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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) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (published March 2014) emphasise the importance of ‘the duty’. The PPG includes detailed advice on the duty¹, and the following key messages, in particular, are emerging:

- The duty is not a ‘tick box’ exercise and local planning authorities should focus on the outcomes and maximising the effectiveness of their plans throughout the process.
- 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 and once submitted to the Secretary of State the preparation of the plan technically stops. However, the duty cannot be applied retrospectively and should be evident across the plan making process.
- 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.

1.4 In a letter from a Local Plan Planning Inspector to a District Council², the following elements were itemised and detailed as being essential to demonstrating the duty to cooperate:

- Has engagement been constructive?
- Has engagement been active?
- Has engagement been ongoing?
- Has engagement been collaborative?
- Has engagement been diligent?


² Letter from Inspector to Mid-Sussex District Council dated 2nd December 2013.
Has engagement been of mutual benefit (the broad outcomes)?

1.5 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.

1.6 The Council adopted a Duty to Cooperate scoping statement in December 2014. The scoping statement was always intended to be a live document and updated to reflect the actions taken to demonstrate that the ‘duty’ has been met, as the Local Plan is prepared. The first update to the Scoping report was published in December 2015 to accompany the Regulation 18 Local Plan: Issues and Approaches document which was formally consulted on between 18th December 2015 and 26th February 2016.

1.7 This 2016 document is a further update, and sets out the steps taken to comply with the ‘duty’ in preparing the Local Plan: Sites Consultation document, which will also be consulted upon under Regulation 18.

1.8 This update should be read in conjunction with the December 2014 Scoping Statement and the 2015 update.
2 The Purpose of this Statement

2.1 As recommended by Government Guidance, the Council prepared a Scoping Framework in September 2014. The scoping statement 2014 was subject to stakeholder consultation before it was adopted by the Council in December 2014.

2.2 Since then, the Council has continued to prepare its Local Plan, with an initial Regulation consultation taking place between December 2015 and February 2016 on the Local Plan: Issues and Approaches document. The 2015 update was prepared to reflect how the Council applied the duty up to that point. This 2016 update, reflects the further steps taken in preparation of the Local Plan: Sites Consultation (2016).

2.3 The steps taken to fulfil the ‘duty’ as set out in this update, are proportionate to the stage in the plan-making process and reflect the nature of the Local Plan: Sites consultation document. The types of engagement which have taken place under the duty are predominantly focussed on progressing the understanding of infrastructure requirements, preparing evidence based documents, involving key partners and developing relationships.

2.4 Consultation on the Local Plan which has taken place to date highlights that infrastructure matters are a key concern for the community and the Council recognise this. However, infrastructure provision can rarely be dealt with until a preferred strategy for the Local Plan is determined and an understanding of where infrastructure will be needed, is known and the Council have made no decisions regarding this yet. However, the Council have commenced early and ongoing engagement with infrastructure providers and other key partners from the outset and ahead of determining the preferred strategy to ensure a mutual understanding of elements which may provide opportunities or significant barriers to the preparation of the Local Plan. This update, further details this engagement.

2.5 This 2016 update will form part of the evidence base that sits alongside the Local Plan: Sites Consultation to be consulted on under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012, and part of the wider evidence base to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for the examination of the Local Plan, once finalised.
3 Legislative Framework and National Guidance

3.1 Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 makes a number of amendments to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and places a legal duty on local planning authorities to cooperate 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’.

3.2 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.

3.3 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.

3.4 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.

3.5 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”.

3.6 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.

3.7 This update is a ‘living’ document and will be updated as the Local Plan moves through each regulatory stage to demonstrate to an Inspector that the duty has been met and all activities have been effective and ongoing though the plan period and will continue beyond the Local Plan’s adoption.

3.8 Whilst 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), the Council will go beyond this and update this document at each regulation of the plan preparation.
4 The Planning Policy Context – Tandridge District

4.1 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.

4.2 The District has a population of approximately 85,000 residents, the majority of whom live in the built up areas of Caterham, Whyteleafe and Warlingham north of the M25 and Oxted/Limpsfield/Hurst Green south of the M25. There are also a number of villages of varying size in more rural and semi-rural areas.

4.3 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.

4.4 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.

4.5 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.

Tandridge Local Plan

4.6 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.

4.7 The Council is now preparing a Local Plan, which will replace the Core Strategy. The Council has set out a programme for the Local Plan in the Local Development Scheme (LDS) June 2016 which sets out the key areas of work. The LDS will be updated, when appropriate, to reflect the real life timetable of the Local Plan. This will ensure clarity and transparency to all stakeholders, community and interested parties.
5 Defining Tandridge’s Duty to Cooperate Bodies

5.1 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

5.2 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\(^3\). By only engaging with adjoining authorities the Council runs the risk of not addressing issues which impact on authorities wider than those simply adjoining Tandridge District. For example, flooding; flood risk and; housing market areas are cross-boundary issues which impact on local authorities across far wider areas. Similarly, just because the Council share a boundary with others does not automatically mean that strategic issues exist. Further detail relating to these matters is set out in the 2015 update document and Section 6 of the 2016 update.

5.3 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\(^4\). They comprise:

- Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs)\(^5\)
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- Highway Authorities
- Highways England
- Integrated Transport Authorities (there is no ITA covering Tandridge)
- Marine Management Organisation (not relevant to Tandridge)
- Natural England
- The Civil Aviation Authority

---

\(^3\) It should be noted that the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 require local planning authorities to consult with statutory bodies on the Development Plan. The engagement with the statutory bodies set out under the duty is an entirely different process and is set out in Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011.

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

\(^5\) Established under Section 14D of the National Health Service Act 2006.
5.4 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.

5.5 As with the neighbouring and other local authorities, the Council intends to proactively focus engagement and work with those prescribed bodies and partnerships where their organisations remit covers particular strategic matters and at the appropriate time. As such, dependent on the content and stage of the Local Plan preparation, it may not be necessary to make particular arrangements for engagement with all bodies at each formal stage. Rather it will be essential that, on submission of the Local Plan, the Council can demonstrate that those listed above have been cooperated with at the appropriate point of plan making overall and where it can be of benefit.

5.6 The duty to cooperate should not be a ‘tick box’ exercise and the list of local authorities/bodies and mechanisms for engagement will be subject to regular review to ensure relevant matters to be considered remain up to date.

5.7 It should also be noted that engagement with those which share a strategic matter, will be in addition to general formal consultation as required by regulations. Formal consultation will invite comment from all statutory bodies as part of the plan making process, even where there is no strategic matter to be discussed.

---

6 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.
6 Strategic Matters and Cross Boundary Implications

6.1 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.

6.2 As well as describing in broad terms the strategic matters, categorised under the strategic priorities identified in paragraph 156 of the NPPF, it identifies the planning authorities, prescribed bodies and other consultees that could be impacted by the strategic matter and who the Council will need to proactively engage and work with to seek to address the strategic matter.

6.3 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.

The Strategic Matters

Housing
6.4 The Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement December 2014 sets out the strategic matter of housing up to that date. Since December 2014, the Council have prepared a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which was published alongside the Local Plan: Issues and Approaches consultation in December 2015.

6.5 The SHMA for Tandridge is formed of several technical papers each in compliance with a specific part of the guidance on SHMAs within the PPG. One of the technical papers sets out the Housing Market Area. The HMA is crucial in focussing who Tandridge DC should engage with in regard to the strategic matter of housing.

6.6 The evidence from the SHMA sets out that Tandridge has important housing market relationships with Croydon, Reigate and Banstead and Mid Sussex in particular. The analysis also identifies relationships with a number of other authorities, primarily Sutton, Sevenoaks and Crawley.

6.7 Although Tandridge is not identified as a standalone HMA, it has not been able to produce a joint SHMA with any other authority due to the differing timetables for Local Plan production and associated evidence. However, this has not prejudiced the plan-making process to date and the Council have ensured that engagement with key authorities has taken place and is ongoing.

6.8 A key matter for the Council in its discussions with the neighbouring authorities and those within the wider HMA, has been that of a likely shortfall to meeting the identified Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) as set out in the Council’s SHMA. This has become more evident as additional evidence for the Local Plan has been prepared and a more comprehensive understanding of constraints has been established, including landscape capacity and ecological constraints. As discussions and non-Tandridge consultation exercises have taken place, the Council have set out this position to others and requested assistance with meeting any shortfall should this be possible.
6.9 Through the Local Plan making process, the Council must be able to demonstrate that every effort has been made to meeting the OAN and consider all reasonable alternatives which could enable development needs to be fulfilled. The Council will need to be able to demonstrate and justify any shortfall and more actively approach those authorities in the wider HMA to assist with meeting a need in the first instance. If such engagement proves unsuccessful, the Council will need to look at other options and have already taken steps to ensure an ongoing dialogue with other authorities on this matter so that it may be utilised more fully as and when needed.

6.10 The Local Plan: Sites Consultation does not consider the Objectively Assessed Need, per se, but is a document which consults on the ways in which the OAN could be met, i.e. through individual sites and new or extended settlements. Evidence continues to be gathered and until this consultation has taken place and the Council have chosen a preferred development strategy, it is not possible to identify if, or how much of the OAN can be met on sites within the district and therefore no detailed discussions or engagement regarding this has taken place and therefore no key actions have arisen. However, it is important to note what has taken place since the 2015 update was prepared, or where existing mechanisms remain in place and where it could impact upon housing. This is set out in table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with</th>
<th>Authorities outside the HMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMA Authorities</td>
<td>Authorities outside the HMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mid-Sussex DC</td>
<td>• Wealden DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reigate &amp; Banstead BC</td>
<td>• Crawley BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sevenoaks DC</td>
<td>• Horsham DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sutton LBC</td>
<td>• Epsom &amp; Ewell BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bromley LBC</td>
<td>• Mole Valley DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Croydon LBC</td>
<td>• Mayor for London/GLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Surrey County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lambeth LBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lewisham LBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Southwark LBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kingston upon Thames LBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Elmbridge BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Runnymede BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Spelthorne BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Surrey Heath BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guildford BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Waverley BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Woking BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• West Sussex County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• East Sussex County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kent County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Homes and Communities Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Nature Partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Duty to Cooperate on Housing
Between the Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement update of December 2015 and Local Plan: Sites Consultation (2016), the Council have been continuing to prepare and collate evidence which will inform the delivery strategy. In addition to the statutory consultation requirements, the Council has provided the main HMA authorities with pre-consultation information in terms of what the document would include for consultation. Direct meetings with authorities will take place during the formal consultation period.

In addition the other activities with the duty to cooperate bodies have been ongoing:

1. Workshop to inform the methodologies for the Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Assessment and Site-based Ecology Assessments (March 2016)
2. Memorandum of Understanding signed with Mid Sussex. Will be reviewed at the appropriate point in Tandridge’s plan making when the number of homes it can deliver are understood.
3. Continued involvement in the preparation of the Local Strategic Statement (LSS) for Surrey
4. Continued work on an update to the joint Local Strategic Statement with all relevant authorities within the Gatwick Diamond area
5. General ‘duty’ meetings/teleconferences with Sevenoaks, Mid Sussex, Reigate and Banstead and Croydon to discuss their emerging evidence, housing numbers and allocations and plan making stages. Discussions on Tandridge’s unmet need were noted but until a preferred approach is determined the level of unmet need could vary and therefore will be an ongoing discussion and an updated position will be set out in the Regulation 19 duty to cooperate statement.
6. Further Regulation 18 consultation on Local Plan: Sites Consultation (November 2016 – December 2016) including pre-consultation with east surrey and neighbouring authorities, as well as Surrey and Sussex County Councils (September 2016)

What will happen next up to Regulation 19?

1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation
2. Continue progressing the Surrey LSS and the Gatwick Diamond LSS
3. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression
4. Another Duty to Cooperate meeting to update authorities on refined approach and preferred approach
5. Continue to with internal partners in relation to affordable housing needs.
6. Seek opportunities for joint evidence bases, where appropriate

Other Housing considerations – London and Gatwick

6.11 Whilst table 1 sets out the refined and focussed approach to duty to cooperate in regard to housing, there are two factors that are outside Tandridge’s control but which could have a significant impact on the amount of housing that Tandridge may be required to provide. These are London’s growth set out in the Further Alternations to the Local Plan, including its review in 2016 and the proposed second runway at Gatwick.

London

6.12 Tandridge have been involved through South East England Councils (SECC) and South East Strategic Leaders (SESL) in the discussions with the Greater London Authority (GLA). The
Council participated in the debate at the Wider South East Summit in December 2015 and will continue to engage with the GLA.

6.13 Tandridge are also in contact and engaging at a local level with the London Boroughs where there is a direct link, particularly those within the Housing Market Area. The details of which are set out in Table 1.

Gatwick

6.14 Since December 2014 when the scoping statement was published, the Airport Commission held a number of consultations on different evidence base documents. Whilst the Council felt there were some discrepancies within the evidence base documents and assumptions being used, as well as some of the major issues not being addressed, the Airport Commission published their recommendation on 6th July 2015. The recommendation was for the expansion to occur at Heathrow.

6.15 At the time of writing (October 2016), the Government has announced its support for the expansion of Heathrow as their preferred choice. However, it is important to note that this decision is still subject to a formal government consultation and does not preclude the possibility that Gatwick Airport will seek expansion independently and through normal planning channels. A watching brief will be kept on this matter and Tandridge Council are continuing to work closely with Gatwick Diamond authorities and this will be a key matter for discussion going forward, particularly in relation to the content of the Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement, which is being prepared. Tandridge have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with all the authorities within the Gatwick Diamond to further emphasise the importance of joint working.

6.16 A Gatwick Officer Group reports any evolving information to the Gatwick Joint Leaders.

Travellers

6.17 The Surrey authorities have a shared methodology in relation to how to undertake a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. This methodology was agreed in 2012. However, since that date a number of things have changed and need to be given further consideration:

- The Government updated the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document, which primarily altered the planning definition for travellers and proposed a change to the housing definition in the Housing and Planning Bill 2015;

- Some research has been undertaken by Opinion Research Services (ORS) 2015\(^7\), which discredits the use of 3% traveller household formation rate. This has been

backed up by Government\textsuperscript{8}, stating that the 3\% was never a fixed number for calculating traveller need; and

- Gypsy and traveller assessments have been tested through appeals.

6.18 The Council have worked with Surrey authorities to understand if there is an appetite to update the methodology and a Surrey Traveller Accommodation Methodology Review Group was set up. Whilst it is understood that some authorities are not ready to review the methodology, Tandridge District Council (TDC) along with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council (RBBC) and Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) felt that it was an appropriate time to work together to update the traveller accommodation assessment which is in line with respective plan-making timescales. The authorities commissioned Opinion Research Services (ORS) to carry out the new assessment.

6.19 As a result, TDC, EBC and RBBC have opted for a new methodology prepared by ORS and have felt that this better reflects the updated definition for traveller and the PPTS. Whilst this has meant a departure from the Surrey-wide TAA Methodology 2012, the position taken is felt to be a more robust one and much cooperation has gone on in arriving at this decision.

6.20 The update to the Council’s GTAA is underway and will be utilised to inform the Regulation 19 draft of the Local Plan.

### Table 2 – Duty to Cooperate on Travellers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with</th>
<th>Wider area to share data with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorities working on joint study with</strong></td>
<td><strong>Surrey authorities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reigate and Banstead Borough Council</td>
<td>• Gatwick Diamond authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elmbridge Borough Council</td>
<td>• Wealden District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sevenoaks District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Homes and Communities Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions taken**

1. Commenced an update of the Council’s Traveller Accommodation Assessment
2. Other meetings and correspondence with Surrey wide and relevant authorities to discuss their emerging evidence, gypsy and traveller allocation and any unmet need. Discussions on Tandridge’s unmet need were noted but until a preferred option is determined the level of unmet need could vary and therefore will be an ongoing discussion and an updated position will be set out in the Regulation 19 Duty to Cooperate Statement.
3. More proactive Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment process to identify sites December 2015 – October 2016
4. Regulation 18 consultation on considered sites (November 2016 – December 2016)

**What will happen next up to Regulation 19?**

1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation

\textsuperscript{8} \url{http://www.local.gov.uk/planning/-/journal_content/56/10180/6137165/ARTICLE}
2. Undertake the traveller accommodation assessment with RBBC and EBC;
3. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression
4. Another Duty to Cooperate meeting to update authorities on refined approaches and preferred approach

**Employment**

6.21 Taking into account the different elements of the Functional Economic Area (FEA) study it is proposed that Tandridge is considered to be a self-contained functional economic area for the purposes of Local Planning Policy. However, some of the elements considered in the report indicate that self-containment is modest with: Croydon; Reigate and Banstead; Crawley; Mid Sussex; and Sevenoaks. These Local Authorities are classed as the ‘wider functional economic area’ and it is considered that the Council will need to engage with them as part of the Duty to Cooperate. Although the ties are weaker there are also economic links with Bromley and Wealden, and under the duty to cooperate the Council will continue to work with these organisations during the preparation of the Plan to ensure that a consistent approach to economic spatial planning is taken.

6.22 The Economic Needs Assessment identifies that Tandridge District can meet its own employment needs through intensification of the existing employment areas within the district.

6.23 However, Tandridge recognise that other areas may not be able to meet their own economic needs and as such Tandridge would be willing to discuss ongoing and effective cooperation with other authorities on this strategic matter. It is important to note that this approach may be at risk with loss of employment to residential through permitted development. Consequently, the Council will have to monitor the situation accordingly and investigate methods such as Article 4 directions to safeguard employment areas within the district as appropriate.

6.24 Table 3 sets out the authorities that employment needs to be discussed with, any actions taken and what happens next.

**Table 3 – Duty to Cooperate on Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with</th>
<th>Authorities within the FEA</th>
<th>Authorities outside the FEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorities within the FEA</strong></td>
<td>• London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>• Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sevenoaks District Council</td>
<td>• Other Gatwick Diamond Authorities (including Surrey County Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reigate and Banstead Borough Council</td>
<td>• Mayor for London/GLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mid Sussex District Council</td>
<td>• Transport for London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Crawley Borough Council</td>
<td>• Highways England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wealden District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• London Borough of Bromley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Continued joint working on the Surrey Local Strategic Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Continued joint working on the Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Other meetings with LEP, Gatwick Diamond Authorities, and other relevant authorities
4. Regulation 18 Local Plan: Sites Consultation (November 2016 – December 2016)

What will happen next up to Regulation 19?

1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation
2. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression
3. Another Duty to Cooperate meeting to update authorities on refined approaches and preferred approach

Retail and Leisure

6.25 The quantitative analysis in the Retail and Leisure Study is based on a defined study area that covers the catchment areas of the main shopping destinations in the District. For the purposes of this study the Tandridge District authority boundary has been adopted as the study area. Given the relatively low position of Tandridge’s centres within the shopping hierarchy and the strength of competing centres within neighbouring authorities, the primary catchment areas of centres within the district are unlikely to extend into neighbouring authorities. However, it is recognised that neighbouring authorities, such as Croydon (where Westfield is), Mid Sussex (where East Grinstead are), Reigate and Banstead (where Redhill, Reigate and Horley are) and Crawley (where Crawley town centre is) play an important retail and leisure role for Tandridge District residents.

6.26 The planning policy team have worked closely with the economic development team to understand how the Local Plan could help with the BIDs. However, this is not technically an element for the duty to cooperate.

6.27 The preparation of the Local Plan: Sites Consultation has not necessitated any additional work on retail facilities and no duty related actions have arisen. However, Caterham Town Centre Masterplan continues to be prepared and Tandridge District Council will keep relevant neighbouring authorities updated on this at duty to cooperate meetings.

Table 4 – Duty to Cooperate on Retail and Leisure

Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

- London Borough of Croydon
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Mid Sussex District Council
- Crawley Borough Council

Actions taken

1. Regulation 18 Local Plan: Sites Consultation (November 2016 – December 2016)
2. Continued joint working on the preparation of the Surrey Local Strategic Statement

What will happen next up to Regulation 19?

1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation
2. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression
3. Another Duty to Cooperate meeting to update authorities on refined options and preferred option
Infrastructure

6.28 For all infrastructure, two cross boundary studies have been prepared. The Surrey County Council Infrastructure Study looks at provision for infrastructure now and in the future (up to 2030) across Surrey, and identifies potential funding gaps. The other study is the Gatwick Diamond Infrastructure Study, which builds upon the Surrey and West Sussex Infrastructure Studies and considers the impact on infrastructure from Gatwick with one runway and with a second runway up to 2050.

Water Supply

6.29 The Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement December 2014 identified water supply as a strategic issue however, the Council is not aware of any likely need to provide significant new infrastructure for this 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. Nothing has changed since the publication of the scoping statement.

Waste and Minerals

6.30 Waste and minerals for the district are valid considerations and important to the discussions of the duty to cooperate. SCC Waste and Minerals are in the process of updating their own Waste and Minerals Plan and provides a good opportunity for discussion and liaison on similar plan making timescales.

6.31 A number of meetings were held with the Waste and Minerals team to discuss the emerging Sites Consultation document and to also discuss their own safeguarding protocols etc. The SCC team have also been able to get more actively involved in the discussions regarding Tandridge Local Plan now that specific sites are being considered. However, until a preferred delivery strategy for the Local Plan is determined and the sites which are to be included in the Regulation 19 document are known – it was not possible comment in detail.

6.32 It is evident however, that the Local Plan: Sites Consultation, does not conflict with the emerging Waste and Minerals Plan, but the safeguarded sites for minerals, particularly along the A25, is noted and will be considered further as the Local Plan evolves.

6.33 The Council also met with those responsible for waste and refuse matters within the Council and identified that there may be a need for a new civic amenities site should the opportunity arise. It was indicated that more information would be needed in terms of the precise sites that would be included in the final local plan, before detailed comments could be made. However, it was not felt that the new or extended settlement options would present an issue as the development would need to be designed to accommodate refuse vehicles etc and contracts with existing collection services could be amended to cover the additional demand.

Waste Water
6.34 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. Nothing has changed since the publication of the scoping statement.

Flooding

6.35 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.

6.36 There are a number of flood alleviation projects being carried out by Surrey County Council as the Local Lead Flood Authority, within the District. However, as river catchments don’t follow the administrative boundaries there are two significant pieces of work that are being carried out in conjunction with a number of other organisations.

6.37 **Caterham Bourne Flood Alleviation Project** is looking to identify mid to long term measures to reduce and manage the flood risks along Caterham Bourne. The project will improve understanding of the catchment to help investigate and develop options. The options will be assessed to identify which would provide the maximum economic, environmental and social benefits with the available funding and contributions. The Local Plan will play a key role in assisting with the delivery of the chosen option and for this reason a Tandridge District Planning Officer is a member of the project team. Other members are:

- Croydon Council
- Surrey County Council
- Environment Agency
- Thames Water
- Sutton and East Surrey Water
- Network Rail

6.38 **Burstow Flood Alleviation Project** was initially set up to undertake an assessment of flood risk management options at Smallfield following the allocation of £30k from the EA’s Local Levy. However, following a meeting with Reigate and Banstead it was decided to carry out a joint study covering the Burstow catchment to look at flooding to the north of Horley. The project board has commissioned Atkins to carry out the study and this is ongoing. The group consists of: Tandridge District Council, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, Surrey County Council and the Environment Agency.

6.39 **Smallfield Flood Alleviation Scheme.** Work has been undertaken to develop a flood alleviation scheme to reduce the risk of future flooding, following the extreme flooding that impacted Smallfield during December 2013. The intention is to develop a solution that incorporates natural processes so as to utilise more natural measures such as upstream storage and increased wash lands. The expected completion date is September 2020. The Environment Agency/Surrey County Council will seek to utilise Flood Defence Grant in Aid funding for the majority of costs but is likely to require an additional element of partnership funding. CIL funding was applied for and approved by Planning Policy Committee on 15 September 2016.
Table 5 – Duty to Cooperate on Flooding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Medway Drainage Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Diamond Authorities (including Surrey County Council and West Sussex County Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Bromley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealden District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton and East Surrey Water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ongoing meetings with the EA, Reigate and Banstead, Croydon and other relevant authorities to discuss emerging evidence and potential flood risk issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meetings with the Caterham Bourne Flood Alleviation Project Board. It is anticipated that the findings and recommendations will be delivered in late 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Meetings with the Burstow Stream Flood Alleviation Project Board. Consultants have been appointed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Regulation 18 consultation on options and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (December 2015 – February 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A further update to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared to accompany the Local Plan: Sites Consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Regulation 18 Local Plan: Sites Consultation (November 2016 – December 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What will happen next up to Regulation 19?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Another Duty to Cooperate meeting to update authorities on refined approaches and preferred approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The formulation of the Regulation 19 document will consider the findings of the Caterham Bourne and the Burstow Flood Alleviation Schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Potential to work with any neighbouring authorities on SFRA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other infrastructure

6.40 Other infrastructure can include transport, highways, emergency services and Green Infrastructure. The Council have prepared an Infrastructure Baseline Study (IBS) Part 1 and Part 2 which supported the Local Plan: Issues and Approaches Regulation 18 consultation in 2015/16. Part 1 of the IBS sets out current capacity issues in the infrastructure and Part 2 sets out potential issues with the infrastructure following implementation of the different delivery strategies for homes and employment within the Local Plan.
Service providers were invited in May 2016 (see Appendix A) to meet with the Council between mid-August to early September 2016. The purpose of the meetings were to share with Service Providers information regarding the next iteration of the Local Plan so as to ensure that any issues were identified and so that any factors relating to site assessment could be flagged up. Meetings with internal partners were also held to identify where opportunities and/or problems for services such as parks, housing and refuse, were also considered.

The Council also held meetings with Highway England, Surrey County Council Highways, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and the South East Coast Ambulance Service, see details below:

**Highway England (HE)**

There is no local scheme planned for the district in the next five years, unless there is a shift in government policy which necessitates a review. Further discussions would need to be had with HE to discuss any major transport interventions, such as new junctions on motorways and significant economic benefit would need to be demonstrated before this could be considered and subsequently justified.

The Council will continue to work with HE and SCC Transport as the plan progresses and which will inform the additional transport modelling which will take place in 2017 and be used to inform the Local Plan.

**Surrey Fire and Rescue Service**

Tandridge falls within Surrey Fire & Rescue’s East Area and coverage is provided by three stations: Lingfield, which is on call only at night and on weekends, and Godstone and Oxted which are manned twenty four hours, every day. At present, access to the north-eastern part of the district for fire vehicles is challenging as a result of small roads, which needs to be taken into account in determining the Council’s delivery strategy. With regard to the prospect of a new or extended settlement, it was suggested that the existing fire station at Godstone could manage any increase in population and development within Godstone itself and neighbouring Blindley Heath. Large scale development in the far south of the District, i.e. Copthorne, would not be as easily accommodated.

**The South East Coast Ambulance Service**

No issues were raised regarding the objectively assessed housing need of the District, and it was not anticipated that it would have an impact on service delivery. The service is looking to open a “make ready” centre in the Banstead area as a starting point for each ambulance and support staff. The set-up will involve a make-ready station where the ambulances are cleaned and prepared, freeing up paramedic time.

Recruitment is highlighted as an issue in the service. However, there are community first respondents (volunteers) throughout the district with concentration on areas where an ambulance may take longer to get to. The respondents can get to an emergency situation while an ambulance makes its way to the person(s) in need/patient.
Health and community wellbeing

Health service provision including Surrey County Council Adult Social Care

6.48 The amount of additional health service provision that is required is dependent on what delivery strategy the Council chooses. The Council have had discussions with the East Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG) to identify the CCG’s own proposed strategies for the delivery of health care and how the Council’s Local Plan might impact/benefit from this. These discussions included the involvement of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council to understand where there may be opportunities for cross boundary provision.

6.49 The Infrastructure Baseline Study, Part 1 and Part 2, provide further information on the health care needed up to 2033. The main things discussed include:

- A new type of health hub that provides most services and diverts people away from hospital; and
- 4 health care hubs – split across Tandridge District and Reigate and Banstead Borough;
  - Over subscription in some of the surgeries within the District.

6.50 Between the 2015/16 consultation on the Issues and Approaches document and the consultation on the Local Plan: Sites Consultation (2016), the Council met with some of the local GP Practices (Oxted, Whyteleafe and Lingfield), the East Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), and Surrey County Council Adult Social Care. The main things that were discussed are outlined below with further details in Table 8:

- GP Practices: over-subscription of the surgeries in the District, difficulty with recruitment, constraint to expand which may be due to a small site, no room for expansion or financial constraint. An added issue for GP’s, particularly in the southern areas of the District is that GP Practices in East Grinstead are no longer taking new patients and consequently further pressure is placed elsewhere. Lingfield GP has felt this most keenly.
- CCG: the matters which were discussed and included in the Infrastructure Baseline Study Part 1 and Part 2 were mentioned. The question was raised of the number of additional people that would warrant the need for a new GP Practice was not clarified but land availability was highlighted as a main factor. With lack of land availability preventing the provision of new GP Practices or where a small practice which needs to expand can relocate to. An additional challenge highlighted by the CCG was that the business model for PC/Partner is not generally attractive to younger GPs.
- Adult social care provision across the country under review but main challenges were land availability for facilities and the affordability of housing for carers to support the population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6 – Duty to Cooperate on Health Service Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- East Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NHS England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Surrey and Sussex Healthcare Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Director of Public Health (via Surrey County Council)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Local primary care providers (GPs, Dentists and pharmacists)
- London Borough of Croydon
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Sevenoaks DC
- Mid Sussex District Council
- Surrey County Council Adult Social Care

**Actions taken**

1. Discussions with the East Surrey CCG, NHS England and Surrey Healthcare Trust to understand existing capacity issues and potential issues.
2. Adult social care difficulties providing housing in the district for carers. Need to see soon to be completed strategy for adult social care

**What will happen next up to Regulation 19?**

1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation
2. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression
3. Take account of health service provision when preparing the preferred delivery strategy for the Local Plan.
4. Preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule to accompany the Regulation 19 draft of the Local Plan
5. Further meetings and discussion with relevant bodies and partners to discuss the Council’s preferred delivery strategy, which will subsequently assist in refining the strategy and the Local Plan
6. Continue to discuss implications of development on health service with service providers and incorporate into an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.
7. Commence a revision of the Community Infrastructure Levy to identify where additional funding can come from once the Regulation 19 document is completed and the Council are confident in what their submitted document will contain.
8. Update and roll forward infrastructure projects and available funding into the Surrey Infrastructure Study; looking at opportunities for cross boundary working.

**Security**

6.51 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**

6.52 It is logical to assume that there may be a need for additional schools to meet population growth. However, until the delivery strategy for the Local Plan is known and the final housing target has been identified, it is not possible to calculate how many additional school places will be required or where they should be provided.

6.53 Some existing school places (mainly at secondary level) are provided outside the District with children attending schools in Croydon, Old Coulsdon, Redhill and Horley and there may be scope for some additional provision to be made outside the District. The ability to access school places is a matter that is important to plan making and the Council will continue to discuss this with all relevant partners to ensure that the need for a new or upgraded school is highlighted at the earliest opportunity.
The Council met with the SCC Education department as part of ongoing discussions. The main things discussed include:

- Demand which is high in the district both at primary and secondary level, although at present there is some capacity at secondary level.
- The threshold for providing a new school depends on the capacity of an existing school to expand its intake (size and whether there is room for expansion). If there is no capacity in the local area, a school is likely to be required.
- SCC Education would prefer to discuss the necessity of a new or upgraded school at a point where a defined delivery strategy is in place and sites are known so they can reflect on the local context.

Road Networks

In preparing the Issues and Approaches document on 2015, the Council worked with Surrey County Council (SCC) to run strategic transport modelling which identified if and where issues in the road network existed, or where they could arise due to development. More information can be found in the Strategic Highways Assessment Report 2015. The transport modelling was carried out at a ‘high-level’ and will need significant refinement to inform the Local Plan which will be submitted to the Planning Inspector for examination.

In preparing the Local Plan: Sites Consultation document, the Council met with Surrey County Council (Transport) to provide an update on the status on the progress of the Plan and to highlight the sites being considered and the locations of the new and extended settlements that were being assessed. SCC confirmed a preference for development to take place in and around existing settlements where sustainable infrastructure is already in place. It was acknowledged that improvements will need to be provided in order to meet growth but stated that funding for improvements would be more limited for smaller developments and infilling in comparison to a large new or extended settlement option where developer contributions can be secured to provide new roads, improved bus services and cycling routes.

Concerns relating to the discounted new and extended options at Hobbs Industrial Estate and Horne were discussed.

An agreement for continued working between TDC and SCC (Transport) is in place with necessary discussions to update respective parties on timetables and aspects of the modelling process which will be much more keenly embarked on in 2017.

Table 7 – Duty to Cooperate on Education and Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Surrey County Council (as Education and Highways authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- London Borough of Croydon (as Education, Highways and as Planning authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- West Sussex County Council (as Education and Highways authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- East Sussex County Council (as Education and Highways authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Kent County Council (as Education and Highways authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sevenoaks District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mid Sussex District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Crawley District Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• London Borough of Sutton (as Education, Highways and as Planning authority)
• London Borough of Bromley (as Education, Highways and as Planning authority)
• Highways England

Actions taken

1. Discussed education requirements with SCC and input into the SCC education monitoring
2. Engaged in the undertaking of the Surrey Infrastructure Study and Gatwick Diamond Infrastructure Study
3. Regulation 18 consultation on Local Plan: Issues and Approaches (December 2015 – February 2016)
4. Regulation 18 Local Plan: Sites Consultation (November 2016 – December 2016)

What will happen next up to Regulation 19?

1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation
2. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression
3. Take account of education and road network issues when refining the delivery strategy for the Local Plan
4. Update the transport and education models with refined information to ensure proper testing of options before arriving at the Regulation 19 Plan
5. Continue to discuss implications of development on education and highways with service providers and incorporate into an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.
6. Start revision of the Community Infrastructure Levy to identify where additional funding can come from.
7. Update and roll forward infrastructure projects and available funding into the Surrey Infrastructure Study; looking at opportunities for cross boundary working.

Other community and cultural infrastructure

6.59 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. However, discussions between Croydon and Sutton are being had on this duty to cooperate issue. Tandridge District Council will also be assessing its own need to provide burial space in due course and this information will be utilised to inform the Regulation 19 iteration of the Local Plan.

6.60 Other cross boundary matters could include walking, cycling and riding routes that link across administrative boundaries. As part of the East Surrey work on tourism, there is an initiative to join up sporting events and advertise the facilities for these activities. EU funding from the LEP has been secured to help this initiative. As such, in preparing planning policy, consideration will need to be given to Green Infrastructure and tourism, and has been raised in discussions through duty to cooperate meetings and embedded into both the Gatwick Diamond and Surrey Local Strategic Statements.

Table 8 – Duty to Cooperate on other community and cultural infrastructure

Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

• London Borough of Croydon
• London Borough of Bromley
• Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
### Actions Taken

1. Engaged in the undertaking of the Surrey Infrastructure Study and Gatwick Diamond Infrastructure Study
2. Regulation 18 consultation Local Plan: Issues and Approaches (December 2015 – February 2016)
3. Regulation 18 Local Plan: Sites Consultation (November 2016 – December 2016)
4. Continued joint working on the Surrey wide Local Strategic Statement
5. Continued joint working on the Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement

### What will happen next up to Regulation 19?

1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation
2. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression
3. Take account of Green Infrastructure, tourism and encouraging sustainable modes of transport when determining the delivery strategy for the Local Plan
4. Continue to discuss Green Infrastructure with service providers and incorporate into an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.
5. Start revision of the Community Infrastructure Levy to identify where additional funding can come from;
6. Update and roll forward infrastructure projects and available funding into the Surrey Infrastructure Study; looking at opportunities for cross boundary working; and
7. Keep a watching brief on the Croydon cemetery issue.
8. Undertake Tandridge-specific needs assessment for burial space and discuss this with other local authorities and relevant parties. Use this to inform the Regulation 19 draft of the Local Plan.

### Climate change, Conservation, and the Environment

6.61 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 transferral of responsibility for various energy and water standards to be met by Building Regulations instead of the Planning system, 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

#### Ashdown Forest

6.62 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
The Council have updated the Appropriate Assessment Stage 1 Screening for the Local Plan – Issues and Approaches (Regulation 18 consultation document). The Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) screening identified that alone or in combination, it could have a significant impact on any European sites, namely the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA and the Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment SAC and therefore further assessment would be required as the plan progresses.

6.63 The further assessment is required for a number of reasons:

- Natural England has more recently drawn the Ashdown Forest SPA 7km zone of influence to include parts of Tandridge;
- Wealden District Council policy on the Ashdown Forest which included the 7km zone of influence and mitigation measures was removed following a High Court decision;
- Further assessment (most likely through visitor surveys) are required to understand where people are travelling from to visit the Ashdown Forest;
- Uncertainty on potential mitigation; mainly through the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANG); and
- Before the delivery strategy for the Local Plan is determined and without knowing where development is going, the impact on the Ashdown Forest is unknown.

6.64 Following these changes, Tandridge District Council has become more involved in discussions relating to the Ashdown Forest and the potential mitigation strategies, which are set out in table 9 below. A joint project with the authorities effected by the Ashdown Forest is underway and all authorities continue to work together to try and achieve a comprehensive approach to mitigation. The outcome of which will inform the policy which is to be included in both the Tandridge Local Plan and that of others.

Heritage

6.65 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.

Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

6.66 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 District continues into Kent, into West Sussex and East Sussex.

6.67 Management Plans prepared by the respective AONB bodies on behalf of the local authorities that have the AONBs in their areas, provide a framework 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.

Area of Greater Landscape Value (AGLV)

6.68 The Areas of Greater Landscape Value have been an prominent part of planning policies across Surrey for some time and relate to areas in proximity to the Surrey Hills AONB. The AGLV policy was set out in the now revoked Surrey Structure Plan and as such cannot be justifiably carried forward as a landscape designation in the long term. In an attempt to ensure that the supportive nature the AGLV had for the setting of the Surrey Hills AONB, remains in some form, a review of the Surrey Hills AONB will be undertaken.

6.69 The first stage of this has been to prepare a landscape character area study, which spans across the entire Surrey area and was carried out jointly with the majority of other Surrey authorities, led by the landscape team at the County Council. The next step is to work with Natural England and the Surrey AONB unit in determining the appropriate boundaries of the AONB. However, this work is ongoing and unlikely to be finished until after 2017.

6.70 The Surrey Landscape Character Assessment may provide the evidence to put in place new local landscape designations which could also provide a valuable opportunity to work with other authorities to create new shared landscape designations and this will be considered as the plan making process moves forward and discussed with key partners through Duty to Cooperate meetings.

Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity

6.71 As part of the preparation of the Local Plan: Sites Consultation, the Council has undertaken landscape work that goes beyond that of the Surrey Landscape Character Assessment and looks at the landscape of Tandridge and its ability to take development without being irrevocably altered. Given the valued rural and open nature of the district, it is considered important to recognise the landscape as a constraint to development and to understand if, how and where it presents a notable barrier.

6.72 Hankinson Duckett Associates were commissioned to carry out this work for the Council and in doing so, and in recognition of the fact that landscape is not constrained by administrative borders, key partners were invited to feed in to the methodology used to undertake this work. Appendix B sets out those that were in attendance and the outcomes of this.

Ecology

6.73 In addition to the Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Study, the Council commissioned consultants, The Environment Partnership, to carry out site-based ecology assessments to inform the preparation of the Local Plan: Sites Consultation. Key partners including Surrey Wildlife Trust and other authorities were invited to discuss the project ahead of its commencement, with the consultants. This resulted in a refinement of the methodology process and is seen as a valuable piece of work by the County Ecologists. Further details of the meeting and the outcomes is set out in Appendix B.

Sites of Conservation Importance (SNCI)
The Council has over 250 Sites of Conservation Importance (SNCIs) and potential SNCIs. The Council has been working with Surrey Wildlife Trust to review those with a potential SNCIs status, to support their allocation in the Local Plan. This work has also assisted in Neighbourhood Plans and the allocation of Local Green Spaces and is ongoing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9 – Duty to cooperate on Landscape and the Natural Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mid-Sussex District Council – re SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wealden District Council – re SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tunbridge Wells Borough Council – re SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lewes District Council – re SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Nature Partnership – re BOAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surrey County Council (SCC) – re Landscape and Surrey Hills AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Natural England (NE) – re SAC and Surrey Hills AONB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions Taken**

1. Signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the above authorities and the Conservators of the Ashdown Forest for the preparation of a Strategic Access Monitoring and Mitigation document
2. Commenced the joint working on the Strategic Access Monitoring and Mitigation
3. Continued the review of potential Sites of Conservation Interest with Surrey Wildlife Trust
4. Regulation 18 consultation on options and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (December 2015 – February 2016)
5. Obtained buy in from key partners into the methodologies applied in undertaking the Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Study and Site-based Ecology Assessments.

**What will happen next up to Regulation 19?**

1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation
2. Determine a suitable zone of influence for Tandridge District Council
3. Work with neighbouring authorities to agree on use of SANGs or other mitigation measures. If not, the Council will have to consider whether there is a need to provide a mitigation measure (a SANG or similar) if the delivery strategy or development is to be located within the zone of influence from the Ashdown Forest
4. Continue reviewing SNCIs and consider results when allocating sites
5. Continue working with SCC, NE and Surrey Hills AONB unit on AONB review.
6. Carry out further landscape and ecology works as needed to assist in refining the plan and arriving at a preferred delivery strategy.
**LOCAL PLAN INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

**TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL & TDC Community Service**

11 August 2016

Participants: Steve Hyder (Community Service, TDC), Simon Mander (Community Service, TDC), Marie Killip (Planning Policy, TDC), M. Ngaluaf (Planning Policy, TDC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Update with progress on the Local Plan (LP) and current status</strong></td>
<td>MK explained the LP process, timetable, the difference from the last consultation and the current approach. We are now looking on a site by site basis and putting together evidence based studies which are critical in informing the direction of the LP. Several evidence based documents will need to be prepared to enable the refinement of a delivery strategy. Two of these documents include the Landscape study and Ecology study (see more details below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Draft Documents** | MK went through the plans, explaining the process. Part of the work being carried out by the team includes:  
- Refining the Green Belt in what is being referred to as GB Part 2.  
- Sites are categorised: green = existing urban sites which can come forward; amber = still in the process of being considered and red=have been ruled out of the planning process. |
| **Broad Areas** | Part of the work being carried out is looking at strategic sites and the consideration of potential new settlements/urban expansion. Seven areas have been identified: Lingfield, Copthorne, Horne, Bindley Heath, S. Godstone and Lambs and Hobbs. Key issues are:  
- Identifying infrastructure requirements  
- Impact on Service Providers’ services |
From a Waste and Recycling perspective, it was pointed out that phasing is important as it can be absorbed potentially via Saturday collection. The effects of SCC cuts and potential pressure on services and understanding what the impacts maybe.

| Information on the Ecology and Landscape studies | Two studies that have been carried out that will enable the refinement of the delivery strategy are:  
1) Landscape study – which helps to identify where development could be accommodated and avoided.  
2) Ecology study which is site based and looks at the ecological value of sites. |
| Service Providers Views | Question raised by Waste/Recycling:  
• Is there a parcel of land available which can potential be used as a civic site, as we are badly serviced for civic amenity sites.  
• Current contract is coming up for renewal, there is no limit on the number of household; it is based on cost per household  
• To raise with SCC is the opportunity for a new CRC - MK/MNG (note – this has been taken forward with SCC on the meeting that took place on 12/08/2016) |
| What is required from the Council | Parks/Open Space  
If the preferred strategy is a new settlement/urban development - need to know the Council’s obligation as an organisation to take care of verges, landscape, play areas, and open space which puts a massive financial burden on the Council.  
Open Space sites to be considered by Dec 2016 through Resources Committee. |
| Timetable implications | • Waste contract is coming up for renewal in 2019  
• Cross boundary issues  
• Need to look at the Surrey Waster Partnership Strategy (waste plan with partnership) to identify issues or opportunities  
• Population growth would need to be accounted for in waste contract to ensure service delivery |
| Are there any opportunities for joint working/strategic | Waste/Recycling  
• With significant development, there is the need to explore the possibility of new recycling sites. |
| **projects that we could benefit from, or feed into?** | • To get involved throughout and feed into the process to ensure that developments are fit for purpose on parking, collection layout which need to be sufficient.  
• Godstone as a location provides an opportunity location and has the existing road access  
• 48 grit lorries @ depot, some are moving out to Merrow and Bare Green. So transport implications of moving would not be as severe and probably less vehicle movements. Commitment to feed into the process through engagement and formal comments to the LP Consultations – SH/SM  
•  
| **Park/Open Space** | • Policy to look at the Capital Refurbishment Document produced by Community Service which looks at existing provision and costing. |
### Update with progress on the LP and current status

- PM gave an update on the Local Plan. In the Reg. 18 Consultation in Dec – Feb 2016, all the HELAA sites were shown.
- The Council is exploring all the housing options and, as the plan progress, it will become more focussed and only then can the true effect on services be identified. However, the meeting provides an opportunity to give an update and identify any current issues and/or potential effects on each service.
- Update was given regarding the additional round of Regulation 18 Consultation, which is more on a site-by-site basis
- No decision has been made on the delivery strategy, where developments are to take place and the number of houses to be delivered.
- At present, further technical assessment documents are being prepared to inform the LP such as the Landscape and Ecology studies to refine the preferred sites.
- The position with the Waste and Minerals Plan was noted

### Draft Documents

- Maps
  - The indicative broad areas were shown on a district-wide map (Blindley Heath, Copthorne, Horne, South Godstone, Limpsfield, Lambs and Hobbs)

### Broad Areas

- Due to the likely shortfall from the OAN, further work is being carried out on one of the options from the Regulation 18 consultation, Approach 6; the Council may have to consider an urban extension or new settlement to meet the government target OAN figure.
- These are indicative locations that have no specific boundaries with a minimum of 2000 dwellings and no set maximum cap.
| Information on the Ecology and Landscape studies | • See note above. |
| Service Providers Views | • SCC will be consulting on the new Surrey Waste Local Plan – Reg. 18 from 2 Sept. 2016  
• It’s a technical document which looks at the criteria for selecting sites with a draft expected by May 2017. |
| What is required of the Council | • Commitment for continuous engagement |
| Timetable implications | • No issues identified |
| Are there any opportunities for joint working/strategic projects that we could benefit from, or feed into? | • The question was asked as to what is SCC’s view if the preferred strategy is a new settlement/urban extension and whether that would warrant a new transfer site.  
A new substantive plan/evidence will be necessary which looks at import and export on the sites, population density, and a number of factors. This evidence would be helpful to support the case for a new site if the need arises.  
• On the recycling sites in the district, the one in Warlingham is programmed for redevelopment, and upgrade.  
• SCC tasked to look at the need capacity for a new transfer site. |
## Topic  | Specific Matter/Issue
--- | ---
**Update with progress on the LP and current status** | - Update was given regarding the additional Regulation 18 Consultation expected to take place in October-December 2016  
- At present, further technical assessment documents are being prepared to inform the LP such as the Landscape and Ecology studies to refine the preferred sites.  
- No decision has been made on the delivery strategy, where developments are to take place and the number of houses to be delivered.

**Map** | - The indicative broad areas were shown on a district-wide map, see details below.  
- The Council is looking at site by site basis for the next round of consultation.

**Broad Areas** | - Further work is being carried out on one of the options from the Regulation 18 consultation, Approach 6 where the Council may have to consider an urban extension or new settlement to meet the government target *Objectively Assessed Housing need*.  
- These are indicative locations with no specific boundaries with a minimum of 2000 dwellings and no set maximum cap.

**Information on the Ecology and Landscape studies** | - See above note under Update with progress on the LP and current status.

**Service Providers’ Views** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is required from the Council</th>
<th>• Commitment for continuous engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timetable implications</td>
<td>• None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any opportunities for joint working/strategic projects that we could benefit from, or feed into?</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• based on demographics, the schools are at full capacity as of the last years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing projects include expansion at Hillcroft Primary School and St Francis, Downs Ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There was an over forecast for the demand in Caterham by 263. Once this projection comes through, additional capacity will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An additional form entry at de Stafford School (secondary) will be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SCC is fully aware that new homes will change the demographics in the district with the number of pupils and school places required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The threshold for providing a new school depends on the capacity of an existing school to expand its intake (size and whether there is room for expansion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If there is no capacity in the local area, a school is likely to be required, although the exact number was not given at the meeting but the preference that SCC is given specific schemes to comment on so they can reflect on the local context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years and</td>
<td>• To take into account in the plan making the early years needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Children centres with access to a range of services. There are existing ones in the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The updated Childcare Sufficiently assessment 2015 report provides an update on supply and demand of childcare services and identify gaps in provision which affects specific groups that have a lower take-up of children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AB to forward to Council the Childcare Sufficiently Assessment 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LOCAL PLAN INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

**TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL & Surrey Fire and Rescue Service**  
**DATE 22 August 2016, 10am, LN Room, Council Office**

**Participants:** Stuart deFraine Ford (Station Commander for Godstone, Oxted and Lingfield Fire Station, Tal Kleiman (TDC) and M. Ngaluaf (TDC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Update with progress on the LP and current status** | • TK explained the Local Plan Process. The Council is exploring all the housing options and, as the plan progress, it will become more focussed and only then can the true effect on services be identified. However, the meeting provides an opportunity to give an update and identify any current issues and/or potential effect on the Fire service.  
• Update was given regarding the additional Regulation 18 Consultation expected to take place in October-December 2016, and the importance of providing official comments. |
| **Draft Documents**                       | • The indicative broad areas were shown on a district-wide map (Blindley Heath, Copthorne, Horne, South Godstone, Limpsfield, Lambs and Hobbs)                                                                                 |
| **Broad Areas**                           | • Further work is being carried out on one of the options from the Regulation 18 consultation; the Council may have to consider an urban extension or new settlement to meet the government target *Objectively Assessed need.*  
• It is important to understand that whether the Council meets its OAN figure of 9400 or not, housing is required in order to serve an increasing population. |
| **Information on the Ecology and Landscape studies** | • Not discussed                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Service Providers’ Views/Information to share | The measured standard Surrey response time is within 10 minutes from when a call is received  
| | The current provision of fire stations in the district is:  
| | 1) Lingfield: on call but only at night and weekends  
| | 2) Oxted: on call 24/7  
| | 3) Godstone: manned 24/7  
| What is required from the Council | Keep service providers updated through continual engagement which is necessary to ensure that the views and feedback from service providers are fed into the Local Plan process.  
| Timetable implications | Not discussed  
| Are there any opportunities for joint working/strategic projects that we could benefit from, or feed into? | Question was asked whether there is capacity for improvements, and based on the shared information, staffing arrangements will need to change.  
| | SdFF mentioned the need to take into account water supply and increase in water pressure with new development (preferably 2 bar or above the water pressure).  
| | On the matter of the broad areas; it was mentioned that development at Godstone would be preferable because there is an existing fire station there that is manned 24/7.  
| | A development in Blindley Heath can be served by the station in Godstone. A new settlement at Copthorne is the least preferred because getting to it would be difficult from either Godstone or Lingfield. Also the nearest fire stations outside the district are at Salford and Reigate.  
| | At present, accessing the north eastern part of the district for fire vehicles is challenging due to the small roads.
## Local Plan Infrastructure Needs

**Tandridge District Council & SCC Fire Department**  
**Date:** 22 August 2016, 2pm

**Participants:**  
Ronnie Godfrey – Oxted GP, Dr David Hill – Oxted GP, Tal Kleiman – TDC and M. Ngaluafe - TDC

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Update with progress on the LP and current status** | TK gave an update on current status of Local Plan  
The Objectively Assessed Housing Need number is 9400, 470/annually.  
The Council is looking at different options that for the delivery of development in the district. |
| **Draft Documents Map**                    | MNG - The Council is considering various options; at this stage no decision has been made as to where development will take place and quantity of housing. |
| **Broad Areas**                            | Leading on from the last Consultation (Reg. 18 on Dec – Feb 2016), one of the Delivery Strategy approaches/option was Approach 6 for an urban extension or new settlement.  
One of the options that the Council is looking at is:  
Building on from Approach 6, further work is being taken to look at broad areas, with no set boundaries, minimum of 2000 dwellings and no set maximum cap.  
The broad areas are at S. Godstone, Blindley Heath, Lingfield, Horne, Copthorne and the Hobbs and Lambs Business Park.  
Emphasised that the Council has not made any decision as to where development will take place and the number of dwellings. |
| **Information on the Ecology and Landscape studies** | Not discussed in detail except it was referred to as some of the technical studies being carried out to inform the Local Plan. |
| **Service Providers’ Views**               | Oxted Practice concerns/issues:  
Recruitment and the fact that physically there is no scope for expansion |
- High number of patients, the patient/doctor ratio
- Accessibility/public transport/parking are also concerns as to their effect on patients getting to the surgery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is required from the Council</th>
<th>Continuous engagement with service providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timetable implications</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Are there any opportunities for joint working/strategic projects that we could benefit from, or feed into? | - Aspiration to have 1 big centre that provides multiple services with perhaps the administration side to another facility  
- A satellite facility within the Oxted/Hurst Green area was something that had been discussed but never materialised.  
- Having two practices would mean GPs dividing their time between the two and would reduce efficiency.  
- Concern raised about the potential effect on Godstone and Lingfield surgery if development were to take place in Blindley Heath. |
**LOCAL PLAN INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**  
**TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL & SCC Adult and Social Care and NHS East Surrey CCG**  
**DATE 25 August 2pm**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update with progress on the LP and current status | • TK gave an update on current status of Local Plan  
• The Objectively Assessed Housing Need number is 9400, 470/annually.  
• The Council is looking at different options for the delivery of development in the district. |
| Draft Documents                            | • MNG - The Council is considering various options; at this stage no decision has been made as to where development will take place and quantity of housing. |
| Broad Areas                                | • Leading on from the last Consultation (Regulation 18, Dec. 2015 – Feb 2016), one of the Delivery Strategy approaches/option was Approach 6 for an urban extension or new settlement.  
• One of the options that the Council is looking at is:  
• Building on from Approach 6, further work is being taken to look at broad areas, with no set boundaries, minimum of 2000 dwellings and no set maximum cap.  
• The broad areas are at S. Godstone, Blindley Heath, Lingfield, Horne, Copthorne and the Hobbs and Lambs Business Park.  
• Emphasised that the Council has not made any decision as to where development will take place and the number of houses. |
| Information on the Ecology and Landscape studies | • Not discussed                                                                                                                                 |
| Service Providers’ Views                   | • Discussion are taking place about the opportunities at Caterham Dene                                                                                                                                               |
- Oxted GP is oversubscribed; Godstone has no room for expansion. With Lingfield GP, the building is small with no room to expand but the CCG is working with the practice to put a plan together. Finding a site is a challenge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is required from the Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any opportunities for joint working/strategic projects that we could benefit from, or feed into?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CCG is looking at developing sustainable GP practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working with Lingfield GP on the prospect of a new build practice and opportunity to extend Caterham Dene so it is fit for purpose beyond a 20 year period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land availability is a major issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The population number that would trigger the need for a new self-contained GP practice was mentioned (a range) but not a definitive figure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Adult Social Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land availability also mentioned as a major challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concern with affordable housing for carers who work in the district but cannot afford to live in the area due to high house prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work is in its final stages looking at care provision as a whole in the county</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LOCAL PLAN INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**  
**TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL & SECAMB**  
**DATE : 01 Sept. 2016**

Participants: Russel Kempton – SECAMB, M. Ngaluafe – TDC Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update with progress on the LP and current status| • MNG explained the Local Plan Process. The Council is exploring all the housing options and, as the plan progress, it will become more focussed and only then can the true effect on services be identified. However, the meeting provides an opportunity to give an update and identify any current issues and/or potential effect on the Fire service.  
  • Update was given regarding the additional Regulation 18 Consultation expected to take place in October-December 2016, and the importance of providing official comments. |
| Draft Documents                                 | • The indicative broad areas were shown on a district-wide map (Blindley Heath, Copthorne, Horne, South Godstone, Limpsfield, Lambs and Hobbs)                                                                               |
| Broad Areas                                     | • Further work is being carried out on one of the options from the Regulation 18 consultation; the Council may have to consider an urban extension or new settlement to meet the government target *Objectively Assessed Need*.  
  • It is important to understand that whether the Council meets its OAN figure of 9400 or not, housing is required in order to serve an increasing population. |
| Information on the Ecology and Landscape studies | Not discussed |
| Service Providers’ Views | Doesn’t foresee any main concerns on the serviced with the OAN figure  
Recruitment is an issue. There are Community First Respondents (volunteers) throughout the district and they concentrate in areas where an ambulance can take longer to get to, Tatsfield for example.  
Current set up: in Caterham which is leased for the next 10 years and South Godstone  
The service is looking to open a community response post at Godstone Fire Station |
| What is required from the Council | Keep Service Providers informed; further meetings will be arranged through the local plan process. |
| Timetable implications | None identified |
| Are there any opportunities for joint working/strategic projects that we could benefit from, or feed into? | In the next five years, a make ready centre is being developed in the Banstead area. The depot serves as the starting point each morning before Ambulance vehicles set out to their community posts  
The number of additional people whereby the current set up/practice of the Ambulance Service would need to be reviewed is in the region of 30,000. |
### LOCAL PLAN INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

**TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL & Highways England (HE)**  
**DATE:** 01 Sept. 2016, 2pm

**Participants:** Heather Archer – HE, Janice Burgess – HE, David Bowie – HE, Piers Mason (TDC), M. Ngaluaf (TDC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update with progress on the LP and current status | • Update was given regarding the additional Regulation 18 Consultation expected to take place in October-December 2016  
• At present, further technical assessment documents are being prepared to inform the LP, such as the Landscape and Ecology studies, to refine the preferred sites.  
• No decision has been made on the delivery strategy, where developments are to take place and the number of houses to be delivered. |
| Draft Documents                                 | • The Council is looking at site by site basis for the next round of consultation                                                                                                                                   |
| Broad Areas                                      | • The indicative broad areas/concept areas are being considered for urban extension/new settlement                                                                                                                |
| Information on the Ecology and Landscape studies | • PM mentioned that the sites consultation in October and the evidence will be applied at sites which are capable and not capable of being delivered due to a number of things such as Landscape, Ecology for example.  |
| Service Providers’ Views                        | • They are aware of the capacity relating to the off slip at Junction 6  
• No local scheme planned at present.                                                                                                                                  |
| What is required from the Council               | • Continuous engagement  
• Share data to be sent to SCC Transport to run the transport model                                                                                                    |
| Timetable implications                          | • None mentioned                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Are there any opportunities for joint working/strategic projects that we could benefit from, or feed into? | • Their view on a new junction if a large development were to come forward – not generally accepted citing cost and length involved. A significant benefit would need to be demonstrated if it was strongly felt that a new junction is required.  
• They would like to see the sites/raw data that we are to give SCC Transport for the transport model.  
• MNG set up meeting with Council, HE and SCC Transport |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update with progress on the LP and current status | - PM gave an update on the local plan work and timetable  
- Update was given regarding the additional round of Regulation 18 Consultation expected to take place in October-December 2016, which is more on a site-by-site basis  
- No decision has been made on the delivery strategy, where developments are to take place and the number of houses to be delivered.  
- At present, further technical assessment documents are being prepared to inform the LP such as the Landscape and Ecology studies to refine the preferred sites. |
| Draft Documents                            | - The indicative broad areas were mentioned.                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Broad Areas                                | - These are indicative locations that have no specific boundaries with a minimum of 2000 dwellings and no set maximum cap.                                                                                                                                                           |
| Information on the Ecology and Landscape studies | - See above                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Service Providers’ Views                   | - **Surrey & Sussex NHS Trust**  
- Employment – recruitment and maintaining staff an issue – nurses in particular                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
Hospital as part of its long term plan, takes into account an increasing and ageing population.
Will continue to see more people in the hospital even for conditions which can be addressed at GP level, as some people prefer to go directly to hospitals.
The hospital has expanded its services with additional 150 new beds and operating theatre. There is also room to build more accommodation for nurses.
Affordable Housing:
Provision of affordable housing in the district as with so many other authorities is a concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is required from the Council/Planning</th>
<th>Continuous dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timetable Implications</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussed how the Local plan timetable fits in with the HRA business plan and the impact of delivery.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any opportunities for joint working/strategic projects that we could benefit from, or feed into?</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As an authority, to see that the policies in place are sound, putting in sound criteria.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work on the affordable rent which is still high.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To understand new Housing Act and its true impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Update with progress on the LP and current status

- MNG – gave an update on current status of Local Plan
- Subject to member approval, to go out for another round of consultation in October 2016.
- The Objectively Assessment Housing Need number is 9400, 470/annually.
- The Council is looking at different options that development can be delivered in the district.
- The population is growing.

### Draft Documents

- MNG - The Council is considering various options; at this stage no decision has been made as to where development will take place and number of housing.

### Broad Areas

- Leading on from the last Consultation (Reg. 18 on Dec – Feb 2016), one of the Delivery Strategy approaches/option was Approach 6 for an urban extension or new settlement.
  - One of the options that the Council is looking at is:
- Building on from Approach 6, further work is being taken to look at broad areas, with no set boundaries, minimum of 2000 dwellings.
- The broad areas are at S. Godstone, Blindley Heath, Lingfield, Horne, Copthorne and the Hobbs and Lambs business park.
- Emphasised that the Council has not made any decision as to where development will take place and the number of housings.
| Information on the Ecology and Landscape studies | • Not discussed in detail except it was referred to as some of the technical studies being carried out to inform LP. |
| Service Providers’ Views | Lingfield GP Practice concerns/issues:  
  • Recruitment; surgery has room to accommodate 1 more Doctor  
  • The Practice has no capacity for further patients.  
  • the 3 GPS in East Grinstead have closed their books which puts additional pressure on an existing overstretched Practice.  
  • GP is already oversubscribed  
  • The 3 GPs in EG are looking to change the boundaries which will add to the existing problem.  
  • The Practice cover a wide area so is concerned that some of the concept areas (mentioned above) falls within the boundary of the Practice and the implication and ability to cope with large influx in addition to the current situation.  
  • Surgery is small and in its present state cannot expand other than relocating.  
  • The CCG is looking at possible sites where the practice can go.  
  • With 700 more patients as a result of the 3 East Grinstead GP’s closing their books and the possibility of more patients if the boundaries are going to change, the practice will need additional Doctors, 2-21/2  
  • Public transport is an issue at present and any more developments should take this into consideration as some people depend on public transportation to access the GPs.  
|  
| Whyteleafe GP Practice |  
  • Express similar issues as Lingfield with recruitment as a major problem and current overcapacity.  
  • The Practice is looking at expansion  
|  
| Oxted School: |  
  • School places is a challenge  
  • Advised we look at the Surrey County Council projections for clarity on where there are capacity and potential increase in the demand for school places. |
- There is capacity at the secondary school level in the District but to check with County for details.

**What is required from the Council**
- Continuous engagement with service providers

**Timetable implications**
No timetable implications were discussed however there was reference to the timeline of the Local Plan and question on LP dates where MNG explained the programme for producing the LP.
- Another round of Reg. 18 consultation for October 2016
- Draft Plan, Reg. 19 – October to Dec 2017 with projected adoption by Jan – March 2017

**Are there any opportunities for joint working/strategic projects that we could benefit from, or feed into?**
Questions/Matters that were raised:
1) The threshold that would trigger the need for a new surgery: - MNG Action.
2) Finance of a new GP as a result of the need due to a large development would be funded by developer contribution (s106)
3) MNG briefly explained CIL and how the funds can be used. Also what s106 funding can support, site specific, as opposed to CIL.
Dear Sir or Madam

Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment

As part of its continuous work in planning for the future of the District, the Council is seeking to ensure that there is adequate infrastructure and services to meet the needs of the population. Infrastructure planning is an essential part of the Local Plan process which identifies where existing infrastructure needs improvement and the potential future infrastructure needs for the District, possibly using future fund from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or other available funding streams.

Background

The Infrastructure Baseline Plan 2015 was prepared to form part of the evidence base to support the Council’s emerging Local Plan. As the Local Plan develops, the Infrastructure Baseline Plan will be refined and be known as the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS).

The Infrastructure Baseline Plan 2015 was set out in two parts:

1) An overview of the quality and capacity of the existing provision of infrastructure;
2) Consideration what infrastructure may be required to support high level scenarios set out in Regulation 18 Local Plan.

The documents which have been prepared to inform the Local Plan are listed below and can be accessed via the Council’s website:

- Infrastructure Baseline Study Part 1
- Infrastructure Baseline Study Part 1 Appendix 1
- Infrastructure Baseline Study Part 2
- Infrastructure Baseline Study Part 2 Appendix 2
Next Steps

We want to engage with you as a service provider on the refining sites that are being considered in the plan to establish what, and if so, where capacity issues may be. This information will be used to inform the next version of the Local Plan.

This letter is to invite you to take part in this engagement process with the Council, the first of which are the proposed meetings in the Council Offices in August and September 2016 on the dates set out below:

- 11 August 2016: 10 – 12pm
- 12 August 2016: 10 – 12pm or 2 – 4pm
- 18 August 2016: 10 – 12pm or 2 – 4pm
- 22 August 2016: 10 – 12pm or 2 – 4pm
- 24 August 2016: 10 – 12pm or 2 – 4pm
- 25 August 2016: 10 – 12pm or 2 – 4pm
- 29 August 2016: 10 – 12pm
- 1 September 2016: 10 – 12pm or 2 – 4pm
- 7 September 2016: 10 – 12pm or 2 – 4pm
- 8 September 2016: 10 – 12pm

The aim is to obtain your response on your preferred attendance date by Friday 1st July 2016. Appointments will be made on a first come, first serve basis.

If you wish to speak to someone about this letter, please call 01893 732880 or email: clt@tandridge.gov.uk

Yours sincerely

Sarah Thompson
Head of Strategic Planning Policy
Tandridge District Council, Station Road East, Oxted, RH8 0BT

Chief Executive – Louise Round
Service providers that received email reminders

From: Minnie Ngalauf
Sent: 21 July 2016 14:13
To: Jayne Godden Miller; Geraldine Keapng; Steve Hyder; Simon Mandar; jmason@tandridge.gov.uk
Subject: FW: Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment

Dear All

I am writing to follow up on the e-mail circulated in May with the request to set up a meeting with Planning Policy to discuss the sites which continue to be considered through the Local Plan process and which will be consulted on at the next stage from October 2016.

Please let me know whether you are available on the dates listed below and on the attached letter.

Regards

Minnie

[Contact information]

---

From: Minnie Ngalauf
Sent: 21 July 2016 10:07
To: manfield.surgery@nhs.net; shelley.obrien@nhs.net; alison.mason3@nhs.net; wendymaguire@nhs.net; ronnie.godfrey@nhs.net; tommy.rolfe@go-hill1305.nhs.uk; ann.anderson10@nhs.net; cheskord.surgery@nhs.net; philip.greenhill@firstcommunityhealth.nhs.uk; victoria.gillespie@nhs.net
Subject: FW: Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment

Dear All

I am writing to follow up on the e-mail circulated in May with the request to set up a meeting with the Council to discuss the sites which continue to be considered through the Local Plan process and which will be consulted on at the next stage from October 2016.

Please let me know whether you are available on the dates listed below and in the attached letter.

Regards

Minnie

[Contact information]
Dear All

I am writing to follow up on the e-mail circulated in May with the request to set up a meeting with the Council to discuss the sites which continue to be considered through the Local Plan process and which will be consulted on at the next stage from October 2016.

Please let me know whether you are available on the dates listed below and in the attached letter.

Regards

Minnie

_____________________________

From: Minnie Ngakuife
Sent: 21 July 2016 16:44
To: info@tvsc.org.uk; jRobinson@esc.ac.uk
Subject: FW: Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment

Dear All

I am writing to follow up on the e-mail circulated in May with the request to set up a meeting with the Council to discuss the sites which continue to be considered through the Local Plan process and which will be consulted on at the next stage from October 2016.

Please let me know whether you are available on the dates listed below and in the attached letter.

Regards

Minnie
From: Minnie Ngaluwa
Sent: 21 July 2016 12:09
To: broccp.stockportmedicalcentre@nhs.net; paul.simpson@sash.nhs.uk; richardates@nhs.net; Stephen.Hobbs@eastsussexcrg.nhs.uk; Iain.Mackenzie@sash.nhs.uk; Mike.Pritchard@westsussexpct.nhs.uk
Subject: FW: Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment

Dear All

I am writing to follow up on the e-mail circulated in May with the request to set up a meeting with the Council to discuss the sites which continue to be considered through the Local Plan process and which will be consulted on at the next stage from October 2016.

Please let me know whether you are available on the dates listed below and in the attached letter.

Regards

Minnie

---

From: Minnie Ngaluwa
Sent: 21 July 2016 11:18
To: sally.burfoot@nhs.net
Subject: Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment

Dear Ms Burfoot

I am following up with a letter sent to the Practice in May with the request to set up a meeting with the Council to discuss the sites which continue to be considered through the Local Plan process and which will be consulted on at the next stage from October 2016.

Please let me know whether you are available on the dates listed in the attached letter.

Regards

Minnie
From: Minnie Ngaluefe
Sent: 22 July 2016 13:13
To: gill.vaughan@nhs.net
Subject: FW: Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment

Dear Ms Vaughan,

I have been informed by Alison Mason to direct my communication to you, as the Practice Manager, to set up a meeting with the Council to discuss the sites which continue to be considered through the Local Plan process and which will be consulted on at the next stage from October 2016.

If you have any questions, let me know.

Regards

Minnie Ngaluefe
Community Infrastructure Officer
Planning Policy
mngaluefe@tandridge.gov.uk
From: Minnie Ngalwe
Sent: 22 July 2016 13:13
To: Gill.vaughan@mhk.net
Subject: FW: Tendridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment

Dear Ms Vaughan,

I have been informed by Alison Mason to direct my communication to you, as the Practice Manager, to set up a meeting with the Council to discuss the sites which continue to be considered through the Local Plan process and which will be consulted on at the next stage from October 2016.

If you have any questions, let me know.

Regards,

Minnie
## Appendix B: Landscape and Ecology

**TANDRIDGE SITE-BASED ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT & LANDSCAPE CAPACITY AND SENSITIVITY STUDY**

**DUTY TO COOPERATE MEETING & ENGAGEMENT**

**Date: 23.03.16**

Participants: Surrey County Council Landscape, Surrey County Council Ecology, Surrey Wildlife Trust, High Weald AONB, Sevenoaks DC, Environment Agency, Croydon BC, Mole Valley BC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape &amp; Ecology</strong></td>
<td>Offer key DTC stakeholders the opportunity to feed into the methodologies for TDC undertaking of Landscape Capacity and Site Based Ecology Assessments of sites being considered through the Local Plan process.</td>
<td>A number of stakeholders attended a workshop to ask questions and offer views on the approach consultants would take in carrying out both pieces of work. This resulted in the refinement of methodologies and helped to guide how the works were carried out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Pre-Consultation on Local Plan: Sites Consultation

From: TDC Planning Policy Team
Sent: 26 September 2016 14:31
To: Wealden Council; Reigate and Banstead Borough Council; Croydon Borough Council; Mid-Sussex District Council; Horsham Borough Council; Sevenoaks Borough Council; Surrey County Council; Bromley Borough Council; Mole Valley Borough Council; Epsom and Ewell Borough Council; East Sussex County Council; Elmbridge Borough Council; West Sussex County Council; Sutton Borough Council

Subject: Pre-Consultation notification - Tandridge Regulation 18 - Sites consultation

Dear All,

As you may be aware, in June 2016, Tandridge Council amended the Local Development Scheme (LDS) for the preparation of our Local Plan. The new LDS includes an extra round of consultation which will be carried out under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012, and is scheduled to take place from November 4th 2016, and will run for 10 weeks until 30th December 2016. The decision to undertake further consultation has primarily stemmed from the Regulation 18 consultation which attracted responses from over 3,000 individuals, as well as the evidence which continues to be prepared.

As key partners in the plan making process, and in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, I am contacting you to share headline information which will be included in the document ahead of the formal consultation and in advance of formal decision making processes of the Planning Policy Committee which will take place on 31st October 2016. Please note this committee was due to take place on 6th October but has been postponed to accommodate a by-election. As such, the information included in this email and attached should be treated with the upmost confidentiality and is subject to change following the discussions with elected members and the committee meeting.

The consultation is site based and will focus on specific sites which have been considered in the plan making process to date, setting out how emerging evidence is being applied to the consideration of those sites. The sites being considered are all those which were found to be suitable and available in the Councils Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (2016). The document will categorise sites into:

- those which evidence based documents have led the Council to discount from consideration at this time (Red)
- those which continue to be a matter for consideration in the plan making process (Yellow), and
- those which have a high probability of contributing to the land supply for the Local Plan and could come forward ahead of the adoption of the plan under current policy. These sites are primarily those which are already in areas which are inset from the Green Belt (Green).
The maps attached present the sites using their position in the Green Belt as a guide. This approach is taken to demonstrate how the Green Belt Assessment is being utilised in accordance with the other evidence, sites are depicted on three maps:

Cat 1) Sites which are in areas inset from the GB,

Cat 2) Sites which are washed over by Green Belt, but that are located in areas that the Council’s Green Belt Assessment (Part 2) has identified as an area for further investigation, and finally,

Cat 3) Sites which are located in an area of the Green belt which is not identified as an area for further investigation.

The consultation will also set out a number of strategic locations which we have called ‘concept areas’ and are being explored as large extensions and/or new settlements. Consideration of strategic development enables the Council to determine whether this is a valid option that would contribute to meeting local development needs up to 2033. The evidence gathered to date demonstrates that meeting full development needs on suitable sites is incredibly challenging and unlikely to be achievable. As such, TDC want to ensure that we have considered all of our reasonable alternatives before arriving at our preferred strategy which will be consulted upon Autumn/Winter 2017. Exploring alternatives also includes discussions with relevant partners as part of the duty to cooperate to establish if needs can be met elsewhere and we want to be able to have those discussion with a robust understanding of any shortfall.

Attached to this email are the maps which set out the sites being consulted on/publicised and the seven concept areas. All evidence based documents that have informed the consultation document, will be published in November alongside all other consultation documents including the Sustainability Appraisal etc. The full consultation document is still being prepared/finalised and is not available to share with you at this time.

As always, your formal comments will be welcomed during the statutory consultation period. However, I felt it important to share this information with you all at the earliest opportunity in case there was any impact/information relevant to your own plan making processes, and to give you the opportunity to raise any questions you may have at this time. Further, we are anticipating holding partner meetings once the consultation is underway, so please let me know if you would like to meet with us so that we can get a date in the diary for November/December.
Dear Marie,

RE: Pre-Consultation notification - Tandridge Regulation 18 - Sites consultation

Further to your email regarding the pre-notification of the Regulation 18 sites consultation, London Borough of Croydon welcomes the opportunity to comment on the early stages of Tandridge District Council’s local plan process.

The information provided at this stage indicates broad level potential development areas and as such, at this time there is limited information available for London Borough of Croydon to provide comment on. Read alongside The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs of Tandridge (September 2015), it appears that at this early stage, Tandridge District Council is unable to meet its objectively assessed housing need. The London Borough of Croydon would encourage Tandridge District Council to meet its need, and consider needs of neighbouring boroughs through the Duty to Cooperate.

The London Borough of Croydon stresses the need to develop sites to their full capacity and to ensure an in depth and robust assessment of those areas which Tandridge District Council have identified for further investigation are considered thoroughly for potentially meeting housing need.

We wish to remain involved with the progress of the Tandridge Local Plan as it evolves and at such time as further information is made available for consultation.

Yours Sincerely,

Steve Dennington
Interim Head of Spatial Planning