tandridge District Council

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council is now part of the Gatwick Diamond.

6.12 The Memorandum has the following broad objectives:

- To help secure a broad but consistent approach to strategic planning and development issues across the Gatwick Diamond.
- To enable a sharing of information and views and, where appropriate, to facilitate joint working on strategic issues which affect more than one local authority area.
- To ensure that the local planning and development policies prepared by each local authority are, where appropriate, informed by the views of other local authorities within the Gatwick Diamond area.
- To ensure that decisions on major planning applications which have effects across more than one local authority area are informed by the views of other local authorities within the Gatwick Diamond area.

6.13 The Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities will jointly:

- Prepare, maintain and update a Local Strategic Statement (LSS) which provides a broad strategic direction for the Gatwick Diamond and establishes areas for inter-authority cooperation on strategic issues.
- Develop and implement a programme for jointly addressing strategic planning and development issues
- Maintain liaison with the Local Enterprise Partnership(s) on the work they are undertaking.

The Gatwick Diamond authorities are currently considering if the LSS should be reviewed and updated or indeed whether it should continue in its present form.

Joint working has resulted in the production of a number of topic papers which have been presented to Members and helped ensure all the partners are aware of the issues facing one another.

6.14 The map over the page shows the Coast to Capital LEP area and other partnerships:
New Mechanisms

6.15 In some instances it may be acceptable to continue to discuss strategic matters through existing mechanisms. However, it is accepted that other mechanisms will need to be established and new local authorities, prescribed bodies and other organisations will need to be proactively engaged based on the functional geography of the strategic matter. The mechanisms the Council proposed to employ are set out in section 7 of this Scoping Statement.

6.16 Recently authorities in Surrey have recognised the need for joint working across the County because of the Duty to Cooperate. The authorities have agreed to prepare a Strategic Planning and Investment Framework (SPIF) for Surrey that will:

- Integrate strategic spatial, economic and infrastructure priorities for Surrey with a clear set of (agreed) objectives for delivering 'sustainable' prosperity in Surrey. This should build on the priorities in Surrey Future, the Strategic Economic Plans and local plans.
- Provide a positive voice for Surrey, setting out its case for investment and why it is important to the national economy.
- Help to align business/investment priorities of other key bodies, e.g. Environment Agency, Highways Agency and utility companies.
- Provide evidence that the Local Authorities are working ‘constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis’ on strategic planning matters to support compliance with the duty to cooperate and deliver ‘sound’ plans.
- Be ‘spatially specific’ where there is a strategic focus, including any overlaps with adjoining areas.
- Provides a basis for working collaboratively with the GLA/Mayor on the long term growth of London, particularly in relation to the next full review of the London Plan and the Mayor’s Long Term Infrastructure Plan.

This work is at an early stage, however it is hoped that this mechanism may eventually lead to a Local Strategic Statement dealing with strategic planning issues across Surrey.
7. Strategic Matters & Cross Boundary Implications

7.1 Satisfying the duty-to-cooperate when preparing the Local Plan requires the identification of strategic matters with possible cross-boundary implications that may arise during its preparation. This includes issues which may occur during ‘associated activities’ such as the preparation of evidence base documents.

7.2 This Scoping Statement identifies a number of potential strategic matters with possible cross-boundary implications which are likely to need addressing as part of the preparation of the Local Plan. These have been identified below, categorised under the strategic priorities identified in paragraph 156 of the NPPF. At this stage in the Plan process (pre-evidence gathering) it is only practical to identify the broad strategic matters that will arise or be likely to arise during the plan preparation. Therefore at this time limited detail can be provided, and in some cases the details will only be included as the issues are identified by the Duty to Cooperate bodies.

7.3 As well as describing in broad terms the strategic matters, it identifies the planning authorities, prescribed bodies and other consultees that could be impacted by the strategic matter who the Council will need to proactively engage and work with to seek to address the strategic matter. It also explains how and when (in broad terms) this engagement will take place.

7.4 It should be noted that the Council does not intend to engage with all prescribed bodies listed by the Government as in some cases it is not considered that their remit covers a particular strategic issues which is relevant to Tandridge e.g. Marine Management Organisation.

7.5 Table 1 summarises the strategic matters (using the NPPF para. 156 definitions) and which local authorities and prescribed bodies the Council considers that it needs to proactively engage and work with. Table 2 summaries those other consultees who are not local authorities or prescribed bodies but which have a role to play in assisting the Council in addressing relevant strategic matters.

The Strategic matters

Homes and jobs needed in the area

Housing

7.6 The adopted Core Strategy requires the delivery of a minimum of 125 dwellings per year in the period 2006 -2026. This minimum figure has been exceeded with the delivery on average of 260 dwellings in each year of the Plan. This has meant that the Council has been able to maintain a five year supply of housing. In 2011 the Council prepared a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment which demonstrated that there would be a sufficient supply of sites coming forward in the built up areas that would avoid the need to allocate sites (and therefore no need to release Green Belt land). Therefore it has not proved necessary to prepare a site allocations plan.

7.8 However in the light of the NPPF’s requirement for Local Plans to meet objectively assessed needs the Council commissioned GL Hearn to carry out a Locally Generated Housing Needs Assessment. The purpose of this was to assist the Council in deciding whether or not to commence a review of the Core Strategy. Although the Assessment was not agreed by the Council it did provide sufficient evidence to trigger the commencement of a review. It is certainly the case that the Council’s GL Hearn (GLH) produced assessment of housing need was described within the documents as provisional (GL Hearn para 5.15) and that it was not adopted by the Council as the statement of objectively assessed needs.

7.9 Some key results from the assessment are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons per Annum 2006-11</th>
<th>In-Migration to Tandridge</th>
<th>Out-Migration from Tandridge</th>
<th>Net Flow to Tandridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>2340</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sussex</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Migration Flows (Persons) to/from Tandridge per Annum, 2006-11*

The above table demonstrates that net migration from London as a whole is a major factor in the population growth in Tandridge. Not surprisingly Croydon, which adjoins Tandridge to the north is the principal source of the net in-migration with 72% of the total from London coming from Croydon. Other points to note from the table are that east-west flows are very similar and the largest net out migration is to Mid-Sussex which is the district due south of Tandridge.

7.10 The GL Hearn report considered the likely housing requirements to 2031 and came to a provisional conclusion. However as noted above the Council did not agree this assessment but merely considered that it gave sufficient evidence to justify a review of the Core Strategy. The Council now proposes to undertake a NPPF compliant Strategic Housing Market Assessment working in cooperation with other authorities in its housing market area.

7.11 The following figure was not part of the GL Hearn assessment but was taken from the Council’s own Population and Social Profile and helps to illustrate the migration figures for 2011:
Domestic Migration Patterns, 2011

Key
- Tandridge District
- Local authority with a migration flow (in or out) of 50 or more people with Tandridge
- Other local authority

(Source: ONS data)

Domestic migration flows of 50 or more people (in or out), 2011 (ranked by net flow)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Inflow</th>
<th>Outflow</th>
<th>Net Flow</th>
<th>Per 1,000 of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sussex</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealden</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton and Hove UA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton UA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the need to make progress with the SHMA, the Council needed to commission consultants at the earliest opportunity, therefore the Council wrote to the adjoining Local Authorities whose areas it considers are most likely to fall within the Housing Market Area. The following Local Authorities were contacted to ask if they would assist in the production of a joint SHMA:

- Mid-Sussex DC
- Wealden DC
- Crawley BC
- Reigate & Banstead BC
- Sevenoaks DC
- Bromley LBC
- Croydon LBC

All the above authorities responded, but only Sevenoaks considered that there may be a possibility of working on a joint SHMA. The others either felt that the housing market links across the districts were weak or the timing of the Tandridge SHMA did not fit well with their SHMAs (either they had been done or the authorities were not yet ready to do this work). Further discussion with Sevenoaks has taken place to see if joint working is in fact practical. However the result of that meeting is that both authorities consider that the links are in fact quite tenuous and that there would no benefit in working together.

Tandridge Council will however consult all the other Local Authorities where significant migration to or from Tandridge occurs on the methodology and outcomes. Tandridge will also consult all other local authorities within Surrey. In particular it should be noted that the London Borough of Croydon is undertaking a SHMA and the Tandridge SHMA should make reference to the Croydon SHMA in order to ensure all housing matters are considered in a coordinated and consistent way. Outward migration from Croydon and London to Tandridge, is particularly important. A workshop with other Local Planning Authorities to discuss the methodology for the SHMA was held on 24th November 2014.

### The implications of the Further Alterations to the London Plan

In January 2014 the Mayor of London published his Further Alterations to the London Plan and invited comments on the Alterations. Whilst Tandridge does not underestimate the challenges faced by the Mayor and the GLA, the District Council is concerned that the Plan will not deliver the required number of homes if population and household projections prove to be generally accurate. The draft Plan only allocates 42,000 homes pa to the boroughs.
and therefore fails to plan for the level of need of 49,000 - 62,000 pa identified in the London Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Plan states at paragraph 2.11 that the strategy is to accommodate the substantial population growth over the period to 2036 within the current boundaries. However the Plan does not demonstrate how this will be achieved. The Plan does not provide any guidance to the London Boroughs how the interim gap of 7,000 pa should be apportioned, other than to say that this should be augmented where possible with extra housing capacity through high density development.

7.16 The District Council is concerned that if the London Boroughs are unable to allocate the 49,000 through their Local Plans, or that London as a whole is unable to meet a need in excess of 49,000 authorities such as Tandridge will be expected to deliver additional homes to meet this need. The FALP should consider what other ways there are of meeting the need and not just expect areas beyond London to accommodate it. Mole Valley District Council experiences a similar relationship with London Boroughs and shares Tandridge DC’s concern about the apparent under-delivery of housing in the Further Alterations to the London Plan.

7.17 Tandridge is particularly concerned that there is no requirement in the FALP for the London Boroughs to review their Green Belt boundaries or the extent of Metropolitan Open Land. The FALP specifically rules out encroaching on to the Green Belt. This is at a time when Local Planning Authorities around London are being required to review their Green Belt and consider allocations to accommodate growth, particularly that arising from existing out migration from London. Failure to require the London Boroughs to review their Green Belt/Metropolitan Open Land will make it less likely that London will be able to accommodate the housing growth within its boundaries. Tandridge responded to the draft Plan and said that it did not believe the Plan was ‘sound’.

7.18 Therefore the FALP introduces a level of uncertainty for authorities such as Tandridge outside London. Tandridge District Council would however be pleased to work with the Mayor, as the FALP emerges and as its reviews its own Core Strategy. Such cooperation may be directly or where appropriate through relevant groupings of local authorities.

**Key Matters: Housing**

7.19 Therefore in relation to housing the key matters that will need to be dealt with under the Duty to Cooperate are:

- The future housing requirement of the District arising from natural growth;
- The future housing requirement of the District arising from migration;
- The future housing requirement of the District arising from growth in jobs/to encourage job creation;
- How any additional housing requirements might be accommodated within Tandridge?
- Housing redistribution, whether there will be any need for other authorities to assist in meeting that requirement or conversely any need for Tandridge to assist in meeting other authorities’ requirements.

7.20 Reigate & Banstead Borough Council as immediately adjoining neighbours to the west have indicated that their housing figure (including a proportion to be delivered on Green Belt land) allows for some continuing in-migration from other local authorities including those within the East Surrey and North West Sussex, however no specific allowance is made for in-migration from individual districts/boroughs. They are therefore committed to engaging actively with neighbouring authorities, including through the Gatwick Diamond joint working arrangements to understand the extent to which housing needs across the wider area can be accommodated.

7.21 The Council’s view was that ideally those authorities identified in paragraph 7.12 above should be involved in the production of a joint SHMA, but that other authorities particularly within Surrey, the Gatwick Diamond and in South London should be involved in the Duty to
Cooperate. However given the responses noted at paragraph 7.13 Tandridge will commission a SHMA for its area alone. As the Local Plan is produced consideration will need to be given as to whether other local planning authorities will need to be asked to assist in meeting the needs of the Housing Market Area (and vice versa). This will require close cooperation between the relevant authorities.

**Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with**

- Mid-Sussex DC
- Wealden DC
- Crawley BC
- Reigate & Banstead BC
- Sevenoaks DC
- Sutton LBC
- Bromley LBC
- Croydon LBC
- Horsham DC
- Epsom & Ewell BC
- Mole Valley DC
- Mayor for London/GLA
- Surrey County Council
- Lambeth LBC
- Lewisham LBC
- Southwark LBC
- Kingston upon Thames LBC
- Elmbridge BC
- Runnymede BC
- Spelthorne BC
- Surrey Heath BC
- Guildford BC
- Waverley BC
- Woking BC
- West Sussex County Council
- East Sussex County Council
- Kent County Council
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Coast to Capital
- Local Nature Partnership
- East Surrey Clinical Commissioning group
- Environment Agency
- English Heritage
- Natural England
- Highways Agency
- NHS England
- Office of Rail Regulator
- Surrey and Sussex Health Care Trust
- Transport for London

**Proposed methods and timescales for engagement**

In late 2014 consultation on the SHMA methodology and assumptions with all the authorities and bodies through workshops. Early 2015 consultation on the preliminary results through workshops.

Engagement on a revised SHLAA during 2014/15:
- SHLAA methodology,
- Green Belt assessment methodology,
- Site assessment methodology.

Consultation on the results of the above assessments 2015 (through workshops if required).

Consultation on draft site allocations.

Engagement with other authorities if there is a need for others to assist in the delivery of housing.

**Travellers**

7.22 As noted in paragraph 5.9 above in 2013 the Council prepared a Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) in line with a methodology that was prepared and agreed by all the Surrey Districts and Boroughs. The key findings of the TAA were as follows:
7.23 Before approving the TAA as evidence base document the Council consulted with neighbouring local authorities and other interested parties. Responses were received from the following Local Planning Authorities:

- Mid-Sussex DC
- Bromley LBC
- Croydon LBC
- Guildford BC
- Waverley BC

7.24 Potential cross-boundary issues which emerged from the consultation focussed on unauthorised encampments and cross-boundary Traveller movements, and the provision of transit sites. The TAA has been amended on these subjects at paragraphs 4.8, 5.6 and 7.65 – two of which are reproduced below:

**4.8** It is noted that there have been some instances of unauthorised encampments in the south London Boroughs of Bromley and Croydon which may have involved cross-boundary movements through Tandridge. Given the low number of incidents of encampments in Tandridge and the predominantly settled nature of Travellers living in the District, it seems unlikely that the Travellers in question came from, camped or settled in Tandridge.

**7.65** The questionnaires suggest that the Traveller population in the District is relatively settled and the survey responses did not identify a need for transit pitches in Tandridge. However, a transit site would assist in the handling of unauthorised encampments should any appear, providing a site on which they could temporarily reside. The Council notes that there have been issues with encampments in the South London boroughs but local evidence suggests that the recent encampments in Croydon and Bromley did not move from or into Tandridge.

7.25 Tandridge has a predominantly settled Travelling community with 69 of the 89 respondents claiming to have lived at their current address for more than 5 years with many stating much longer periods of time, some in excess of 20 years. Only one Travelling Showpeople household stated that they had a base elsewhere and two Gypsy households stated from where they had moved to the District. Two households from the Travelling Showpeople community had moved to their current address within the past year, both of which moved from within the District, whilst four Gypsy and Traveller households moved to their current location in the past year, only one of which moved from within Tandridge. Three other Gypsy and Traveller households moved from elsewhere in the South East.

7.26 Nearly all respondents considered themselves to be permanent residents in the area with only one Travelling Showpeople respondent stating that they had a base elsewhere. The majority of respondents who did want to move from their current location wanted to stay in Tandridge. However, one Gypsy and Traveller respondent stated that they and their family
would like to move into bricks and mortar accommodation in Crawley, two respondents stated a preference for affordable or social housing for their children in either Tandridge or Reigate and Banstead, and one would like sites in Tandridge or Kent for themselves and their family. The Travelling Showpeople population interviewed were also largely settled but two respondents expressed a preference for plots in Surrey, two in Tandridge or Waverley, one in Tandridge, Dorking or Waverley, and one elsewhere within the South East, preferably Kent.

7.27 In March 2014 the Council issued a ‘call for sites’ to try to establish if any land can be identified that might be suitable for inclusion in a site allocations document. There has been a limited response to this ‘call for sites’ and the Council is now considering how it should proceed given that insufficient sites have so far been identified to meet the need. A complication is that given land values in the urban areas and the fact that 94% of the District is Green Belt it is difficult to see how new sites can be provided. The Council may need to consider if Gypsy & Traveller site allocations should follow any Green Belt review carried out as part of the Core Strategy review.

Key Matters: Travellers

7.28 Therefore in relation to Travellers the key matters that will need to be dealt with under the Duty to Cooperate are:
- The future Traveller pitch/plot requirement of the District;
- How any additional pitch/plot requirements might be accommodated within Tandridge?
- Whether there will be any need for other authorities to assist in meeting that requirement or conversely any need for Tandridge to assist in meeting other authorities’ requirements.
- If the Government redefines the definition of Gypsies, Tandridge may need to work with other authorities in considering the implications on the current identified needs.

7.29 Reigate & Banstead BC indicates that it is facing similar issues. It is committed to meeting its identified needs as far as possible, and is considering opportunities for provision in the urban area, countryside beyond the Green Belt, and within the Green Belt. However, it has not yet been able to conclude whether sites can be allocated to meet the full need identified within their Traveller Accommodation Assessment without compromising the purposes or integrity of the Green Belt. It may therefore need to look at whether neighbouring authorities are able to meet some of their own needs.

7.30 The London Borough of Croydon has commented that this scoping framework should refer to the possible future need for transit sites in the Key Matters. Although not identified in the Tandridge TAA this is an issue that may need to be considered. LB Croydon has indicated that at an appropriate stage they would be happy to meet to assemble relevant evidence. They will share their evidence on this topic as it emerges.

7.31 Crawley Borough Council commented as follows: Whilst agreeing with Tandridge’s suggested approach, should a wider, strategic approach be taken then it may be advantageous for this to be supported by a ‘workshop’ style meeting for a larger grouping of affected authorities. Crawley Borough Council is open to discussions between authorities regarding how constructive joint working across the Gatwick Diamond may resolve any potential unmet needs. It should be noted that at a Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Members’ Meeting, held on 16 April 2013 it was agreed that:
- the evidence base with respect to the needs of the travelling community is shared and examined on a collaborative basis;
- each district or borough looks to address within its own boundaries any need for permanent sites identified in its assessments;
the local authorities work together to gain a greater understanding of the need for transit accommodation, liaising within the counties and the Gatwick Diamond and, as appropriate, with other local authorities.

7.32 Crawley Borough Council have suggested that that where sites are considered suitable for conventional, bricks and mortar accommodation, they should not be overlooked for their potential for accommodating permanent Travelling families arising within Tandridge district.

7.33 Mole Valley District Council understands that there are family connections between Travelling Showpeople currently based in Mole Valley and others based at The Plantation site in Tandridge. There is an unmet need for 7 plots for Travelling Showpeople in Mole Valley. MVDC is still investigating options to meet this need but has not yet been able to identify any suitable, available and deliverable sites. There may be a requirement for ongoing discussions between MVDC and Tandridge to understand the relationship between the identified needs for Travelling Showpeople’s plots in both Districts, and what options exist to meet this identified need.

Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

- Mid-Sussex DC
- Wealden DC
- Horsham DC
- Crawley BC
- Reigate & Banstead BC
- Sevenoaks DC
- Croydon LBC
- Bromley LBC
- Mayor for London/GLA
- Surrey County Council
- Homes and Communities Agency

- Epsom & Ewell BC
- Elmbridge BC
- Mole Valley DC
- Runnymede BC
- Spelthorne BC
- Surrey Heath BC
- Guildford BC
- Waverley BC
- Woking BC

Proposed method and timescales for engagement

If sufficient sites cannot be identified to from the call for sites and other work to provide sufficient pitches/plots, the Council will seek to work with neighbouring local authorities prior to the Preferred Options Consultation – during 2015 to establish if they can assist in making provision. This can generally be carried out through correspondence.

Employment land

7.34 In July 2014 the Council received a report from Matthews Associates & TSE Research “Tandridge Economic Development & Business Study” to establish the key economic issues in Tandridge, including the economic-base within the district, and to develop a strategic approach to economic growth. This will provide a useful basis for a more detailed assessment of economic development requirements and an employment land review.

7.35 In preparing the Core Strategy the following picture emerged. Tandridge is in some ways a paradox - it has had an extremely high economic activity rate of 90.4% (that is number of people of working age who are economically active), with very low levels of unemployment but is has had an extremely low job density, in other words there are considerably fewer jobs than there are workers. This is manifest by the very high out-commuting that takes place. This demonstrates that there is a considerable reliance on jobs outside the area, with a high proportion of jobs being within London. On the one hand London relies on commuters from areas like Tandridge and on the other hand residents of the District rely on London for...
employment. The economy of the District is inextricably linked to the wider region and to London.

7.36 The recent “Tandridge Economic Development & Business Study” has revealed the following key economic performance results:

- Poor comparative GVA: 28th out of 29 in both C2C & EM3 LEPs
- Lowest Surrey LA in UK competitiveness index at 92nd
- Largest Surrey LA fall in UK competitiveness from 2010
- 268 out of 326 for business start-ups in first four months of 2014
- Good fall in JSA claimants but only in-line with Surrey averages
- Loss of major businesses since mid-1990
- Comparatively weak ‘top 50’ commercial sites by NNDR
- 12 out of the top 50 sites claim £1.6m of rate reliefs
- Only 5 commercial premises in District with RV over £1m

7.37 To the immediate south-west of the District lies Gatwick Airport. An area around the airport has been identified as the “Gatwick Diamond” – this stretches from the coast up to the edge of London. The impact of the economy in the Gatwick Diamond on Tandridge must be recognised, particularly in that it may compete with other areas for labour. Also the implications of a second runway at Gatwick Airport, if permitted, would result in the displacement of a large amount of commercial floor space. Whilst some might be re-provided on-airport, some may move out of the area, there may be a demand for new space within Tandridge.

7.38 Within Tandridge there has been limited investment in new commercial property in recent years relative to other parts of Surrey. The commercial market appears to be less buoyant in Tandridge with lower rateable values, for all sectors, than elsewhere in Surrey. In addition a number of large employers have moved out of the District and there has been little interest in the available floorspace. Although the District appears to have relatively good locational advantages the evidence suggests that Tandridge is not seen as a particularly good location for new businesses, particularly larger employers.

7.39 The question for the Council is has the above picture changed since the 2008 when the Core Strategy was adopted and following a period of recession?

**Key Matters: Employment Land**

7.40 Therefore in relation to employment land the key matters that will need to be dealt with under the Duty to Cooperate are:

- The future employment land requirement of the District related to economic growth;
- The future employment requirement of the District arising from population growth
- How any employment land requirements might be accommodated within Tandridge?
- Whether there will be any need for other authorities to assist in meeting that requirement or conversely any need for Tandridge to assist in meeting other authorities’ requirements.
- The implications of a second runway at Gatwick in terms of potential new requirements for employment land to accommodate new businesses and those that may be displaced by the runway development.
- As the Local Plan is produced consideration will need to be given as to whether other local planning authorities will need to be asked to assist in meeting the needs of the Functional Economic Market Area (and vice versa). This will require close cooperation between the relevant authorities.
### Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

- Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership
- Gatwick Diamond Authorities (including Surrey County Council)
- Mayor for London/GLA
- London Borough of Croydon
- Sevenoaks District Council
- Wealden District Council
- Transport for London
- Highways Agency

### Proposed method and timescales for engagement

It may be appropriate to consult the identified authorities on any proposed economic assessment methodology/ELR, most likely by correspondence rather than workshops. Consultation on the emerging findings of such assessments. This is likely to take place during 2015 through correspondence. Meetings with Crawley Borough Council might be useful to discuss the implications of any displaced employment arising from the provision of a second runway at Gatwick Airport.

---

### The provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development

**Retailing**

7.41 The two centres that serve the main retail needs of the District are Caterham and Oxted. Local Centres have been identified at Warlingham, Whyteleafe, Lingfield and Caterham Hill. Since the development of large supermarkets in Caterham in the late 1980s and Oxted in the mid-1990s there has been no pressure for additional supermarkets in the town centres, although in Oxted there has been a desire to extend the existing supermarket. Supermarkets were also built at Warlingham and at Caterham Hill, the latter as part of a large mixed development.

7.42 As part of the preparation for the Core Strategy the Council commissioned a Comparison Retail Needs Assessment – (CACI 2007) this indicated that whilst Caterham has some capacity for additional retailing it unlikely there would be much demand from retailers, particularly in the light of the potential growth of Redhill. Within Oxted there was little long term opportunity for new floorspace. There were therefore no requirements for site allocations identified in the Core Strategy. With the preparation of the Detailed Policies the Council has developed new policies to protect retailing the town and local centres.

7.43 Given that both Oxted and Caterham town centres fulfil the needs of the local community and do not generally meet the needs of a wider area it is unlikely that any new Local Plan will need to make significant provision for additional retail floorspace, particularly in the light of the growth of internet shopping. However no new retail studies have been undertaken and therefore the question for the Council is has the above picture changed since the 2008 when the Core Strategy was adopted and following a period of recession?

**Key Matters: Retailing**

7.44 The Council does not at this stage consider that there are likely to be any strategic cross boundary issues related to retailing. However the matters that will require consideration under the Duty to Cooperate could be:

- Any future retail land requirement of the District related to changes in the economy and or shopping patterns?
- Any future retail land requirement of the District arising from population growth?
- How any retail land requirements might be accommodated within Tandridge?
• Whether there will be any need for other authorities to assist in meeting that requirement or conversely any need for Tandridge to assist in meeting other authorities’ requirements?

Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

• Gatwick Diamond Authorities (including Surrey County Council)
• London Borough of Croydon
• London Borough of Bromley
• Sevenoaks District Council
• Wealden District Council
• GLA

Proposed method and timescales for engagement

Should there be an identified need for significant growth in retailing to serve the local community; the Council will consult on the preferred options during 2016. It would seem unlikely that other local authorities will be required to assist in the provision of retailing to support the Tandridge population. This is likely to take place during 2016 through correspondence.

Leisure and other commercial development

7.45 The leisure facilities in Tandridge primarily serve the local population with no built facilities that would appear to serve a regional or sub-regional need. There are leisure facilities/sports centres in Caterham and Oxted with some smaller facilities in other locations.

7.46 The Council did not identify any additional leisure facilities in preparation for the 2008 Core Strategy and it is unlikely that this position will have changed. There is no apparent need for other forms of commercial development that cannot be otherwise met through the Development Management process.

Key Matters: Leisure

7.47 The Council does not at this stage consider that there are likely to be any strategic cross boundary issues related to leisure or other commercial development. However the matters that will require consideration under the Duty to Cooperate could be:

• Any future leisure or commercial land requirement of the District related to changes in demand, including that created by population growth?
• How any leisure or commercial land requirements might be accommodated within Tandridge
• Whether there will be any need for other authorities to assist in meeting that requirement or conversely any need for Tandridge to assist in meeting other authorities’ requirements.

Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

• Gatwick Diamond Authorities (including Surrey County Council)
• London Borough of Croydon
• London Borough of Bromley
• Sevenoaks District Council
• Wealden District Council
• GLA
Proposed method and timescales for engagement

Should there be an identified need for significant growth in leisure and other commercial development to serve the local community; the Council will consult on the preferred options during 2016. It would seem unlikely that other local authorities will be required to assist in the provision of such development to support the Tandridge population. This is likely to take place during 2016 through correspondence.

Infrastructure

**Water Supply**

7.48 In terms of water supply the Council is not aware of any likely need to provide significant new infrastructure within the District. There will no doubt be a need to provide additional supplies, but in terms of reservoirs or pumping stations the Council has not been made aware of any requirements. As such no strategic cross boundary matters have been identified.

**Waste Water**

7.49 In terms of waste water disposal the Council is not aware of any likely need to provide significant new infrastructure within the District. There will no doubt be a need to provide additional sewers but the Council has not yet been made aware of any requirements. As such no strategic cross boundary matters have been identified. Crawley Borough Council would welcome meeting with officers from Tandridge District Council and the appropriate waste water infrastructure companies if this arises as an issue of infrastructure concern.

**Flooding**

7.50 In preparation for the Core Strategy the Council prepared a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. This will require revising and updating to accompany the review of the Core Strategy. The following is a summary of the main flooding issues affecting the District.

7.51 Flooding within Caterham is generally not considered to be a significant issue except where the Environment Agency flood zone extends up Caterham Valley from Wapses Lodge roundabout to the railway station in the town centre. The Bourne flooding detailed in the paragraph below can extend into the north part of Caterham Valley. The area is classed as a sensitive area in terms of groundwater on head deposits (clay) above chalk, consequently pooling occurs in depressed areas during times of heavy rainfall.

7.52 Whyteleafe and Warlingham is underlain by chalk deposits, therefore, due to the porous nature of the rock flooding is not a major issue apart from when the groundwater level rises. This has happened on a number of occasions along Godstone Road in Whyteleafe, the largest recorded flood events in this area occurred in December 2000 and in January/February 2014 when a large area of land was flooded from Caterham to Purley, a distance of about 4 miles. The flooding problems observed along the course of the Bourne have been associated with ephemeral groundwater discharges combined with normal winter rainfall. Surcharging of the Bourne occurs when the water table is high. Any new development in this area including within the London Borough of Croydon will need to take into account any potential cross boundary impacts. During 2014 the County Council has built reservoirs on the Woldingham Road to act as temporary balancing ponds in case of future flooding. The flooding will be considered at as part of the wider Caterham Bourne project being undertaken jointly with Croydon Council, Surrey County Council and Tandridge District Council.

6 [http://www.tandridge.gov.uk/Planning/PlanningPolicy/localplanning/localdevelopmentframeworkevidencebase.htm](http://www.tandridge.gov.uk/Planning/PlanningPolicy/localplanning/localdevelopmentframeworkevidencebase.htm)
The river Eden passes through Oxted and has caused localised flooding periodically with no significant damage to residential properties, some commercial properties in Station Road East have been flooded. A small section of the river is culverted through Oxted town centre.

Smallfield has suffered serious flooding problems in the past. Notably, the 1968 floods resulted in a substantial part of the village being flooded. Since that time the M23 motorway has been built no-one is quite sure how this will affect flood water in the future, however, there are a number of large culverts running through the embankment to ensure that the flow of water is not impeded. There have been localised problems in more recent years when heavy rainfall has been experienced. The open fields to the north east of Smallfield dip down towards the urban area, when the ground is saturated the precipitation moves over the fields via the process of overland flow. A ditch along the eastern boundary of the settlement protects the properties and channels the water south, however, this has caused highway flooding along Plough Road. A number of the problems have resulted from the ingress of surface water into the foul water system, which has then surcharged from manholes. Measures have been taken to improve the situation of surcharging from foul sewers by improving capacity of the Burstow waste water treatment works (the treatment works lie just to the west of the motorway, adjacent to the district boundary and are within the flood risk area). Any new development within this area, including in Horley within Reigate & Banstead will need to take into account any potential cross boundary impacts. There is a Smallfield Flood Alleviation Scheme planned by the Environment Agency in conjunction with Surrey County Council. Reigate and Banstead BC recognise the flooding issues in the Horley/Smallfield area and support the Tandridge approach to engagement. As Reigate & Banstead BC test options for site allocations in the Horley area they will continue to engage with TDC and the Environment Agency in relation to flood prevention, alleviation and mitigation.

The Burstow Stream, in the Smallfield/Horley area is a tributary of the River Mole, which flows through Mole Valley. Parts of Mole Valley were seriously affected by flooding from the River Mole, during the December 2013/January 2014 period. In the event that significant development is proposed in the Smallfield area, there may be a need for cooperation between the Mole Valley and Tandridge Councils (and Reigate and Banstead Borough Council) with regard to strategic flooding issues.

The Eden Brook flows from Blindley Heath into the River Eden at Lingfield. It is known that significant flooding occurred in the 1968 flood, leaving Lingfield entirely isolated. Occasional flooding has taken place since, but not to the same degree. The principle cause for flooding in the urban area is due to overland flow from the fields to the north west of Lingfield during periods of heavy rainfall, often compounded by fluvial flooding from the River Eden. However, the flood defences constructed along the banks of the Eden Brook and River Eden should reduce the magnitude and impact of flooding on Lingfield.

Key Matters: Flooding

Although flooding is an issue in various places across the District the only three areas where there are likely to be cross boundary issues are in Whyteleafe (Tandridge)/Kenley (Croydon), in Smallfield (Tandridge)/Horley (Reigate & Banstead) and in the Marsh Green (Tandridge)/Edenbridge (Sevenoaks) area. Therefore it is likely that flooding and the impact of additional development is likely to be a cross boundary strategic issue. The matters that will require consideration under the Duty to Cooperate could be:

- The impact of new development, particularly arising from any site allocations on flooding within Tandridge and beyond its boundaries.
- Whether any additional water course capacity, flood defence or storage capacity should be provided outside of Tandridge.
Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

- Environment Agency
- Upper Medway Drainage Authority
- Gatwick Diamond Authorities (including Surrey County Council and West Sussex County Council)
- London Borough of Croydon
- London Borough of Bromley
- Sevenoaks District Council
- Kent County Council
- Wealden District Council
- GLA
- Natural England

Proposed method and timescales for engagement

When the likely scale of new development has been identified, discussions/meetings will be required with the Environment Agency and other authorities to establish what if any water course capacity, flood defence or storage capacity might be required. During 2015 and 2016.

Other infrastructure

7.58 Other infrastructure can include transport, highways, emergency services and Green Infrastructure. The Council is not aware of any transport or highways issues that are likely to have land requirements in the District. There may be capacity issues and increased demand for transport services arising from housing growth however at this early stage no strategic cross boundary matters have been identified.

7.59 The Council is not aware of any other likely infrastructure requirements that are likely to arise from a future Local Plan and specifically from an increase in housing supply.

The provision of health, security, community/cultural infrastructure and other local facilities

Health service provision

7.60 Whilst there may be a need for additional primary care facilities to meet population growth given that the majority of new housing that is likely to be required will be in and around the existing built up areas there are unlikely to be any increased demand on medical services just over the District boundary. However until the Council has determined what its new spatial strategy should be, in other words where development will take place it is not possible to be completely sure whether there will be any cross boundary demand (for example from villages close to the District boundary).

Key Matters: Health service provision

7.61 The Council does not envisage that there will be any cross boundary strategic matters relating to the provision of health services. However the matters that will require consideration under the Duty to Cooperate could be:

- Any future health service requirements of the District related to changes in demand, including that created by population growth.
- How any health service requirements might be accommodated within Tandridge?
- Whether there will be any need for other authorities to assist in meeting that requirement or conversely any need for Tandridge to assist in meeting other authorities’ requirements.
Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

- Gatwick Diamond Authorities (including Surrey County Council)
- East Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group
- NHS England
- Surrey and Sussex Healthcare Trust
- Director of Public Health (via Surrey County Council)
- Local primary care providers (GPs, Dentists and pharmacists)
- London Borough of Croydon
- London Borough of Bromley
- Sevenoaks DC
- Wealden DC
- GLA

Proposed method and timescales for engagement

Should there be an identified need for significant growth in health service provision to serve the local community; the Council will consult on the preferred options during 2016. It would seem unlikely that other local authorities will be required to assist in the provision of health services to support the Tandridge population. This is likely to take place during 2015 through correspondence.

Security

7.62 The Council is not aware of any security issues that are likely to have land requirements in the District. As such no strategic matters have been identified.

Education

7.63 There may be a need for additional schools to meet population growth. Some existing school places (mainly at secondary level) are provided outside the District. For example some children may attend the Oasis Academy in Old Coulsdon (within the London Borough of Croydon). Children from the District also attend schools in Redhill and Horley. Conversely Warlingham Secondary School, which adjoins the boundary with the London Borough of Croydon, provides places for children from that borough. Until the final housing requirement has been identified it is not possible to calculate how many additional school places will be required or where they should be provided. However there may be scope for some additional provision to be made outside the District as part of another authority’s own additional provision, but such arrangements are unlikely to be created from ‘requirements’ under the Duty to Cooperate.

Key Matters: Education

7.64 The Council does not envisage that there will be any cross boundary strategic matters relating to the provision of schools. Although until the relevant authorities have been consulted this cannot be confirmed. However the matters that will require consideration under the Duty to Cooperate could be:

- Any capacity issues or future school requirements of the District related to changes in demand created by housing development?
- How any new schools might be accommodated within Tandridge?
- Whether there will be any need for other authorities to assist in meeting that requirement or conversely any need for Tandridge to assist in meeting other authorities’ requirements.
Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

- Gatwick Diamond Authorities (including Surrey County Council)
- Surrey County Council (as Education authority)
- London Borough of Croydon (as Education and as Planning authority)
- London Borough of Bromley (as Education and as Planning authority)
- West Sussex County Council (as Education authority)
- East Sussex County Council (as Education authority)
- Kent County Council (as Education authority)
- Sevenoaks DC
- Wealden DC
- GLA

Proposed method and timescales for engagement

Should there be an identified need for significant growth in school place provision to serve the local community; the Council will consult on the preferred options during 2016. It would seem unlikely that other local authorities will be required to assist in the provision of school places to support the Tandridge population. This is likely to take place during 2015 through correspondence. Sharing school place provision information could be a useful exercise.

Other community and cultural infrastructure

7.65 The Council is only aware of two community or cultural infrastructure issues that are likely to have any land requirements in the District. The first is the provision of a cemetery and the second is the provision of new civic amenity sites. The London Borough of Croydon also has a need to provide additional cemetery space.

7.66 Snell Hatch cemetery in Crawley is estimated to reach capacity by 2017. Crawley Borough Council is currently looking to submit a planning application for a site within the borough to accommodate a further 50 years of burials for the population of Crawley. Crawley Borough Council would be happy to keep Tandridge District informed of this progress.

Key Matters: Other community and cultural infrastructure

7.67 The Council envisages that the main cross boundary strategic matter relating to the provision of community and cultural infrastructure is the provision of cemetery space. However the matters that will require consideration under the Duty to Cooperate could be:

- Any future land requirements for a new cemetery and new civic amenity sites in the District?
- How a new cemetery and new civic amenity sites might be accommodated within Tandridge?
- Whether there is scope for any cross boundary provision with the London Borough of Croydon?

7.68 Other cross boundary matters could include walking, cycling and riding routes that link across administrative boundaries.

Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

- London Borough of Croydon
- Gatwick Diamond authorities (including Surrey County Council)
- London Borough of Bromley
- Sevenoaks DC
- Wealden DC
- GLA
Proposed method and timescales for engagement

During 2015 initiate discussions and meetings with London Borough of Croydon on Cemetery provision.

Climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape

**Climate change, mitigation and adaptation**

7.69 Whilst climate change is an issue that knows no borders there are no obvious cross boundary issues that will arise from a future Local Plan. Given the Government’s likely move of various energy and water standards from the Planning system to Building Regulations it is even less likely that there will be any strategic cross boundary issues.

**Conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape**

7.70 The main area where cross boundary impacts are likely to occur is in relation to European Wildlife Sites such as the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area and Special Area for Conservation and the Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment Special Area for Conservation. The possible impacts on these areas could arise mainly from additional visitor numbers or from additional pollution from additional vehicles travelling through such areas from Tandridge in combination with the impacts from other areas. At the time of the Core Strategy the Council undertook an Appropriate Assessment Stage 1 Screening\(^7\) which concluded that the Core Strategy, alone or in combination would be unlikely to have a significant impact on any European sites, namely the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA and the Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment SAC and therefore no further assessment is needed. As such both sites could be “screened out” and it was not necessary to move to the Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment. A similar exercise will be required for any review of the Core Strategy. One significant difference is that Natural England has more recently drawn the Ashdown Forest SPA 7km zone of influence to include parts of Tandridge, as shown on the map below.

---

The red hatched area shows the 7km zone of influence including part of Felbridge and part of Dormans Park. Following the adoption of the Detailed Policies document in 2014, Dormans Park will no longer be a village suitable for infilling, although Felbridge will continue as a Defined Village in the Green Belt within which infilling can take place. Although the Council will have to consider the spatial strategy following new housing need being established at this point it is unlikely that Felbridge will be considered as an area for expansion and certainly any new development (other than infilling) could be directed away from the zone of influence. Any cross boundary impacts are likely to be dealt with by way of an Appropriate Assessment and if necessary through mitigation. In particular the Council will need to cooperate with Mid-Sussex District Council (MSDC) regarding any mitigation measures. MSDC has introduced an Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMM) interim mitigation and an interim Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) strategy as described above.

Whilst the District has a wealth of heritage assets it is not envisaged that there will be any strategic cross boundary matters that will arise that will require consideration under the Duty to Cooperate.

As with Climate Change landscapes know no borders. The Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty continues across Surrey to the west and physically it becomes part of the Kent Downs AONB to the east. Similarly the High Weald AONB that covers the south eastern most part of Tandridge continues into Kent, into West Sussex and East Sussex. Management Plans prepared by the respective AONB bodies on behalf of the local authorities that have the AONBs in their areas have recently been revised and provide a framework for local authorities to consider planning and management issues. It seems unlikely that there will be any strategic cross boundary matters arising that will not have already been addressed through the Management Plans.

Key Matters: Conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape

Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC is located within Wealden District, and the current evidence base shows that there a number of Local Authorities that may potentially affect this European site in terms of recreational pressure. This includes Lewes District Council, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Wealden District Council and Mid Sussex District Council. All these Councils are working together in order to help provide mitigation on Ashdown Forest. Therefore Wealden District would be interested in working on this particular strategic issue.

There is a further issue on the Ashdown Forest which Wealden District is working upon and that is the impact of Nitrogen deposition, resulting from vehicles, on the Ashdown Forest SAC. Wealden DC are interested in working with partners on this cross boundary issue as in their opinion it is necessary to consider the in combination effects with all authorities that may potentially have an impact upon the designated site.

---


9 [http://mid-sussex.cmis.uk.com/Mid-Sussex/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5fUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgq=wc52s8UljkzZEE3EiZKWveTsK%2beBShywzBMnoGBsrxofamSoC1QA%3d%3d&rUzwRPI%2bZ3zd4Egkn8lyw%3d%3d=prRE6AGJFLDNIh225F5QMqWcFIP/wdUfC2%2fLiuQzgAzUL5jNR4gjO%3d%3d&mC1bCubSF1xsDfW9lXnjg%3d%3d=fFluUh3100%3d&kC1xAnS9%2fWZQ4DXFydew%3d%3d&hFluUhN3100%3d&kJovDxwdjMPoY%2bAjAy/F3100%3d&FgPlIEJYlot/JS%2bYGoBiloIA%3d%3d&NhdURQburHA%3d&d9Qjloag1Pd993jsyOqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJKf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeneNR9xq8ux0r1Q82A060iavYmz=ctNJKf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeneNQ16BMHucPMRK2MwaG1PaO=ctNJKf55vVA%3d]
### Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

- Mid-Sussex District Council – re SAC
- Wealden District Council – re SAC

### Proposed method and timescales for engagement

During 2015 initiate discussions and if required meetings with Mid-Sussex and Wealden District Councils.

Crawley Borough Council would welcome discussing approaches towards landscape and the natural environment with officers from Tandridge District Council should this be considered helpful.
Table 1: Summary of Strategic Matters & Duty to Cooperate Bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homes and Jobs</th>
<th>Retail Leisure &amp; Other Commercial Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Health, security, community and cultural Infrastructure</th>
<th>Climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing and Land</td>
<td>Travellers</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Croydon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Bromley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks DC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealden DC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Sussex DC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley BC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringgate &amp; Banstead BC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell BC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley DC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge BC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham BC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex CC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent CC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex CC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford BC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton BC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston BC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Kingston</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Lambeth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Lewisham</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Southwark</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Sutton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast to Capital LEP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Nature Partnership (via SWT)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes &amp; Communities Agency</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes and Jobs</td>
<td>Retail Leisure &amp; Other Commercial Development</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Health, security, community and cultural infrastructure</td>
<td>Climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Travellers</td>
<td>Employment Land</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; other Commercial Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>Water Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waste Water</td>
<td>Waste Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td>Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Infrastructure</td>
<td>Other Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health service provision</td>
<td>Health service provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other cultural and community Infrastructure</td>
<td>Other cultural and community Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Surrey CCG</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey &amp; Sussex Health Care Trust</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Health Service Commissioning Board (NHS England – Surrey and Sussex)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Aviation Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Rail Regulator</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Transport Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Management Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Other Consultees the Council intends to engage on each Strategic Matter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homes and Jobs</th>
<th>Retail Leisure &amp; Other Commercial Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Health, security, community and cultural infrastructure</th>
<th>Climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing and Land</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Commercial Development</td>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>Waste Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Diamond</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South London Partnership</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Coast Ambulance Service</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Fire &amp; rescue (via SCC)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Police</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom providers (via Mono)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy providers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Medway Internal Draining Board</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply providers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste water operators</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Mole and River Medway Catchment Partnerships</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity and gas suppliers and National Grid</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Public Health</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>