Duty to Cooperate

1. Tandridge District Council engaged with the Greater London Authority through a range of events; this was done prominently on a county led basis (through Surrey County Council and through the Gatwick Diamond) due to the scale and geography of all London’s neighbouring authorities. This also involved discussions as part of the preparation of the Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement and Surrey Local Strategic Statement.

2. The following pages set out in chronological order the discussions had on these matters, which are provided as annexes to this note:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annex Ref</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Surrey Local Strategic Statement – Surrey Group Leaders</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Gatwick Diamond Joint Local Authorities response to the London Infrastructure Plan 2050</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Wider South East Summit Agenda and Slides</td>
<td>19 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Wider South East Engagement – Discussion Paper and supporting documents</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>South East England Planning Working Group Agenda</td>
<td>30 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Gatwick Diamond Spatial Planning Group Minutes</td>
<td>31 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Notes from Wider South East roundtables</td>
<td>10 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities response to the Outer London Commission full questions</td>
<td>11 September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Wider South East Summit Agenda, recommendations and annexes</td>
<td>11 December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Surrey Local Strategic Statement – progress report to Surrey Planning Officers Association</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>South East Councils Planning Working Group Agenda</td>
<td>22 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Greater London Authority response to Tandridge District Council Local Plan Issues and Approaches Consultation</td>
<td>26 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>South East Councils Planning Working Group Agenda and discussion points</td>
<td>6 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Gatwick Diamond Local Authority Members Meeting</td>
<td>27 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Surrey Planning Officers Association response to the Mayors Transport Strategy</td>
<td>21 September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Gatwick Diamond Strategy Project Group Agenda</td>
<td>28 September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Surrey Local Strategic Statement – progress report to Surrey Chief Executives</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Gatwick Diamond Joint Local Authorities meeting</td>
<td>26 June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement and evidence base report (Examination Library SDTCE19 and SDTCE25)</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Gatwick Diamond Joint Local Authorities response to the London Plan</td>
<td>9 March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Surrey Place Workshop – Planning for the Future</td>
<td>21 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Greater London Authority Response to Tandridge District Council Local Plan (Regulation 19)</td>
<td>10 September 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document Reference TED15:
Tandridge District Council – Duty to Cooperate – October 2019
**Scope of a Local Strategic Statement (LSS)**

Paper by Surrey Chief Executives and Surrey Planning Officers Association

1. **Introduction and Background**

1.1 Under the system put in place by the current Government, the duty to co-operate is intended to ensure that issues which affect more than one local planning authority are managed effectively. Inspectors now look for evidence that such strategic issues have been substantively addressed in Local Plans. That means more than just gathering evidence or engaging in discussions. It means having a clear and deliverable output from such discussion. Inspectors are also looking for sufficiently robust decision making arrangements to show that issues can be addressed on an ongoing basis.1

1.2 The duty applies to each local planning authority and relates to strategic matters, which may have different relevant functional geographies, for example housing market areas and landscape areas. These geographies differ between authorities and will extend beyond the county boundary, while co-operation between the county and districts is important for dealing with infrastructure issues such as transport and education. So a framework for the county area of Surrey in itself cannot satisfy the requirements of the duty. The work proposed in this paper would, however, make a significant contribution to helping each planning authority fulfil its requirements under the duty by promoting a framework for Surrey for joint working to address strategic issues and to deliver on strategic priorities. It would help to align strategic spatial, infrastructure and economic priorities which can then be reflected in the Local Plans of individual planning authorities and would also facilitate a co-ordinated approach to engaging with London and its growth impacts on Surrey.

1.3 Against this background, Leaders endorsed further work on the development of a framework which would comprise:

(a) a **Local Strategic Statement** setting out common priorities on strategic matters which can be used in Local Plans and the associated examinations

(b) a **Memorandum of Understanding** on how councils will work together towards an LSS and more generally and **Terms of Reference** for the work being undertaken and agreed collectively. Leaders have seen and commented on earlier drafts and revised versions of both are attached

(c) an **Investment Framework** which gives practical support for the implementation of the strategic priorities in the LSS (and hence to the realism of the Local Plans) building on Surrey Future and other investment mechanisms.

---

1 The duty to co-operate guidance issued by Government is very clear: ‘Local planning authorities and other public bodies need to work together from the outset at the plan scoping and evidence gathering stages before options for the planning strategy are identified. That will help to identify and assess the implications of any strategic cross boundary issues on which they need to work together and maximise the effectiveness of Local Plans. After that they will need to continue working together to develop effective planning policies and delivery strategies. Cooperation should continue until plans are submitted for examination and beyond, into delivery and review.’
1.4 As this paper describes, taking forward such an approach is not easy but in the absence of such a framework authorities will continue to struggle with satisfying the duty to co-operate and will face significant problems in terms of:

(i) difficulty in putting up to date Local Plans in place

(ii) having to engage in ongoing piecemeal efforts to discuss strategic issues with neighbouring authorities with fragmented outcomes which will be unlikely to satisfy an Inspector;

(iii) consequential difficulties in controlling and influencing development. Since most Local Plans within Surrey were adopted prior to the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) they are at risk of being considered out of date and councils may as a result be unable to refuse undesirable development. In effect ‘planning by appeal’ is becoming increasingly common. Councils without an adopted Local Plan or core strategy are also likely to be unable to maximise Community Infrastructure Levy receipts to match the level of infrastructure investment required by the levels of growth as advocated by the NPPF.

(iv) being hampered in addressing collectively the pressures that are likely to emerge from London in terms of addressing unmet housing needs. An up to date evidence base on housing need and supply across Surrey will be a much better basis on which to engage with London on these issues and to enhance the robustness of Local Plans

(v) being less able to make the case for investment in Surrey.

1.5 In short, in the absence of such an approach, the ability of councils to manage growth sustainably and to be able to control where and how development occurs are likely to be compromised.

2 Approach

2.1 Following further discussions in SPOA and with Surrey Chief Executives, this paper sets out an approach that is the minimum which in the opinion of officers would be needed to achieve a framework which will do what is required given current national planning policy. What is needed is a statement which sets out a spatial planning vision for the County reflecting the evidence base described below (on housing needs, environmental issues, economic growth plans and infrastructure) and sets a broad strategic direction for spatial planning on strategic cross boundary matters. To be effective it needs to help deliver shared objectives across authorities so that development can be delivered in the right place properly supported by the right infrastructure. So, an LSS needs shared objectives around spatial, infrastructure and economic priorities and measures that will help to achieve them.

2.2 Two stages are envisaged to achieve this: the completion of the evidence base and then using this evidence to develop the LSS.

2.3 It is important to recognise that:
(i) a lot of what is needed would have to be done individually by each borough and district and whilst the approach has implications for further work for some districts and boroughs there will be external support available if needed for most of the new elements such as assembling evidence for the county as a whole for the relevant strategic issues

(ii) the proposal maintains the ‘bottom-up’ approach in which the individual local authorities retain the fundamental responsibility for determining how best to meet the needs and aspirations of their area in the context of the wider issues which affect Surrey

(iii) the approach will be staggered and break points inserted so that Leaders are not committed to undertaking all of the work until they have seen the outcome of the preceding stage

(iv) this approach gives Leaders collectively the opportunity to drive the development of a collective and evidenced position on the broad priorities for development for Surrey which will help address the dilemmas faced by all borough and districts

(v) whilst the LSS would cover the geographic area of Surrey it would reflect (and seek to influence) work across county boundaries and in London and would not detract from the work that some boroughs need to do with areas outside Surrey. Indeed, this work should provide a useful basis for an ongoing relationship with Surrey’s neighbours.

3. Evidence Bases

3.1 As described in the previous paper, to inform any decisions about balancing land use demands, there are four major pieces of evidence that need to be assembled:

(a) a picture of **housing need** across Surrey which means having NPPF compliant Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) that cover each borough and district. Many are in place or are in the process of being developed individually or jointly. Any gaps would need to be filled. In order to ensure that there is a comprehensive and consistent picture these individual evidence bases would then be looked at together to make sure that it is possible to make suitable allowances or extrapolations to reflect differences between them e.g. in terms of population projections or different timeframes having been used. This work would be concerned only with ensuring a comparable set of outputs which can be used to show theoretical housing needs over an agreed period. It would not alter and would not purport to alter or undermine the individual evidence bases.

(b) having an **up to date picture of the Green Belt** to inform local plans and the LSS. All local planning authorities with Green Belt in their area that could restrict their ability to meet housing needs in full already need to undertake a Green Belt review in order for their plans to be considered sound. The LSS would bring together existing Green Belt reviews. Where no such review has yet been undertaken it would be necessary to look at whether such a review is needed given the test described above. All reviews would be compared for consistency of methodology so that scoring in one borough can be confidently considered alongside scoring in another.
It is crucial to recognise that the aim of any such reviews is not about changing the broad extent of the Green Belt in Surrey. The aim is descriptive: to have an up to date and consistent picture of the Green Belt in relation to the contribution it makes to the fundamental aim of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It remains entirely a matter for local decision makers to consider the extent, if any, of changes to Green Belt boundaries.

(c) a picture of infrastructure needs which would draw heavily on Surrey Future which largely reflects strategic transport infrastructure needs, but together with the LEP SEPs also addresses other infrastructure such as flood defence and regeneration schemes. There may be other issues such as school expansion and primary health care which would also need to be considered. The SEPs and the existing and emerging infrastructure delivery plans for each borough and district will directly contribute to the LSS and an accompanying investment framework could set out in broad terms how this infrastructure will be funded and delivered if a robust LSS for Surrey is to be produced.

(d) a picture of envisaged economic growth. The two LEP economic plans set out growth locations, transport investment, and bringing forward delivery of housing and infrastructure. An LSS would build on these plans by putting them into a spatial planning context taking account of evidence on housing need and location as well as environmental constraints and designations (such as Special Protection Areas). This is what turns the evidence base from being simply collaboration into one that produces planning outcomes that would pass muster with an Inspector.

4 Putting the Evidence to Work – the Strategic Statement

4.1 The updated and expanded evidence base described above would provide evidence of co-operation but it would not achieve effective outcomes on Surrey wide and sub-regional issues. So it is necessary but not in itself sufficient.

4.2 Accordingly the second stage of the work would be to pull together the evidence with land supply evidence from existing Local Plan work undertaken by the boroughs and districts to form an opinion at Board level about the broad prioritisation of areas for housing growth (including any potential strategic sites). This would take account of economic growth ambitions and strategic infrastructure priorities already identified. It will require hard issues to be addressed.

4.3 This would require an additional piece of work to assess potential housing provision across Surrey and to consider to what extent any shortfall might be addressed taking into account wider land use demands, particularly employment land and the ‘balance’ of housing and employment provision and environmental constraints. It then fills the crucial gap in the current arrangements and would provide the basis to enable the production of an LSS that would set a broad strategic direction for local authorities and a framework to help them meet the duty to cooperate by addressing strategic issues.
5 Implications: Resources and Timeframe

5.1. To undertake the work described above, our best estimate of what is needed is that:

- all boroughs and districts would need to undertake any outstanding work to complete their SHMAs
- there would need to be agreement on undertaking any additional reviews by boroughs and districts of their portion of the Green Belt
- there will need to be adequate reference to the work being undertaken in consultation and community engagement on Local Plans
- work will be needed to align the evidence bases on housing need and Green Belt and to assemble that evidence base into a Surrey wide picture. This could be led by Surrey's Planning Working Group (PWG) reporting to SPOA but external support could be made available to supplement the resources available from councils if required
- all of the above could take about 9 months
- at that point Leaders would review the position and agree how to move into stage 2 which would be the point at which the LSS itself starts to be prepared
- the major element of stage 2 would be facilitated discussions with Leaders following preparatory discussions within each borough and district
- stage 2 may take a further 3 months to complete in terms of having a written up draft of the LSS to a standard that would deliver effective policies in individual Local Plans
- at that point Leaders would decide whether to approve the LSS
- individual planning authorities would then need to make local arrangements to add weight to the status of the LSS.

5.2 In terms of other elements of the framework:

- the Memorandum of Understanding is based on the one being used for the Woking, Guildford and Waverley SHMA and so reflects current practical arrangements for joint working
- the Terms of Reference have been amended so that Leaders would meet in private rather than in public when discussing these issues. It is important to recognise that the results of such discussions would need to be transparent through a clear record of what had been agreed (in the early stages this would be largely about process). There would be no need to establish a new Board and the terms of reference focus instead on the nature of the tasks being taken forward by Leaders in the context of the local strategic statement rather than any new governance arrangements.

5.3 The overall timeframe for the work will be about 12 months although this could be shortened depending on the resources that can be made available locally. SCC has offered to make a contribution towards the costs of any external support required to supplement the activity being undertaken by boroughs and districts individually and collectively for stage 1.

5.4 There are choices for Leaders about when work should begin but the staged approach is designed to allow for a stock take before deciding whether and when to proceed further. A lot of the evidence gathering and review work is already underway as part of the development of Local Plans
so there is the opportunity to fill the gaps in the evidence alongside that activity over the next 6-9 months.

Surrey Chief Executives Group

Surrey Planning Officers Association

July 2014
Dear Mr Johnson

London Infrastructure Plan 2050 – July 2014

I am writing on behalf of the Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities* in response to your consultation on the London Infrastructure Plan 2050.

By way of introduction, you may wish to note that the Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities have a history of cooperation on strategic planning and development issues. We link closely to, and on key economic issues form part of, the Gatwick Diamond Initiative, one of the five spatial partnerships which make up the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership. We have an agreed Memorandum of Understanding setting out how we work together on issues which cross local authority boundaries and a Local Strategic Statement, finalised in early 2012, which we are looking to update. We intend to liaise closely with areas outside the Gatwick Diamond, including London, as we look to review the Local Strategic Statement.

We acknowledge that infrastructure to support the projected scale of economic and population growth to 2050 is a key issue for London and that a coordinated infrastructure plan is highly desirable. However, we note that the Plan explores a number of scenarios about where growth can be accommodated within London and beyond London’s boundaries ‘as a precursor to the next full revision of the London Plan after 2016’. Indicative maps in the Plan and supporting documentation highlight the Gatwick area as a potential growth area in the context of accommodating some of London’s forecast increase in population. We believe that it is not the place for this non-statutory plan to start to determine a spatial strategy for London and the South East or to seek to influence the Local Plans of authorities outside London. Gatwick Airport is of national significance and the Gatwick Diamond is an important economic area in its own right with associated growth needs. Local authorities in the area are planning to meet these needs and this should not be compromised by growth from London.

Spatial options to accommodate London’s future growth should be tested through the next review of the London Plan, expected to be complete by 2019/20, which will require the Mayor to engage with local authorities or groups of authorities from across the South East, sharing evidence and understanding of opportunities and constraints, in order to agree on how to address the challenges facing the area as a whole.

Since the London Infrastructure Plan was published, the Airports Commission has ruled out as a viable option a hub airport in the Thames Estuary to increase airport capacity in the South East to 2030. The document and supporting background evidence is therefore out of date and any future version of the Plan needs to consider the consequences for infrastructure in the event that Heathrow Airport or Gatwick Airport is selected for expansion, as well as addressing the infrastructure needs of their already planned growth.

.../
We would also like to make the following comments in relation to a number of the questions posed in the consultation.

**Q: Do you agree with the need for an infrastructure plan for the capital? Do you support our approach? If not, why?**

Given the scale of growth and the nature of the infrastructure needs, a coordinated plan supported by appropriate evidence would seem to be highly desirable. However, such a long term infrastructure plan needs to reflect the interrelationship between London and the South East and their collective economic success and support this through strategic infrastructure provision for this wider area.

**Q: Is any of the infrastructure identified unnecessary – if so why? What (if any) infrastructure do you think London will need in addition to what we have identified? Why?**

The wider South East will continue to provide homes for significant numbers of London commuters requiring local services and so a proportion of infrastructure requirements such as education and health will fall on areas outside London.

Infrastructure and its funding should be planned in a wider context. Working with local authorities in the South East, the Mayor should consider how strategic connectivity within the wider area could support economic success and offer mutual benefits as part of its infrastructure package.

The Plan should consider how strategic transportation links should be improved as part of a long term infrastructure plan in the event that Heathrow or Gatwick is selected for expansion. Gatwick Airport anticipates a growth of up to 45 million passengers per annum by 2030 even without a second runway. Ensuring 40% of these passengers arrive at the airport by sustainable transport, in line with the current target, will require maintaining and enhancing an adequate network, particularly rail, from London.

**Q: Will the London Infrastructure Delivery Board be enough to ensure best-practice joined-up delivery of infrastructure in London? What more could the Mayor do?**

Any London Infrastructure Delivery Board should be expected to consider wider issues relating to infrastructure delivery where they affect areas beyond London’s administrative boundaries with those areas.

**Q: Where do you think London’s growth would be best accommodated (please explain why)? Are there alternative spatial scenarios we need to analyse?**

As indicated in the Plan, London should first look to accommodate its growth within its boundaries. Where necessary, this may dictate a review of existing Metropolitan Open Land and Metropolitan Green Belt designations. As we have previously indicated in our response on the Further Alterations to the London Plan, areas to the south of London do not provide unconstrained opportunities for meeting London’s growth, as evidenced by the challenges faced by the local authorities in meeting their own objectively assessed housing needs, and may even need to plan for growth to support a future expansion of Gatwick Airport.

That said, the issue of London’s growth is not one which should be set to one side. However, it is not the place for this non-statutory Infrastructure Plan to start to determine a spatial strategy for London and the South East or seek to influence a local authority’s strategy for the planning and development of its area. Spatial options to accommodate London’s future growth should be tested through the next review of the London Plan. This will require the Mayor to engage with local authorities from across the South East in order to understand and agree on how to address the challenges facing the area as a whole.

.../
Q: Transport - Are there any other strategic projects we have not considered?

The plan should look to address wider connectivity within the South East, given the importance that this will have in securing collective economic success and, for the long term, successful places in which to live and work.

I hope these comments are helpful. We would welcome the opportunity to work more closely with the GLA both in the context of this London Infrastructure Plan and on the proposed full revision of the London Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Crowley
Chief Executive, Horsham District Council
On behalf of the Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities

* The Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities comprise: West Sussex County Council, Surrey County Council, Crawley Borough Council, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Mid Sussex District Council, Mole Valley District Council, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council and Tandridge District Council. With the exception of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, which joined later, all the Authorities work within the terms of a Memorandum of Understanding agreed in 2012. The Local Strategic Statement, finalised in early 2012, was endorsed by all the Councils with the exception of Tandridge District Council and Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
Recommendation:

That the Summit considers and decides how to take forward joint discussions between London, East and South East England, to explore mechanisms (see options overleaf) to:

i. Understand common issues underpinning the economic future of London and the wider South East
ii. Seek more effective engagement in the London Plan review
iii. Seek more effective engagement on strategic infrastructure provision.

It is proposed a 2\textsuperscript{nd} wider South East Summit in November 2015 will aim to agree a way forward on future dialogue and cooperation.

Final Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker/Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Sir Edward Lister (Deputy Mayor of London for Planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:40</td>
<td>View from the East</td>
<td>Cllr Tony Jackson (EELGA Chairman, East Herts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45</td>
<td>View from the South East</td>
<td>Cllr Gordon Keymer CBE (SEEC Chairman, Tandridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:50</td>
<td>View from London</td>
<td>Sir Edward Lister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:55</td>
<td>Trends, issues and options (based on Discussion Paper attached)</td>
<td>Stewart Murray and John Lett (GLA – Planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:05</td>
<td>Panel discussion with speakers plus Deputy Chairs of</td>
<td>Chair: Phil Swann, Shared Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SEEC (Cllr David Hodge, Surrey)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EELGA (Cllr Marco Cereste, Peterborough)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:50</td>
<td>Thanks and next steps</td>
<td>Sir Edward Lister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Options for exploring arrangements for dialogue/cooperation

Option 1  Wider South East Commission/Panel
Establishment of formal Commission/Panel (e.g. with one unitary, one county and two district authority representatives, and perhaps independent advisors on planning and the economy and an independent chair). This could follow the already established Outer London Commission model (meetings in public; officer/invited presentations; background papers circulated beforehand; local publicity; followed by private meetings to finalise the recommendations) with four sub-regional roadshows/events spread around the wider South East to sound out views of future structures. It would offer the opportunity for councillors to set out local issues. This arrangement would operate collaboratively with the work by the Outer London Commission, which will be taking soundings on such structures from a London perspective.

Option 2  Wider South East Roundtables
Less formal roundtable meetings taking place in London with councillors from the wider South East and an independent ‘facilitation panel’; structured/facilitated questions and discussions. This arrangement would operate collaboratively with the work by the Outer London Commission (see Option 1 above).

Option 3  Wider South East Officer Group
Building on councillor input at the 19 March summit, an already established officer group (SSPOLG) would work on developing and testing options iteratively which are then assessed by the small political steering group (see paragraphs 3.1). This arrangement would operate collaboratively with the work by the Outer London Commission (see Option 1 above).
POS/BPF JOINT CONFERENCE

THE PLAN IS NOT ENOUGH INTEGRATING PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE FUTURE

18 March 2015
Stewart Murray
Assistant Director - Planning

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY
LONDON PLANNING & INFRASTRUCTURE

1. CONTEXT
2. APPROACH
3. REQUIREMENTS
4. SPATIAL ASPECTS
5. DELIVERY
6. COSTS AND FUNDING
7. NEXT STEPS
1. CONTEXT: LONDON IN THE UK GOVERNMENT

Local Government in England

County Level
- Metropolitan Counties
- Shire Counties
- Metropolitan Districts
- Shire Districts
- Unitary Authorities
- London Boroughs
- City of London Corporation
- Functional Bodies of the GLA

District Level
- Parish Councils

Parish Level
- Parish Councils

GLA
- Higher-tier authority created by the GLA Act 1999
- Unique role supporting the Mayor of London in his work
- Unique structure: GLA = Mayor of London + London Assembly (scrutiny)
- An evolving institution, e.g. housing, economic promotion.
THE GLA GROUP

GLA
Greater London Authority

THL
Transport for London

LLDC
London Legacy Development Corporation

MOPAC
Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime

LEPFA
London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority

OPDC
Old Oak Park Royal MDC
LONDON'S POPULATION: GROWING RAPIDLY! FORECASTS...

In February London surpassed its 1939 population peak of 8.5 million.
...DWARLING OTHER UK CITIES

City trends
English City Population projects 2012-2037
2. GROWTH RESPONSE:
LONDON PLAN 2015
LONDON INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN 2050

- London Plan (2015) identifies 49,000 new homes pa (1/3+)
- 860,000 new jobs
- 38 Opportunity Areas
- 5 more than 2011 London Plan
- OAPFs: 300,000 new homes and 500,000 new jobs
- Development Infrastructure Funding Studies (DIFS)
- 20 Housing Zones designation: 50,000 accelerated homes
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS

• MDCs: LLDC and new 2nd MDC from 1st April 2015
• Old Oak Common/Park Royal (OPDC)
• 24,000 new homes and 55,000 new jobs
• Mega HS2/Crossrail hub
• £1.6 billion infrastructure bill
• Thames Gateway Opportunity Areas
• big infrastructure investment +3 River Crossings
• Transport led growth as a catalyst for new homes, jobs, higher densities
• Crossrail 2: 200,000 new homes study & funding model
• We needed a big Capital Infrastructure Plan!
2. CAPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Overall aim for London's infrastructure is to create a green, productive city which is environmentally, financially and economically sustainable, and which remains at the forefront of new technology.
FOUR CRITICAL QUESTIONS

Where will it go?

How will we pay for it?

What infrastructure will we need?

How will we deliver it?
3. LONDON’S OVERALL REQUIREMENTS

By 2050, across the city we will need:

- An additional 1.5 million homes
- A 20% increase in energy supply capacity
- Over 800 more schools and colleges
- Around 40 new waste facilities
- An extra 9000ha of accessible green space
- 10% more green cover in central London and town centres
- A 50% increase in public transport capacity
- High speed digital connectivity
- Thames tideway tunnel (sawyer)
4. SPATIAL SCENARIOS

Assuming current policies continue

Increasing densities at town centres.

Increasing densities in locations with good public access.

Accommodating some population outside London (no encroachment on Green Belt)
5. IMPROVED DELIVERY: VIA NEW LONDON INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY BOARD (LIDB)

- Brings together key players in delivering London’s infrastructure – utilities, regulators, developers, TfL, Network Rail and others

- Advise on and take forward best practice integrated, innovative delivery

- Work to identify and overcome barriers to efficient infrastructure delivery

- First Board met November 2014. Next this month.
LIDB MEMBERSHIP (1)

Members: Utilities, Transport, Connectivity Providers, Political Leaders

• Martin Baggs - CEO, Thames Water
• Greg Barker MP - Chair, London Sustainable Development Commission
• Mark Camley - Executive Director of Park and Venues, London Legacy Development Corporation
• Mark Carne - CEO, Network Rail
• Isabel Dedring - Deputy Mayor for Transport, Greater London Authority
• John Dickie - Director of Strategy, London First
• Sir Philip Dilley - Chairman, Environment Agency
• Emma FitzGerald - CEO UK Gas Distribution, National Grid
• Peter Gerstorm - CEO, Cory Environmental and Chairman, Environmental Services Association
• Sir Peter Hendy - Commissioner, Transport for London
• Harvey McGrath - Deputy Chair London Enterprise Panel
• Tom Mockridge - CEO, Virgin Media
• Gavin Patterson - CEO, BT
LIDB MEMBERSHIP (2)

Members: The Mayor of London Chairs with Deputy Mayor for Transport

- Boris Johnson - Mayor of London, CHAIR
- Cllr Claire Kober - Leader, Haringey Council and Infrastructure Lead, London Councils
- Cllr Clyde Loakes - Board member, LWARB; Deputy Leader, Waltham Forest Council and Chair, North London Waste Authority
- Trevor Maginley - Director of Business Development, Cleshar, representing the Civil Engineering Contractors Association
- Dr Nelson Ogunshakin - CEO, Association for Consultancy and Engineering
- Matthew Pencharz - Senior Mayoral Advisor for Environment & Energy, Greater London Authority
- Jules Pipe - Mayor of Hackney and Chair, London Councils
- Peter Redfern - CEO, Taylor Wimpey
- Ed Richards - CEO, Ofcom
- Cllr Philippa Roe - Leader, Westminster City Council
- Basil Scarsella - CEO, UK Power Networks
- Geoffrey Spence - Chief Executive, Infrastructure UK
LIDB – ACTION AREAS

1. Programme plan and map of infrastructure activity
2. 3 case studies –
   (i) Old Oak Common, (ii) Upper Lea Valley, (iii) North Bexley
3. Regulatory change
5. Skills and employment
6. Innovation and new growth sectors (Tech, Fintech, Life Sciences/Research, Creative, Cultural, etc)
7. Capital investment decision rules
8. Market research on attitudes and barriers to ‘growth’
9. Funding and financing
10. Developments in line with circular economy principles
6. PAYING FOR IT: COSTS ESTIMATE

Our best cost estimates to meet all our infrastructure needs would almost double expenditure as a proportion of the economy. Housing and transport make up three quarters of the total costs.

OVERALL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Population 2050 of 11.3 million, construction cost inflation at 2% per annum above RPI, policy aspirations are achieved

- Transport
- Schools
- Housing
- Waste
- Energy
- Digital connectivity
- Water
- Green infrastructure

Capex as % of GVA

Source: Arup
PAYING FOR IT - SOLUTIONS

1. Prioritisation – infrastructure investment
2. Fiscal devolution – Mayor/Cities tax base increased
3. Collaborative construction
4. Land and asset intensification – Land Commission
5. Demand management
6. Technological innovation – connectivity
7. Funding Models: TIFS, Land Value Capture, CILs and MCIL (mark 2)
7. CURRENT STATUS/NEXT STEPS

Consultation: 270 responses rec’d, 71% positive

• 19 March – Wider South East Regional summit on “Growth”
• 25 March – publish update on London Infrastructure Plan
• 31 March – London Infrastructure Delivery Board key meeting

Then......

• Pre election period: preparing the Capital’s case
• 7 May – General election: new Government priorities
• Summer/Autumn – comprehensive spending review
CASE STUDIES:
LONDON THAMES GATEWAY
**Strategic direction:** Central West Opportunity Areas
VAUXHALL NINE ELMS BATTERSEA OPPORTUNITY AREA: 20,000 NEW HOMES AND 25,000 NEW JOBS

Tube Investment: Northern Line Extension: £1 billion loan paid for by levy on development
FURTHER ALTERATIONS TO THE MAYOR'S LONDON PLAN (PUBLISHED MARCH 2015)
Review of the Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement

A discussion paper prepared by the Gatwick Diamond Strategy Project Group for Gatwick Diamond Chief Executives/Leaders Group.

Summary:

The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement (LSS) was one of the first examples of inter-authority cooperation, but is now becoming dated. If it is to remain valid as a means of addressing cross-boundary issues and demonstrating cooperation between authorities it needs to be reviewed.

The Gatwick Diamond Strategy Project Group¹ (GDSPG) believes there is merit in retaining and updating the LSS. It supports duty-to-cooperate obligations, demonstrates support for the economic ambitions of the Local Economic Partnership (LEP), and provides a mechanism for collaboration on cross-boundary issues. Without it, cooperation would become more ad hoc, and the focus for individual authorities would move from the Gatwick Diamond to neighbouring strategic groupings such as Coastal West Sussex and Surrey/London fringe.

A review of the LSS provides an opportunity to determine the future ambition of the local authorities in the Diamond to work together. Some aspects, such as meeting the duty to cooperate, and responding to other LSS strategies have general support. Other aspects, such as convergence of Local Plan timetables, joint evidence gathering, and agreeing the right amount and distribution of housing are more challenging. The scope of the LSS will form part of the review. The GDSPG feels the existing Gatwick Diamond governance structures would be appropriate but this requires agreement from the Gatwick Diamond.

A dedicated resource is essential for a successful review, in terms of funding officer or consultant time to coordinate discussion and draft a revised LSS.

An appropriate time to start the review will be following the Airports Commission’s recommendation on runway capacity in the south east (Summer/Autumn 2015) and completion of the West Sussex & East Surrey Infrastructure Study, although identifying the scope of the review and its objectives could start sooner.

What is the LSS?

The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement was prepared in 2012 and sets a framework for Gatwick Diamond authorities² to work together to address common issues across the Gatwick Diamond area. Its objectives are:

---

¹ The Group comprises the Planning Policy Managers of the Gatwick Diamond local planning authorities.

² The LSS was endorsed by Surrey CC; West Sussex CC; Crawley BC; Horsham DC; Mid Sussex DC; Mole Valley DC and Reigate & Banstead BC. It was prepared before Epsom & Ewell joined the Gatwick Diamond and although Tandridge DC did not endorse the LSS it was a signatory to the Memorandum of Understanding.
- To provide a strategic direction for the Gatwick area on planning and economic issues
- To translate the strategic direction into change and development
- To establish mechanisms for inter-authority co-operation
- To identify and prioritise areas for joint working

The LSS is accompanied by a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Gatwick Diamond authorities. The MoU acknowledges the cooperative nature of the relationship, with statutory powers for plan-making and decision-taking remaining with individual authorities.

Why is there a need to review?

The LSS was published in March 2012. It included a work programme, timescales for which have now largely expired. While setting a broad strategic direction, it recognised that further work was required to translate that direction into planning and development. The age of the LSS and lack of an on-going work programme has been questioned at the most recent Local Plan examinations and the LSS is now carrying decreasing weight in such situations.

There have also been a number of changes since 2012 that need to be incorporated into the LSS. These include: publication of Coast to Capital’s Strategic Economic Plan and Coastal West Sussex’s LSS; discussions with the London Mayor on alterations to the London Plan; Epsom & Ewell joining the Gatwick Diamond; and most recently a proposal to develop a Gatwick Diamond/West Sussex Infrastructure Plan. In addition the Surrey local authorities agreed in 2014 to develop a separate but complementary LSS for the County and the preparation of a Surrey Infrastructure Plan is being considered.

Lastly, there is the work of the Airports Commission, which is due to publish its conclusions about future airport expansion in the South East during this summer. If it recommends the provision of a second runway at Gatwick and this is subsequently agreed by the Government there will be major consequences for the Gatwick Diamond area.

Initial scoping on a more detailed work programme was begun in 2014 with the support of Planning Portfolio Holders but has since stalled due to withdrawal of resources and uncertainty over the purpose of the LSS in the Gatwick Diamond.

What benefits would accrue?

An up-to-date LSS would:

- Help meet the duty to cooperate, providing a consistent strategic planning direction across the Gatwick Diamond area. The extent to which it tackles more challenging cross-boundary issues is a matter for discussion, but it will at least show an up-to-date position which has been collectively agreed. It will also provide an opportunity for Epsom & Ewell Borough Council to be involved in the review.
• Support economic growth in the Gatwick Diamond, responding at a sub-regional level to the LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan using evidence-based goals.

• Support infrastructure funding bids, by complementing infrastructure plans and identifying strategic priorities. This will help compete with demands for funding from other sub-regions in the LEP.

• Support a collective response to development pressures from London. The Mayor has prepared an Infrastructure Plan for 2050 and begun a review of the London Plan, which will include engagement across the wider South East about if/how London’s development needs can be met in the wider region. An updated LSS would provide a collective Gatwick Diamond voice for responding to those pressures.

• Address issues associated with the expansion of Gatwick Airport, with or without a second runway. A second runway at Gatwick would have major implications for development and infrastructure in the area, which would need to be planned collectively at a sub-regional level. Even if Gatwick remains as a one runway/two terminal operation, it will continue to be an economic driver in the Gatwick Diamond with consequent implications for housing and employment and a need for agreement on cross-boundary issues. In either case an LSS will help address issues of mutual interest. Since a second runway would be a ‘game changer’ in terms of future development needs, it would be sensible to link a review of the LSS to the recommendation of the Airports Commission, expected later this summer.

• Inform future reviews of the LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan, from a collective perspective. A revised LSS would provide a stronger voice in the process based on tested evidence and integrated with social and environmental aims.

What would it involve?

Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities would continue to provide a suitable governance structure for review of the LSS. Initial discussions about the content and ambition of the revised strategy would be for Portfolio Holders with overview provided by Gatwick Diamond Joint Leaders.

Review of the LSS will require a dedicated officer/consultant resource. The original LSS was drafted using a modest resource of approximately one day/week of professional time over a period of around a year and was funded by the Gatwick Diamond Initiative. This funding has since been withdrawn. If work is to progress on a review, a similar level of resource will be needed to coordinate work and provide draft documents for discussion and agreement. Consideration could be given to each Gatwick Diamond local authority making an equal contribution to funding a resource.

The extent and direction of strategic planning in the Gatwick area will be heavily influenced by a decision on whether Gatwick Airport is allowed to build a second runway. The housing, employment and infrastructure implications of an expanded airport would be of a different scale in a two runway scenario to a one runway scenario. The Project Steering Group therefore considers it would be sensible to await the recommendation of the Airports Commission before embarking on a review of the LSS. Equally, it will be important that an updated LSS takes account of other strands of work being undertaken in relation to these strategic issues.
Recommendation:

That the Summit considers and decides how to take forward joint discussions between London, East and South East England, to explore mechanisms to:

i. Understand common issues underpinning the economic future of London and the wider South East
ii. Seek more effective engagement in the London Plan review
iii. Seek more effective engagement on strategic infrastructure provision.

It is proposed a 2nd wider South East Summit in November 2015 will aim to agree a way forward on future dialogue and cooperation.

1 Background

1.1 The localism agenda rightly emphasises the need to address local issues at the local level and it is widely recognised that this agenda can address many of those which, individually, face authorities in London, the South East and East of England – the wider South East (SE).

1.2 However, although a highly diverse area, there are strong strategic interdependencies between London and the wider South East that underpin their collective economic success – geographically and economically this is much bigger than any other city region in the country.

1.3 Supported by a small joint officer group (the Strategic Spatial Planning Officers Liaison Group – SSPOLG), the East of England Local Government Association (EELGA), South East England Councils (SEEC) and the Mayor currently discuss on an informal basis common strategic issues facing the area. Wider SE responses to the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) and the Mayor’s 2050 Infrastructure Plan suggest that there is potential for developing more effective arrangements over time to:
   - identify the broad strategic challenges and opportunities facing the area;
   - represent them to relevant agencies, including government and the Mayor; and
   - develop policy options to address them.

1.4 This paper is intended to inform discussion on potential arrangements including:
   - the objectives of wider SE dialogue and cooperation;
   - how to best develop options to take these objectives forward in terms of the structure of the arrangements in the short/medium and longer terms; and
   - initial ideas on the issues which might be considered through these arrangements.
1.5 As a discussion document this paper has gone through several iterations. To initiate political dialogue and cooperation a ‘wider South East Summit’ is taking place on 19 March 2015. At the Summit, views will be canvassed on options to improve political dialogue/cooperation and whether it would be useful to support one of the mechanisms proposed for taking wider soundings around the wider SE. The outcomes/recommendations emerging from this process would report to a second wider SE Summit in November 2015.

1.6 The work would complement that of the Mayor’s established Outer London Commission (OLC)\(^1\) which has been invited to explore, from a London perspective, more effective ways of coordinating approaches to common strategic planning issues facing London and the Wider South East. It is envisaged that both the next steps arising out of the Summit and the OLC will work collaboratively to enhance and strengthen future engagement between London and the Wider South East. The OLC will also report in late 2015.

2 Draft objectives: more effective arrangements for dialogue and cooperation across the wider South East

2.1 While not all stakeholders in the wider SE may agree with some of the detail of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it does provide a common policy benchmark for the area and it is suggested that most would support its central objective – to foster sustainable development. Given the significance of the interdependencies between London and East and South East England, and growth challenges and opportunities facing the areas, closer dialogue/engagement will be vital.

2.2 The statutory Duty to Cooperate (DTC) applies to all local authorities and the GLA in terms of Local Plans. In terms of the preparation of the London Plan, the Mayor is bound by his own Duties to Inform and Consult which effectively if not legally are similar to the DTC. His London Plan also gives strong policy support to cooperative working to address issues of concern in the wider SE. Irrespective of legal differences between London and the wider SE, it is suggested that all can rally round the need to engage constructively on common strategic issues and collaborate in addressing some of them, even if it may not be possible always to agree on a universal way forward.\(^2\)

2.3 Three key objectives for wider SE dialogue and cooperation are proposed for consideration:

i. **To better understand common issues**: currently there is a strong ‘localist’ focus in identifying and addressing planning issues within the wider SE. Could

---

\(^1\) Its role is to advise how Outer London can play its full part in the city’s economic success. For further details see [http://www.london.gov.uk/olc/](http://www.london.gov.uk/olc/)

\(^2\) See also:

- National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) - Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 9-007-20140306: ‘Cooperation between the Mayor, boroughs and local planning authorities bordering London will be vital to ensure that important strategic issues, such as housing delivery and economic growth are planned effectively’.

- FALP Inspector’s Report (Nov 2014) – paragraph 57: ‘In my view, the Mayor needs to explore options beyond the existing philosophy of the London Plan. That may, in the absence of a wider regional strategy to assess the options for growth and to plan and co-ordinate that growth, include engaging local planning authorities beyond the GLA’s boundaries in discussions regarding the evolution of our capital city.’
this usefully be complemented by developing consistent data collection/analytic capacity to identify strategic issues which affect the area more widely? An authoritative appreciation of the relationship between changing demographics and housing need is particularly important, backed by a similar understanding of the wider SE’s changing economy and supporting infrastructure requirements under different future scenarios.

ii. **To seek more effective engagement in the London Plan review:** consultation on the draft Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) and the 2050 Infrastructure Plan elicited a wide range of responses from the wider SE, many with a common theme – the need for more effective political and technical engagement in preparation of the full review of the London Plan. Facilitating this could be a core objective for the new arrangements.

iii. **To seek more effective engagement on strategic infrastructure provision:** this has emerged from discussions with EELGA and SEEC as an area with particular potential, not just in terms in making common cause in bidding for investment but also in bringing forward sustainable development. It might apply to social and environmental as well as physical infrastructure.

2.4 To develop options for practical arrangements for cooperation and collaboration, different mechanisms are proposed below. Underlying principles are that options for future engagement should be transparent and open, and make best use of existing resources and structures.

3 **Developing more effective arrangements for dialogue and cooperation across the wider South East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key steps/timetable:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEP 1. Discuss and test options for engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial wider SE Summit to consider options for exploring future dialogue/cooperation arrangements (see grey box below) and agree a preferred way forward – 19 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish small political steering group to oversee the process – May 2015 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take forward preferred option to explore dialogue/cooperation arrangements – Spring-Winter 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Second wider SE Summit, with the aim of agreeing a way forward on future dialogue/cooperation – November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEP 2. Implementation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementing mechanisms for dialogue and cooperation – November 2015 onwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 The following includes different options as potential mechanisms to advise on these arrangements by late 2015. All options would be supported by a small political steering group comprising representatives from the South East, East of England and London and a second summit in November 2015 which will, based on emerging outcomes and draft recommendations, aim to agree next steps:

**Option 1  Wider South East Commission/Panel**
Establishment of formal Commission/Panel (e.g. with one unitary, one county and two district authority representatives, and perhaps independent advisors on planning and the economy and an independent chair). This could follow the already established Outer London Commission model (meetings in public; officer/invited presentations; background papers circulated beforehand; local publicity; followed by private meetings to finalise the recommendations) with four sub-regional roadshows/events spread around the wider South East to sound out views of future structures. It would offer the opportunity for councillors to set out local issues. This arrangement would operate collaboratively with the work by the Outer London Commission, which will be taking soundings on such structures from a London perspective.

**Option 2  Wider South East Roundtables**
Less formal roundtable meetings taking place in London with councillors from the wider South East and an independent ‘facilitation panel’; structured/facilitated questions and discussions. This arrangement would operate collaboratively with the work by the Outer London Commission (see Option 1 above).

**Option 3  Wider South East Officer Group**
Building on councillor input at the 19 March summit, an already established officer group (SSPOLG) would work on developing and testing options iteratively which are then assessed by the small political steering group (see paragraphs 3.1). This arrangement would operate collaboratively with the work by the Outer London Commission (see Option 1 above).

3.2 For all options the following issues will have to be considered:
- **membership** – size, geography, political and other representatives, chair?
- **venues** – where would the required meetings take place?
- **written contributions** – (how) should short written contributions for those not able to take part in person be considered?
- **reporting** – who should be responsible for the administrative arrangements and ensure outcomes and draft recommendations are captured?

3.3 Effective political engagement of Council Leaders from outside London is a key issue, and therefore views on the role that councillors may wish to have in steering the process or getting involved are crucial.

3.4 For all options it may be useful to refine this Discussion Paper in the light of the Summit as the basis for the further discussions and to establish a small political steering group to oversee the process.

3.5 Any mechanism would consider options for future cooperation arrangements including building on current arrangements (EELGA/SEEC/Mayor + SSPOLG), with additional informal/sub-regional groupings focused on particular
challenging issues or opportunities eg early ‘volunteers/partners for growth’ which could carry out more detailed work.

3.6 It will also draw on the considerable body of thinking on how arrangements for wider SE cooperation/planning could be made more effective in the longer term (see Annex 1). Models range from loose voluntary associations to suggestions already made, eg a regional ‘senate’; a regional equivalent to the London Planning Advisory Committee; lessons from other big city regions.

3.7 Would it be useful for these (see Annex 1) to be collated and summarised as a basis for discussion and to inform the meetings?

4 What are the issues to address via new arrangements for political and technical dialogue and cooperation across the wider South East

4.1 The abolished Regional Spatial Strategies identified what at the time were considered to be the strategic issues facing the East and South East, but that was under different administrative arrangements for addressing them and prior to the recent recession and substantial growth in London’s population and employment. It is anticipated that authoritative identification of strategic issues currently facing the wider SE will require further analysis, developing understanding of the issues and mechanisms for political and technical dialogue and cooperation where appropriate. The headlines set out in the following paragraph are intended to inform initial discussions.

4.2 Key issues where London and the wider SE have strong inter-dependencies or face significant challenges:

- **Sustaining and growing economic success** – what are key economic links and dependencies across/beyond the wider SE? what’s needed to underpin ongoing success?
- **Tackling economic under-performance and regeneration** – how can all areas benefit from the wider SE’s economic potential?
- **Housing the growing population** – what demographic changes are expected and where will people live?
- **Balancing growth and environmental priorities, including open space and addressing climate change** – how will constraints and opportunities influence future development?
- **Delivering strategic transport infrastructure** – what are the priorities for investment to support economic success?
- **Providing services for communities, including education/skills, health, care, power, water, waste** – how to ensure all partners play their part meeting the needs of the growing population?

Also informed by FALP and London Infrastructure Plan consultation and discussions since then.
Annex 1 - Strategic Planning – Recent Publications


**Royal Town Planning Institute:** Strategic Planning –
- Effective Cooperation for Planning Across Boundaries (Jan 2015): Includes a range of case studies. For England the focus should be on incentives where the duty to cooperate has not been effective, and to build on the momentum to harness the potential of the city regions. [http://www.rtpi.org.uk/media/1230885/RTPI-Strategic%20Planning-Brochure%20FINAL%20web%20PDF.pdf](http://www.rtpi.org.uk/media/1230885/RTPI-Strategic%20Planning-Brochure%20FINAL%20web%20PDF.pdf)


**Andrew Boff GLA Conservatives:** Southern Power House (Jan 2015): Promotes a comprehensive reform of London’s governance and tax powers and the establishment of a Thames City-Region to give the South East a say in London’s growth and prosperity. [http://glaconservatives.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/southern-power-house.pdf](http://glaconservatives.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/southern-power-house.pdf)

Also relevant in this context:

**Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners:** London’s Unmet Housing Needs – Meeting London’s overspill across the wider South East (Apr 2014): Study shows how London’s unmet housing needs could be distributed using a ‘Gravity Model’ approach and calls for the GLA and the authorities within the wider London Housing Market Area to work together to address this unmet need effectively. [http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/285GladmanDevelopmentsLtdResponse.pdf](http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/285GladmanDevelopmentsLtdResponse.pdf)


**DCLG: National Planning Policy Guidance:** Duty to Cooperate, paragraph 7: Cooperation between the Mayor, boroughs and local planning authorities bordering London will be vital to ensure that important strategic issues, such as housing delivery and economic growth, are planned effectively. [http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/duty-to-cooperate/what-is-the-duty-to-cooperate-and-what-does-it-require/](http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/duty-to-cooperate/what-is-the-duty-to-cooperate-and-what-does-it-require/)

**Planning Advisory Service** has developed a suite of practical guidance tools to facilitate compliance with the Duty to Cooperate. This includes a ‘Duty Statement template’, which addresses Governance and working arrangements and suggests for example memorandums of understanding to evidence agreements. [http://www.pas.gov.uk/web/pas1/events-and-support2/-/journal_content/56/332612/6387362/ARTICLE](http://www.pas.gov.uk/web/pas1/events-and-support2/-/journal_content/56/332612/6387362/ARTICLE)

---

4 Only selection – not comprehensive.
Review of the Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement

A discussion paper prepared by the Gatwick Diamond Strategy Project Group for Gatwick Diamond Chief Executives/Leaders Group.

Summary:

The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement (LSS) was one of the first examples of inter-authority cooperation, but is now becoming dated. If it is to remain valid as a means of addressing cross-boundary issues and demonstrating cooperation between authorities it needs to be reviewed.

The Gatwick Diamond Strategy Project Group1 (GDSPG) believes there is merit in retaining and updating the LSS. It supports duty-to-cooperate obligations, demonstrates support for the economic ambitions of the Local Economic Partnership (LEP), and provides a mechanism for collaboration on cross-boundary issues. Without it, cooperation would become more ad hoc, and the focus for individual authorities would move from the Gatwick Diamond to neighbouring strategic groupings such as Coastal West Sussex and Surrey/London fringe.

A review of the LSS provides an opportunity to determine the future ambition of the local authorities in the Diamond to work together. Some aspects, such as meeting the duty to cooperate, and responding to other LSS strategies have general support. Other aspects, such as convergence of Local Plan timetables, joint evidence gathering, and agreeing the right amount and distribution of housing are more challenging. The scope of the LSS will form part of the review. The GDSPG feels the existing Gatwick Diamond governance structures would be appropriate but this requires agreement from the Gatwick Diamond.

A dedicated resource is essential for a successful review, in terms of funding officer or consultant time to coordinate discussion and draft a revised LSS.

An appropriate time to start the review will be following the Airports Commission’s recommendation on runway capacity in the south east (Summer/Autumn 2015) and completion of the West Sussex & East Surrey Infrastructure Study, although identifying the scope of the review and its objectives could start sooner.

What is the LSS?

The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement was prepared in 2012 and sets a framework for Gatwick Diamond authorities2 to work together to address common issues across the Gatwick Diamond area. Its objectives are:

---

1 The Group comprises the Planning Policy Managers of the Gatwick Diamond local planning authorities.

2 The LSS was endorsed by Surrey CC; West Sussex CC; Crawley BC; Horsham DC; Mid Sussex DC; Mole Valley DC and Reigate & Banstead BC. It was prepared before Epsom & Ewell joined the Gatwick Diamond and although Tandridge DC did not endorse the LSS it was a signatory to the Memorandum of Understanding
- To provide a strategic direction for the Gatwick area on planning and economic issues
- To translate the strategic direction into change and development
- To establish mechanisms for inter-authority co-operation
- To identify and prioritise areas for joint working

The LSS is accompanied by a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Gatwick Diamond authorities. The MoU acknowledges the cooperative nature of the relationship, with statutory powers for plan-making and decision-taking remaining with individual authorities.

**Why is there a need to review?**

The LSS was published in March 2012. It included a work programme, timescales for which have now largely expired. While setting a broad strategic direction, it recognised that further work was required to translate that direction into planning and development. The age of the LSS and lack of an on-going work programme has been questioned at the most recent Local Plan examinations and the LSS is now carrying decreasing weight in such situations.

There have also been a number of changes since 2012 that need to be incorporated into the LSS. These include: publication of Coast to Capital’s Strategic Economic Plan and Coastal West Sussex’s LSS; discussions with the London Mayor on alterations to the London Plan; Epsom & Ewell joining the Gatwick Diamond; and most recently a proposal to develop a Gatwick Diamond/West Sussex Infrastructure Plan. In addition the Surrey local authorities agreed in 2014 to develop a separate but complementary LSS for the County and the preparation of a Surrey Infrastructure Plan is being considered.

Lastly, there is the work of the Airports Commission, which is due to publish its conclusions about future airport expansion in the South East during this summer. If it recommends the provision of a second runway at Gatwick and this is subsequently agreed by the Government there will be major consequences for the Gatwick Diamond area.

Initial scoping on a more detailed work programme was begun in 2014 with the support of Planning Portfolio Holders but has since stalled due to withdrawal of resources and uncertainty over the purpose of the LSS in the Gatwick Diamond.

**What benefits would accrue?**

An up-to-date LSS would:

- Help meet the duty to cooperate, providing a consistent strategic planning direction across the Gatwick Diamond area. The extent to which it tackles more challenging cross-boundary issues is a matter for discussion, but it will at least show an up-to-date position which has been collectively agreed. It will also provide an opportunity for Epsom & Ewell Borough Council to be involved in the review.
- Support economic growth in the Gatwick Diamond, responding at a sub-regional level to the LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan using evidence-based goals.

- Support infrastructure funding bids, by complementing infrastructure plans and identifying strategic priorities. This will help compete with demands for funding from other sub-regions in the LEP.

- Support a collective response to development pressures from London. The Mayor has prepared an Infrastructure Plan for 2050 and begun a review of the London Plan, which will include engagement across the wider South East about if/how London’s development needs can be met in the wider region. An updated LSS would provide a collective Gatwick Diamond voice for responding to those pressures.

- Address issues associated with the expansion of Gatwick Airport, with or without a second runway. A second runway at Gatwick would have major implications for development and infrastructure in the area, which would need to be planned collectively at a sub-regional level. Even if Gatwick remains as a one runway/two terminal operation, it will continue to be an economic driver in the Gatwick Diamond with consequent implications for housing and employment and a need for agreement on cross-boundary issues. In either case an LSS will help address issues of mutual interest. Since a second runway would be a ‘game changer’ in terms of future development needs, it would be sensible to link a review of the LSS to the recommendation of the Airports Commission, expected later this summer.

- Inform future reviews of the LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan, from a collective perspective. A revised LSS would provide a stronger voice in the process based on tested evidence and integrated with social and environmental aims.

**What would it involve?**

Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities would continue to provide a suitable governance structure for review of the LSS. Initial discussions about the content and ambition of the revised strategy would be for Portfolio Holders with overview provided by Gatwick Diamond Joint Leaders.

Review of the LSS will require a dedicated officer/consultant resource. The original LSS was drafted using a modest resource of approximately one day/week of professional time over a period of around a year and was funded by the Gatwick Diamond Initiative. This funding has since been withdrawn. If work is to progress on a review, a similar level of resource will be needed to coordinate work and provide draft documents for discussion and agreement. Consideration could be given to each Gatwick Diamond local authority making an equal contribution to funding a resource.

The extent and direction of strategic planning in the Gatwick area will be heavily influenced by a decision on whether Gatwick Airport is allowed to build a second runway. The housing, employment and infrastructure implications of an expanded airport would be of a different scale in a two runway scenario to a one runway scenario. The Project Steering Group therefore considers it would be sensible to await the recommendation of the Airports Commission before embarking on a review of the LSS. Equally, it will be important that an updated LSS takes account of other strands of work being undertaken in relation to these strategic issues.
## AGENDA

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Wider South East (SE) Summit 19 March</strong> – discussion/feedback re member/officer reactions to event and way forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Wider SE roundtables and longer-term political engagement between SE councils and GLA/Mayor/London councils</strong> – shaping the way forward for political discussions during summer/autumn 2015 and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Officer/technical support for political engagement between SE councils and London</strong> – what support will be needed, including: role/evolution of this working group; relationship with GLA’s Strategic Spatial Planning Officer Liaison Group (SSPOLG, next meeting 5 May) &amp; East of England officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>General election manifesto proposals for planning, growth and infrastructure</strong> – views/reactions to main party proposals and implications for the SE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Updates on work since last meeting (Sept 2014):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Political meeting between SEEC/SESL and London Councils and actions arising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feedback on <strong>SEEC workshop 28 November: duty to co-operate and strategic building blocks for successful Local Plans</strong> (see presentations &amp; note of event <a href="#">here</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Update on <strong>GLA London Infrastructure 2050 plan</strong> (see SEEC/SESL final response <a href="#">here</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Making the case for <strong>SE strategic transport investment</strong> - next steps on SEEC/SESL <em>Mind the Gap</em> campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>SEEC response</strong> to <strong>CLG Planning for Gypsies &amp; Travellers</strong> consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Arrangements for future meetings, invitees &amp; topics</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes of a meeting held on 31st March 2015

Attended by:

Elizabeth Bridgen  Crawley
Julia Dawe  Horsham
Chris Lyons  Horsham
Caroline West  West Sussex
Cath Rose  Reigate & Banstead
Jack Straw  Mole Valley
Guy Davies  Mole Valley
Sarah Thompson  Tandridge
Sue Janota  Surrey.

Apologies – Claire Tester (Mid Sussex); Karol Jakubczyk (Epsom & Ewell)

Notes of last meeting

Work on the review of the Tandridge, Reigate and Banstead Traveller Accommodation Assessment has been commenced by consultants ORS. Looking to complete survey work before travelling season gets under way. Difficulties in identifying travellers in bricks and mortar housing.

Cath drew attention to the current CLG consultation on the Review of Housing Needs for caravans and Houseboats; draft guidance. Link below


Gatwick Diamond LSS Review.

Following publication of an ITQ, three responses had been received from Chilmark, Shared Intelligence and Genecon.

Following a general discussion about how to review the three quotes, the following actions were agreed:

- Elizabeth and Sarah would score the three bids using the matrix provided by Julia and circulate their conclusions to the rest of the Group.

- Jack would contact the three bidders and explain the process we are carrying out and when we are likely to come to a decision.

- Once we have made a decision, Jack to advise Roger Dennis at Horsham (Procurement) to agree arrangements for the contract.
- Jack to contact successful bidder and agree date for an inception meeting.

- Everyone to update their Lead Member/CEO on the work that is in hand and how they will be expected to be involved in the review process. Make use of briefing note attached.

- Chris/Julia to consider process for reviving GD CEOs/Leaders Group to ensure governance of the review process.

- Jack to chase Karol about a financial contribution from Epsom towards the LSS review.

**Coastal West Sussex LSS Review.**

Work on the refresh of the Coastal West Sussex LSS has now been completed and signed off by the constituent local authorities which now includes Horsham and Mid Sussex; Crawley only West Sussex local authority not in area covered by the LSS. The LSS narrative now has a section on the rural area and recognises the distinction between Horsham town and rural Horsham to the south. The review is seen as a useful tool for bidding for funds and as an example of the Duty to Cooperate. A Coastal West Sussex LSS 3 is now being canvassed; no longer likely to be able to duck housing numbers and distribution.

**London Plan – Feedback from Summit.**

A note of the Second Wider South East Summit held on 11th December was circulated. It was recognised that a review of the London Plan will gather momentum after the Mayoral election in May and that the findings of the Outer London Commission and the support for Crossrail 2 from the National Infrastructure Commission and the Government will increase pressure on the South East and East of England to soak up some of the development pressures from London. The refreshed LSS could be a useful tool in establishing a position for the GD authorities to provide a united front in the face of such pressures.

**3SC Devolution**

The work of the Housing and Planning Workstream Group was noted. There was a general feeling that the benefits of the devolution bid need greater clarity and there is a limited appetite for it at district level. Noted there is a 3SC Leaders Meeting on the 8th April.

**Action**

- Jack to share papers prepared by Arup that review the 3SC planning asks.

- All to ensure their CEOs are cascading information from Kathryn Hall the CEO at Mid Sussex who is leading the Housing and Planning Workstream Group.
North Downs Line Summit

GWR had held a summit to explain their vision for the future of the North Downs Line which runs through Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead and Crawley. The proposals included electrification, capacity enhancements and station improvements. GWR will be bidding for Growth Deal 3 funds as part of their strategy for upgrading the line.

Local Plan Update

- Horsham to consult on draft CIL Charging Schedule in next couple of months.
- Mole Valley’s LDS has been agreed; CIL examination to be held in May.
- Reigate and Banstead CIL to come into force on 1st April. Consultation on Development Management policies in July.
- Crawley planning to adopt CIL in July; challenge to Local Plan policy relating to off-airport car parking. Still waiting to hear from CLG about Manor Royal Article 4 Direction.
- Tandridge Regulation 18 Consultation completed. Had 3,000 responses. Waiting for High Court judgement on the challenge to the Tandridge CIL and development management policies.
- West Sussex involved in the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan; issues around safeguarding wharves for handling minerals.

AOB

- Arrange to revive the GD Leaders/CEO Board and organise meeting to consider the LSS review and the GD Infrastructures Study 2030/2050

Date of Next Meeting

8th June 2016

Action

- Group needs to agree a new convenor as Jack is stepping back from his planning policy work at Mole Valley which will be taken over by Guy.
Emerging consensus from the first two Roundtables

Following a Wider South East Summit in March 2015, Roundtable discussions were set up to progress political discussion about future co-ordination/co-operation between the Mayor of London, the South East and East of England on strategic growth and infrastructure issues. Leaders from all councils and Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) representatives in the South East and East were invited to attend small Roundtable meetings with the GLA, with the first two sessions held on 10 July and a further three in September. A second Wider South East Summit on 11 December 2015 will consider the Roundtable findings and the way forward.

Attendees at both Roundtable sessions supported the need for political engagement, with the following emerging consensus on four broad topics of discussion as identified by the independent facilitator.

1. **Purpose/scope**
   - There must be a recognition of the importance of the strong mutual relationship between London, East and the South East.
   - The focus must be on economic prosperity as well as housing and planning, and must address transport and other strategic infrastructure in the wider sense.
   - The purpose must relate to the strategic big picture, with mechanisms for more focused work on particular areas such as transport corridors.
   - There is a need before the September sessions to begin to refine the scope/scale of future political engagement.

2. **Geography**
   - The proposed mechanism should relate to the areas covered by London, East and South East of England. The focus should be on the area as a whole with mechanisms for more detailed work being done on specific localities. It would complement not duplicate cross-boundary relationships.

3. **Political mechanisms**
   - The mechanisms should be bureaucratically light. They should enable different voices to be heard and not be dominated by a particular place or type of council. The principles of the proposed arrangements should be:
     - inclusive (possibly a summit at least once a year);
     - workable (possibly a smaller steering group/executive);
     - accountability of the smaller group to the wider membership (with a concerted effort on communications to enable the accountability to work);
     - operates in an all-party fashion.
   - There is a need for a more detailed discussion on the design of these mechanisms at the September sessions.

4. **Support and resources**
   - Consideration must be given to developing a shared and consistent data base, building on existing work and information.
   - Any support mechanism must be light touch and build on existing arrangements.
   - More work is needed on this once the scope and scale of the future engagement have been refined.
**South East England Roundtable (9.30 am)**

**Welcome**

Sir Edward Lister (Deputy Mayor for Planning at the Greater London Authority) welcomed the significant interest by Council Members and LEPs within the wider South East in these Roundtable discussions. He reiterated that London could meet its own housing need but, as throughout the wider South East, delivery was not keeping up. He referred to the publication of the Government’s Productivity Report and the need to consider its implications for planning. Heather Bolton (Director at South East England Councils) highlighted that the South East has a very successful economy in its own right and shared challenges with London on housing demand, overstretched infrastructure and balancing development needs with protected designations. It was important for London and South East politicians to work together to shape these strategic issues for the future.

**Scene Setting**

Stewart Murray, Assistant Director Planning, and Jorn Peters, Senior Strategic Planner, from the GLA gave a brief presentation (provided separately) setting the scene for the discussion.

**Roundtable discussion**

Phil Swann from Shared Intelligence independently facilitated the Roundtable discussion. The following key points were discussed by participants:

**Purpose/Scope**

- No one area (London, East or South East of England) or type of council should dominate another within the new arrangements. The new arrangements must be democratic and accountable.
- Key issues to consider include jobs growth, housing demand, protected land, and strategic infrastructure. Strategic infrastructure covers not only transport but also e.g. health, water, energy. Infrastructure and spatial planning regimes do not match, and despite the application of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) there are significant funding gaps.

**Geography**

- Arrangements should look at the whole wider South East, complementing not replacing existing one-to-one relationships between councils in London, the East and South East of England. The focus of the new arrangements should be on issues relevant for the whole wider South East.

**Political mechanisms**

- SERPLAN worked for 30 years as a strategic planning mechanism. It was acknowledged that circumstances are different today, but one could learn from the past for new bottom-up arrangements.
- There should be a genuine commitment from all partners that the new structure does not become a ‘talking shop’. In large groups (beyond the size of these Roundtables) it would be difficult to maintain discussion and interest. Therefore, the new mechanism should include a small overarching political steering group with the different tiers of local authorities involved, and any additional detailed work on specific strategic areas, such as corridors or...
other geographies, could be undertaken by small specialised groups. Regular but infrequent plenary sessions would allow everybody to get involved directly. Regular communication is needed to ensure everybody remains engaged.

- The Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) welcomed the invitation to participate at these Roundtable discussions. They could help in particular with the strategic delivery of growth.

**Support and resources**

- There are limited resources currently available in local authorities for this strategic engagement work. Work should be facilitated through existing bodies such as SEEC, EELGA and the GLA rather than creating a new organisation/secretariat. Some officer support was already in place through the Spatial Strategic Planning Officer Liaison Group (SSPOLG), which had already been established in 2013 during the preparation of the Further Alterations to the London Plan to address wider South East issues. Officers were asked to refine the purpose/scope of the future engagement, so that mechanisms and necessary technical support can be considered more fully at the September Roundtables.
- Robust, consistent and objective data/evidence is required to inform the issues the new arrangement will be dealing with. SSPOLG is already sharing data, e.g. on demography. Local authorities also hold valuable strategic evidence gained through the preparation of their Local Plans. However, the focus should remain on broad strategic issues without going towards the creation of a form of plan for the wider South East.

**East of England Roundtable (2.30 pm)**

**Welcome**

Fiona Fletcher Smith (Executive Director-Development, Enterprise & Environment at the GLA) reminded participants why better co-operation was so important referring in particular to the potential benefits in terms of economic development and infrastructure investment. Cllr Jason Ablewhite (Leader of Huntingdonshire District Council and new Chair of the East of England Local Government Association) reiterated the key principles that were set out by his predecessor at the Wider South East Summit in March including recognition of the variety of views within the wider South East and the challenges the places around London are facing as well as the importance of economic growth alongside housing growth.

**Scene Setting**

Jorn Peters, Senior Strategic Planner, at the GLA gave a brief presentation (provided separately) setting the scene for the discussion.

**Roundtable discussion**

Phil Swann from Shared Intelligence independently facilitated the Roundtable discussion. The following key points were discussed by participants:

**Purpose/scope**

- The new arrangements should focus on ‘big picture’ issues that go beyond local relevance.
- London already has a strong voice, but local authorities within the wider South East are not getting sufficient support for infrastructure required to accommodate their strategic growth.
ambitions. LEPs can provide some support to speed up delivery and at a strategic level look e.g. into the forward funding of infrastructure.

Geography

- Strategic growth areas should be recognised, but where there are existing structures such as for the London Stansted Cambridge corridor; these should not be duplicated.

Political mechanisms

- There is a need for every authority to buy into the new emerging arrangement, and smart communication is required to keep the engagement going over time.
- Every authority should be involved at some level. Summits like the one in March may work well in this respect. However, a small workable executive structure that has the confidence of all authorities across all political parties is needed to get the engagement work done. Effective communication between all authorities and this small group is required.

Support and resources

- The significant variation in strategic geographies (e.g. Housing Market Areas) and data (e.g. Strategic Housing Market Assessments) needs to be addressed. The new arrangements should facilitate co-ordination and consider appropriate geographies and datasets for key strategic issues. There may also be benefits in jointly commissioning research work that produces consistent outputs/evidence across the wider South East.

Emerging consensus and next steps

At both sessions there was support for better engagement arrangements. The summary on page 1 of this note represents the emerging consensus as identified by the independent facilitator from the two first Roundtable sessions. These will inform the second set of Roundtable discussions in Sept 2015 as well as the Outer London Commission’s consideration of the wider South East relations.

List of Attendees

See Annex 1
Annex 1 List of Attendees

South East of England Roundtable (9.30 am)

Cllr Richard Bower  Cabinet Member for Planning & Infrastructure, Arun DC
Cllr Neil Bell  Deputy Leader, Ashford BC
Cllr Martin Tett  Leader, Buckinghamshire CC
Cllr Isobel Darby  Leader, Chiltern DC
Cllr Keith House  Leader, Eastleigh BC
Cllr John Cubitt  Leader, Gravesham BC
Cllr Stephen Parker  Leader, Hart DC
Cllr Garry Wall  Leader, Mid Sussex DC
Cllr Sarah Seed  Executive Member for Planning, Mole Valley DC
Cllr Roland Dibbs  Cabinet Member for Environment & Service Delivery, Rushmoor BC
Cllr Robert Piper  Portfolio Holder for Planning, Sevenoaks DC
Cllr Howard Rogers  Cabinet Member Planning & Transportation, Tonbridge & Malling BC
Cllr Christine Field  Deputy Leader, West Sussex CC
Geoff French  Chairman, Enterprise M3 LEP
Graham Brown  Board Member, South East LEP
Sir Edward Lister  Deputy Mayor for Planning, Greater London Authority (GLA)

Supporting officers/observers:

Phil Swann  Facilitator, Shared Intelligence
Brian Horton  Adviser, South East LEP
Jack Straw  Planning Policy Manager, Mole Valley DC
Daniel Hawes  Planning Policy Manager, Hart DC
Heather Bolton  Director, South East England Councils (SEEC)
Nick Woolfenden  Head of Policy Co-ordination, SEEC
Fiona Fletcher Smith  Executive Director-Development, Enterprise & Environment, GLA
Stewart Murray  Assistant Director Planning, GLA
Richard Linton  Strategic Planning Manager, GLA
Jorn Peters  Senior Strategic Planner, GLA
Mike Keegan  Transport for London
East of England Roundtable (2.30 pm)

Cllr Dr Richard Moore  Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Planning, Basildon DC
Cllr Colleen Atkins   Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Regulatory Services, Bedford BC
Cllr Bill Frame  Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth and Planning, Colchester BC
Cllr Roger Hirst  Cabinet Member for Customer Services, Libraries, Planning and the Environment, Essex CC
Cllr Derrick Ashley  Cabinet member for Environment, Transport and Planning, Hertfordshire CC
Cllr Harvey Cohen Planning Portfolio Holder, Hertsmere BC
Cllr Jason Ablewhite  Leader, Huntingdonshire DC
Cllr Roy Davis  Elected Member, Luton BC
Cllr Derrick Haley  Leader, Mid Suffolk DC
Cllr Terry Cutmore  Leader, Rochford DC
Cllr John Fuller  Leader, South Norfolk Council
Cllr Ron Woodley  Leader, Southend-on-Sea BC
Cllr Julian Daly  Leader, St Albans DC
Cllr John Gardner  Deputy Leader - Environment and Economy, Stevenage BC
Cllr Mandy Perkins  Executive Member for Planning, Housing & Community, Welwyn Hatfield BC
Hilary Chipping  Head of Infrastructure, SEM LEP
Adrian Cannard  Strategy & Planning Director, GCGP LEP
Fiona Fletcher Smith  Executive Director-Development, Enterprise & Environment, GLA

Supporting officers/observers:

Phil Swann  Facilitator, Shared Intelligence
Brian Horton  Adviser, South East LEP
Richard Hatter  Strategic Planning Manager, Thurrock Council
Mark Silverman  Policy and Transport Manager, Hertsmere BC
Matthew Winslow  Strategic Planning & Housing Strategy, Basildon BC
Des Welton  Hertfordshire Planning Coordinator
John Williamson  Manager, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Planning Unit
Cecilia Tredget  Director, East of England Local Government Association
Çınar Altun  Policy and Secretariat Manager, East of England LGA
Richard Linton  Strategic Planning Manager, GLA
Jorn Peters  Senior Strategic Planner, GLA
Mike Keegan  Transport for London
Dear Sir/Madam

Outer London Commission Questions to Inform the Full Review of the London Plan

I am writing on behalf of the Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities* in response to your consultation on the Outer London Commission Questions to Inform the Full Review of the London Plan and the Options for Growth.

By way of introduction, you may wish to note that the Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities have a history of cooperation on strategic planning and development issues. We link closely to, and on key economic issues form part of, the Gatwick Diamond Initiative, one of the five spatial partnerships which make up the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership. We have an agreed Memorandum of Understanding setting out how we work together on issues which cross local authority boundaries and a Local Strategic Statement, finalised in early 2012, which we are looking to update. We intend to liaise closely with areas outside the Gatwick Diamond, including London, as we look to review the Local Strategic Statement.

In the Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities' response to the London Infrastructure Plan 2050 (letter dated 29 October 2014, attached) we acknowledged that infrastructure to support the projected scale of economic and population growth to 2050 is a key issue for London and that a coordinated infrastructure plan is highly desirable. However, we noted that the Plan explored a number of scenarios about where growth can be accommodated within London and beyond London's boundaries ‘as a precursor to the next full revision of the London Plan after 2016’. Indicative maps in the Plan and supporting documentation highlighted the Gatwick area as a potential growth area in the context of accommodating some of London’s forecast increase in population. We contended that it was not the place for a non-statutory plan to start to determine a spatial strategy for London and the South East or to seek to influence the Local Plans of authorities outside London.

Instead, we recommended that spatial options to accommodate London’s future growth should be tested through the next review of the London Plan, and this would require the Mayor to engage with local authorities or groups of authorities from across the South East, sharing evidence and understanding of opportunities and constraints, in order to agree on how to address the challenges facing the area as a whole.

In this respect we welcome the opportunity to be engaged in the early stages of the Full Review of the London Plan and would like to make the following comments in relation to a number of the questions posed in the consultation.

QG4: In the Context of meeting London’s growth, what contribution should the following mechanisms make to helping to meet the challenge of delivering increased levels of housing?
- Increasing outer London densities, particularly through suburban renewal
- More housing at higher densities in town centres and Opportunity Areas/Intensification Areas with good public transport
- Greater cumulative contribution of small scale sites, such as infill
Selective release of London’s greenbelt around public transport nodes for housing (or consolidation of employment)

All of the above suggestions for meeting housing growth are supported. In accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF the London Plan should seek to meet their needs as well as boosting the supply of housing.

Only if the above means cannot meet the needs of London should the last option below be considered. The areas beyond London are facing their own pressures and have supported the London economy through commuting. The road and rail infrastructure is at capacity, so increasing commuting will have related infrastructure complications.

Densification of built up areas beyond London (new towns; garden cities, suburban extensions)

QG6: Would it be worth considering growth ‘corridors’ (e.g. as with LSCC and linked to existing/potential public transport) in terms of enabling an integrated housing/employment/ cross-boundary strategy… and if so, which corridors could be a focus (e.g. associated with CR2, HS1, HS2, CR1 extensions, C2C improvement, Gatwick)?

As indicated in the Gatwick Diamond representation on the London Infrastructure Plan, London should first look to accommodate its growth within its boundaries. Where necessary, this may dictate a review of existing Metropolitan Open Land and Metropolitan Green Belt designations. As we have previously indicated in our response on the Further Alterations to the London Plan, areas to the south of London do not provide unconstrained opportunities for meeting London’s growth, as evidenced by the challenges faced by the local authorities in meeting their own objectively assessed housing needs, and needs to plan for growth to support a future expansion of Gatwick Airport, even if a second runway is not proposed at this stage by the government.

The area where there is the greatest mismatch between the housing need and planned provision is the South East. Gatwick Airport is of national significance and the Gatwick Diamond is an important economic area in its own right with associated growth needs. Local authorities in the area are seeking to meet these needs through the district and borough’s Local Plans and this should not be compromised by growth from London. However, currently in Surrey and West and East Sussex counties, of the 23 local planning authorities only two are planning to meet their needs: Horsham and Mid Sussex. Horsham District is also planning to assist in meeting the needs of the wider area. Of an estimated objectively assessed need of 16,000 homes per year for the three counties, current proposed provision figures amount to 8,427 per year, or just over 50% of the need.

This is due to the amount of constraints, including Greenbelt (73% of Surrey), Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Park and the high level of ‘need’ because the population projections assume that the high level of in-migration to the South East will continue indefinitely. There are also significant environmental, social and infrastructure constraints in areas outside these national designations where housing is being targeted disproportionately. The existing infrastructure deficit cannot be addressed through contributions from development generating a greater burden on these areas.

Since the London Infrastructure Plan was published, the Airports Commission has ruled out as a viable option a hub airport in the Thames Estuary to increase airport capacity in the South East to 2030. The Plan needs to consider the consequences for infrastructure in the event that Heathrow Airport or Gatwick Airport is selected for expansion, as well as addressing the infrastructure needs of their already planned growth.

QG7: How can we maximise the benefits of growth regionally, sub-regionally and locally; and mitigate concerns? (e.g. provision of supporting social and community infrastructure; greater focus on place-making; re-provision in the new development of social housing)

The wider South East will continue to provide homes for significant numbers of London commuters requiring local services and so a proportion of infrastructure requirements such as education and health will fall on areas outside London.
Infrastructure and its funding should be planned in a wider context. Working with local authorities in the South East, the Mayor should consider how strategic connectivity within the wider area could support economic success and offer mutual benefits as part of its infrastructure package.

The Plan should consider how strategic transportation links should be improved as part of a long term infrastructure plan in the event that Heathrow or Gatwick is selected for expansion. Gatwick Airport anticipates a growth of up to 45 million passengers per annum by 2030 even without a second runway. Ensuring 40% of these passengers arrive at the airport by sustainable transport, in line with the current target, will require maintaining and enhancing an adequate network, particularly rail, from London.

The plan should look to address wider transport connectivity within the South East, given the importance that this will have in securing collective economic success and, for the long term, successful places in which to live and work.

**QR1: Should London and the wider south east be viewed as one area for managing growth? What are the planning implications of this for housing and jobs growth and strategic infrastructure provision?**

Given the scale of growth and the nature of the infrastructure needs, a coordinated plan supported by appropriate evidence would seem to be highly desirable. However, such a long term infrastructure plan needs to reflect the interrelationship between London and the South East and their collective economic success and support this through strategic infrastructure provision for this wider area.

**QR4: How could useful co-operative relationships be built (over time) across the border and going beyond the statutory requirements under which the Mayor and LPAs work? How can any value be added to this process?**

**QR8: Who could constitute the membership? How many local authority representatives, how many LEP representatives and others should be directly involved?**

The representation by local authority could be based on a housing market area or economic areas, with one representative per area. The Gatwick Diamond, as explained above, is a collective voice that would be willing to contribute.

Individual representations by each local authority in the South East would be impossible to manage.

**QR9: What should be the format of new co-ordination arrangements, and how many layers should it have?**

It is requested that any arrangements that are set up in relation to Regional Coordination for London and the South East are mindful to the existing structures and bodies already set up beyond the Greater London boundary, including the Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities. This would help reduce duplication and maximise the limited resources available.

Any new relationships and arrangements should be expected to consider wider issues relating to infrastructure delivery where they affect areas beyond London’s administrative boundaries with those areas.

I hope these comments are helpful. We would welcome the opportunity to work more closely with the GLA both in the context of this London Infrastructure Plan and on the proposed full revision of the London Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Crowley
Chief Executive, Horsham District Council
On behalf of the Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities
* The Gatwick Diamond Local Authorities comprise: West Sussex County Council, Surrey County Council, Crawley Borough Council, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Mid Sussex District Council, Mole Valley District Council, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council and Tandridge District Council. With the exception of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, which joined later, all the Authorities work within the terms of a Memorandum of Understanding agreed in 2012. The Local Strategic Statement, finalised in early 2012, was endorsed by all the Councils with the exception of Tandridge District Council and Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
1. Emerging Consensus from Roundtables

1.1 Following a Wider South East (WSE) Summit in March 2015, well-attended Roundtable discussions were set up to progress political discussion about future co-ordination/co-operation between the Mayor of London, the South East and East of England on high-level cross-boundary growth and infrastructure issues. Leaders from all councils and Local Enterprise Partnership representatives in the South East and East were invited to attend small Roundtable meetings with the GLA, with the first two sessions held on 10 July and a further three in September. Today’s second WSE Summit on 11 December 2015 will consider the Roundtable findings and agree the way forward (see paper for Agenda Items 2-4 related recommendations to Summit).

1.2 Attendees at all Roundtable sessions supported the need for political engagement, with the following emerging consensus on four broad topics of discussion as identified by the independent facilitator (Phil Swann, from consultants Shared Intelligence):

i. **Purpose/scope** - There must be a recognition of the importance of the strong mutual relationship between London, East and the South East. The focus must be on economic prosperity as well as housing, planning and environmental quality and must address transport and other strategic infrastructure in the wider sense. The purpose must relate to the strategic big picture, with mechanisms for more focused work on particular areas such as transport corridors. It will be important to prioritise, with an initial focus on housing and transport to underpin economic prosperity.

ii. **Geography** - The proposed mechanism should relate to the areas covered by London, East and South East of England. The focus should be on the area as a whole with mechanisms for more detailed work being done on specific localities as necessary. It would complement not duplicate cross-boundary relationships.

iii. **Political mechanisms** - The mechanisms should be bureaucratically light and remain flexible. They should enable different voices to be heard and not be dominated by a particular place or type of council. The principles of the proposed arrangements should be:
   - there should be an inclusive annual summit, with a clear task/purpose;
   - the work between summits should be steered by a workable small executive. East of England, South East and London should be free to appoint their representatives in a way that suits their area, but the arrangements should be politically and geographically representative;
   - there must be highly effective communication mechanisms between meetings to ensure accountability and progress;
   - where appropriate steering mechanisms should be established for work on particular corridors or areas.

iv. **Support and resources** - Consideration must be given to developing a shared understanding of evidence/data relevant to future political working, building on existing work and information. It was agreed that a short note should be produced on the actions currently in hand to progress this and the likely timescales (see Annex 2).

More generally, any officer arrangements to support the political mechanisms must be light touch and build on existing arrangements. More engagement from London beyond the Mayor is required. Opportunities to tap into resources such as those available to the Local Enterprise Partnerships outside London should also be explored.

2. Emerging key actions for WSE political engagement to initially focus on?

- Information needs/sharing data & understanding of evidence.
- Emerging timetable/work programme and growth options for the London Plan Review.
- Emerging shared issues of concern for early joint action – initial suggestions are:
  - ‘Contract’ based approach to expediting housing delivery (also known as ‘use it, lose it or pay for it’).
  - Explore transport investment/existing agreed corridor-based development.
AGENDA

1. Welcome and introductions

2. Agreement on new collaboration arrangements between East of England, South East and London
   a) Remit, objectives and governance for proposed annual Summit and executive political Steering Group
   b) Meeting schedule and communications between meetings

3. Potential early priorities for collaboration and joint action
   a) Preparation and timing for the full review of the London Plan
   b) Common understanding of data/evidence base
   c) Addressing barriers to housing delivery
   d) Making the case for strategic infrastructure investment

4. Next steps and actions
1. Towards a common understanding of the evidence

1.1 For context, it is important to understand that most data analysis for planning/infrastructure in South East and East is undertaken at the local level following the abolition of regional strategies, whilst GLA continues to undertake London-wide analysis for the statutory, strategic London Plan and other Mayoral responsibilities. Further to discussions at the recent Wider South East (WSE) Roundtables, SSPOLG (the existing Spatial Planning Officer Liaison Group with officers from London, East and South East) has initiated a technical ‘stocktake’ exercise, which provides an overview of available data on various strategic issues in London, the East and South East of England. This exercise, which is ongoing, will help create a shared understanding of each area’s evidence bases and highlight shared strategic priorities, such as demographic trends and transport infrastructure. It will also help to identify data inconsistencies between the three areas and any strategic data gaps where additional research may be required. To support common understanding of strategic data issues, an officer group could be established to help ensure partners are clear about the methodologies and assumptions used, and what this means for their local areas. There may also be scope for joint commissioning of additional research.

1.2 The following represents an initial overview of issues/opportunities that are being considered. This has been informed by the technical stocktake exercise. The Roundtables concluded that the initial focus of co-operation should be on housing & transport/infrastructure to underpin economic prosperity, and then on environmental quality. Progress and timescales for investigating these issues will depend on the availability of resources across the three areas:

- Population and household projections: The GLA is expanding its models to allow production of projection scenarios across England. This capability could facilitate more in-depth co-operation across the WSE, and GLA projections could be considered alongside ONS projections, which are traditionally/widely used by WSE local authorities.
- Employment and economic projections: GLA Economics is currently considering the feasibility of extending its employment projections to cover the WSE. It will be decided by the GLA within the next couple of months if this is possible. There are other economic models, including for example the East of England Forecasting Model. Officers could explore compatibility between different models.
- Current strategic growth locations: It may be useful to bring together on one diagram the strategic growth locations set out in Local Plans across the WSE.
- Transport modelling: TfL will engage the WSE on the new Mayoral Transport Strategy, and will share its latest information on commuting patterns. It may also be desirable to produce evidence for common priorities in terms of specific strategic transport schemes that could unlock growth.

In addition to the issues above relating to the emerging priority issues, existing work is also underway on:

- Minerals and waste: Discussions at SSPOLG indicate that better waste management data is required in particular on hazardous waste and construction, demolition and excavation waste. In terms of minerals better data on movements and destinations of aggregates needs to be surveyed. Existing technical advisory groups are likely to lead/co-ordinate this work.
- Water supply and flood risk: Initial discussions with the Environment Agency and the relevant Water Resource Groups are taking place.

2. Local Authorities working together

2.1. SSPOLG initiated a meeting in early 2015 between the Mayor of London’s demography/housing experts and key Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) consultancies working in the WSE. The Mayor of London’s concerns about the
CLG/ONS population/household projections were raised and his alternative approach to inform their future work on SHMA within the WSE was explained. (The GLA projections show different housing demand than ONS projections as the two data sets treat the impacts of recession differently). The meeting was a valuable opportunity for experts to work together towards a better understanding of the demography and housing projections and it was agreed that this group will meet periodically to improve the understanding and co-operation between relevant experts from across the WSE to contribute to the development of more consistent evidence underpinning Local Plans.

2.2. Demography experts from the WSE have also been invited to regularly attend the GLA’s Population Statistics User Group. This is a forum for local authorities, now offering those outside London the opportunity to engage with counterparts in London on demography issues. However, it has to be noted that there is only a limited pool of expertise within WSE local authorities due to its specialist nature.

2.3. There is of course further scope to explore joint opportunities in other areas, such as: economic development, transport and environment. SSPOLG could initiate this, but in the light of scarce resources this needs to be done in a focused and effective way. As part of considering effectiveness, the shared understanding of the data could also support bidding documents/investment discussions and could be shared with wider partners, such as LEPs.

3. Data made available by the GLA

3.1. SSPOLG was established in 2013, and since then efforts have been made to improve the common understanding of the technical data available to councils across London and the WSE. The GLA produces/analyses a range of London-wide data to inform the London Plan and other Mayoral responsibilities. Following the abolition of regional strategies outside London, little comparable data is available in the East and South East of England, where data is predominately produced/analysed at local level to meet local need.

3.2. The Mayor of London has made available strategic data on demography and related key issues with officer colleagues within the WSE. The most up-to-date GLA datasets and pieces of research are the following:

- **Migration flows** for each WSE district to/from London - for the years 2002 to 2014 and for 2013/14 broken down by age are available on the website referred to in paragraph 3.4. They reflect the Government’s latest internal migration data for mid-2014. For further details please also see the following research report: [http://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/ons-2014-mid-year-population-estimates--london-analysis](http://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/ons-2014-mid-year-population-estimates--london-analysis)

- **Household projections** for each WSE district for every year up to 2037 - also comparing those based on CLG’s 2012 and 2008 Sub-national Population Projections are available on the website referred to in paragraph 3.4. However, GLA’s own trend-based projections are only available for London. A key concern for many is that CLG’s household projections are not based on longer-term (10-year) migration trends.

- **Overview of LEPs’ Strategic Economic Plans in the Greater South East (April 2015)** – focuses on key housing and transport objectives and is available on the website referred to in paragraph 3.4.

3.3. Other related issues for example on GLA research into Barriers to Housing Delivery (a common concern) and the Mayor’s 2050 Infrastructure Plan are also being discussed by the SSPOLG.

4. Full Review of the London Plan

4.1. The following sets out an indicative timetable for a Full Review of the London Plan, which is likely to be requested by any new London Mayor (election in May 2016):

- May 2016: New London Mayor
- Autumn 2016: London Plan initial high-level consultation
- Autumn 2017: London Plan consultation draft
- 2018/19: Earliest new London Plan Examination in Public

4.2. Key components of the technical evidence required to underpin the development of this new London Plan are listed below. This list is not comprehensive and will evolve further over the next few months. The Mayor of London will endeavour to engage the authorities within the WSE as and when that is appropriate.

- Populations, household and employment projections
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
- Density study
- Opportunity Areas review
- Office, industrial, retail and Town Centre review
- Regional Flood Risk Appraisal
- Infrastructure Plan related outputs
- Spatial options modelling.
1 Forward funding infrastructure

- Maximise use of existing mechanisms to forward fund infrastructure within the borrowing limits set by the prudential code (eg. Tax Increment Financing, joint ventures, bonds or pension funds).
- Greater fiscal devolution to the Mayor of the property tax revenues raised in London - so that these could be used or leveraged in order to forward fund infrastructure (eg council tax, business rates, stamp duty and capital gains).
- Additional mechanisms to capture land value uplift following planning approval and the delivery of infrastructure. This could be through:
  - Reform to the CPO process - to enable land assembly and compensation at Existing Use Value, with potential to use land value increases to forward fund infrastructure (and surplus profits shared between landowners, developers and the public sector).
  - Some form of land value taxation.

2 Small sites and small developers

- Provide a more streamlined, positive and certain planning policy framework for small sites and small developers.
- Produce more tailored, straightforward planning and design guidance for small developers.
- Make information on the availability of small sites more widely available – eg infill opportunities and surplus public sector assets.
- Explore the potential to fast-track planning permissions through planning permissions in principle or development orders.

3 Accelerate build out rates on large sites

- Greater use of recycled grant funding to address abnormal costs and infrastructure delivery challenges associated with complex brownfield development – ala Housing Zones.
- Require land parcelling or sub-division on large sites to increase the number and size of developers on each site and to stimulate greater diversity and competition.
- Provide greater encouragement to Private Rented Sector (PRS) – as this tenure may be less affected by the perceived absorption issues associated with selling market sale units at a particular price point.
- Explore potential approaches to incentivise developers to speed up the building out of planning permissions, for example:
  - Apply stricter timescales for starting onsite within a planning permission (with the option to extend timescales through appeal where there are mitigating circumstances).
  - Require a minimum agreed level of housing output over 5 year periods through planning conditions.
  - Levy Council Tax on approved but unbuilt homes (paid by developer).
  - Incentivise accelerated output (eg higher densities if within a set period).
4 **Land assembly and CPO**
- Simplify, speed up and de-risk CPO process for local authorities.
- Enhance local authority skills and resources in land assembly and CPO.
- Improve pan-London sharing of local authority technical experience, skills and resources.

5 **Public Sector Land**
- Simplify, speed up and de-risk the procedures involved in public sector land disposal and procurement.

6 **Improve the speed & certainty of the planning system**
- Speed up the planning process for schemes which already have outline consent – eg Section 106, conditions discharge – eg mediators and stricter timescales.
- Reduce the scope for negotiation on adopted policy - consider fixed affordable housing targets and fast-tracking policy compliant schemes. These policy compliant schemes would not need to be subject to further negotiation, viability appraisals or review mechanisms. This would provide an incentive to meet policy requirements and might reduce land value inflation.
- Address the absence of a single agreed methodological approach to assessing development viability.

7 **Land supply**
- Improve the speed of identifying and allocating brownfield land for housing (eg Brownfield Registers).
- Consider addressing supply challenges by increasing land supply from other sources – eg the green belt, suburban renewal/intensification.

8 **Increase public sector housebuilding**
- Encourage greater flexibility for local authorities and the Mayor to borrow and invest in building homes.

9 **Construction sector capacity**
- Encourage the use of modern methods of construction through bespoke planning policy and design guidance.
- Increase the resilience of the London labour market by funding construction training and apprenticeships.
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Barriers / challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Land supply</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• planning policy framework</td>
<td>• existing policy barriers/constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• up to date and responsive Plans</td>
<td>• local authority resources and funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the identification / allocation of sites</td>
<td>• necessary political and local community buy-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• housing trajectories - maintaining a rolling 5 year supply (plus necessary buffer)</td>
<td>• identification &amp; allocation of large and small sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reality - all options for additional capacity are contentious and difficult to deliver – eg higher densities, green belt, further industrial land release, estate renewal, suburban intensification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• land assembly</td>
<td>• fragmented ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• third party land – potential acquisition and ransom costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CPO process – too slow, complex, risky, issues with some local authority resources &amp; skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• land availability</td>
<td>• ownership barriers – non-house builders/non developers and land banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• viability – distinction between identified capacity and viable &amp; deliverable sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• infrastructure delivery timescales and funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• public sector land – procedural challenges (eg OJEU thresholds, ‘best value’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• information and certainty – brownfield registers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Getting consent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• obtaining planning permission</td>
<td>• Section 106 – slow, lengthy negotiations &amp; capacity of legal resource in local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• condition discharge &amp; statutory consultees - too slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• local authority resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• existing planning policy barriers to development or land use change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• certainty of the planning policy framework – for large and small sites/infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• nimbyism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• other consents</td>
<td>• Rights to Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environment Agency – eg protected species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Viability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• risk v reward</td>
<td>• planning inputs to residual valuation are often negotiated and uncertain – can impact price paid for land, leading to inflated land values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• affordable housing requirements</td>
<td>• cash flow issues affect build out rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• infrastructure delivery – CIL and other s106</td>
<td>• methodological uncertainty, ambiguity &amp; dispute (eg NPPF, NPPG, RICS, GLA guidance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• construction costs</td>
<td>eg which benchmark land value to use? - EUV+ or Market Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• abnormal costs</td>
<td>• circularity of some approaches to MV based appraisals – where AH policies are not fully taken into account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• acceptable developer return (%)</td>
<td>• transparency and openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• changing/cyclical market conditions</td>
<td>• local authority skills &amp; resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• what benchmark land value to use?</td>
<td>• lengthy and costly negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• certainty and consistency of policies &amp; decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• large proportion of developer costs are up front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• high land values and completion for sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• price of land – do policy constraints and lack of availability increase competition &amp; land values?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How to avoid land value inflation with policy interventions/allocations (eg Housing Zones)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4 Funding and infrastructure delivery
- Transport connectivity drives densities, values and viability
- Delivering large-scale transport infrastructure is difficult
- Development finance not easily available or affordable for small/medium sized developers or start-up firms
- High land values in London

- Higher risks = higher interest
- Lenders require premium on risk – uncertainty costs money
- Small builders and developers pay increased costs on finance due to economies of scale
- Forward funding transport infrastructure is challenging and requires borrowing and a degree of risk
- Developers reliance on off-plan pre-sales to secure funding mortgage restrictions for residents
- Seeking off-plan or custom build

### 5 Building out
- Perceived absorption issues with market sale units
- Lack of diversity in house building industry – dominated by big players
- Overpaying on land - leading to delays or slow build outs to achieve necessary sales values
- Construction sector skills and capacity
- Availability of skilled staff during a buoyant market
- Availability of finishers – eg plumbers, electricians, plasterers

- Challenges to sell units at certain price points during phases – reliance on mortgage finance being available to prospective buyers. The need for developers to recoup initial outlay on land.
- Challenges facing other tenures – affordable housing, PRS, custom build, older peoples housing, student accommodation, shared living
- Potential for local authority housebuilding
- Small sites and infill / gap sites – locally contentious
- Supply from housing associations and registered providers – impacts of right to buy and 1% rent cuts
- Public sector land and duties on land disposal – achieving ‘best value’
- Use it or lose it powers or incentivising housing output?
- Parcelling and sub-dividing large sites
- Modern methods of construction – viability and scale of off-site production and issues with delivery on site
- Starter homes – impacts on viability, market absorption and other tenures
- Payments in lieu – when to take on site or off site affordable housing and speed of delivery
- Skills and staff - Government immigration policy – availability of construction workers and other trades
1. Introduction

1.1 At the SPOA meeting in December, it was agreed that PWG would give initial consideration to the format and content of a high level position statement that could provide the basis of an ‘interim’ LSS. This was in recognition that - with recent progress on devolution discussions and with a London Plan review on the horizon - it will be important that Surrey authorities are in a position to articulate their spatial priorities for the short-medium term.

1.2 This proposition, along with other actions including a joint meeting with Sussex planners, was endorsed by Surrey Chief Executives at their meeting on 22 January.

2. Summary of PWG discussions to date

2.1 The LSS formed the main item on the agenda of Planning Working Group on 22 January, where a very constructive discussion agreed the following main points to inform a way forward on the LSS:

2.2 Support: There is value in and support for progressing work on an interim LSS at this stage.

2.3 Shared challenges: The main focus will need be on the challenges that are being faced across Surrey, and how those are being responded to. Any quantified information about growth levels (homes, jobs etc) will only be able to be provided for the relatively short term, recognising that districts and boroughs are at very different stages in the plan preparation process. However even articulating growth trajectories for the short term (say 5 years) will be relevant in informing devolution discussions.

2.4 Vision: The LSS should include an overarching vision – although work is still underway to refine this, it was suggested that it should capture:

   a. The necessity of balancing competing priorities and managing growth pressures

   b. A positivity that builds on what is best in Surrey, recognising that there are challenges associated with the county’s strengths (pockets of deprivation, affordability issues, congestion etc)

   c. A focus on creating places (not just hitting housing targets or becoming a London dormitory)

2.5 Objectives: A small number of strategic objectives should be identified, under which priorities and implementation mechanisms will be identified. These objectives could be as follows:

   a. Supporting sustainable economic growth

   b. Meeting housing needs

   c. Delivering infrastructure

   d. Supporting environmental sustainability/green infrastructure
2.6 **Sub-areas:** Surrey is not a homogenous county, and administrative geographies do not reflect functional geographies. This means that how the above objectives will be delivered upon across the county will vary. The LSS needs to recognise this.

2.7 A number of sub-areas will therefore be defined, within which the local challenges will be described and the spatial priorities identified. There are many ways to ‘cut the cake’ and it will need to be acknowledged that authorities will inevitably need to work together in different groupings to address different issues. However...

2.8 …As a starting point the following sub-areas (areas where issues and challenges broadly align) have been suggested:
   a. Blackwater Valley
   b. Upper M3
   c. A3 Corridor
   d. Rural South Surrey
   e. Gatwick Diamond.

2.9 **Key diagram:** The LSS will be accompanied by some form of key diagram mapping spatial priorities across the county.

3. **Next steps and recommendations**

3.1 A small subgroup of PWG officers has been formed to coordinate work on the LSS, recognising that it will be critical that each sub-area works closely together to input into the process and to identify its own challenges and priorities.

3.2 At this stage, it is requested that SPOA:
   a. Confirm its agreement that PWG continues to progress work in developing an interim LSS
   b. Confirm its agreement of the approach outlined above, in particular:
      - Those aspects that it is most important to capture in the vision (para 2.4)
      - The proposed strategic objectives (para 2.5)
      - The proposed approach to identify Surrey-wide objectives, but to recognise that the spatial responses to these are best considered and articulated on a sub-area basis.
      - The proposed sub-areas (para 2.8)

3.3 Surrey Chief Executives are due to receive their next update report on the LSS in July. It is therefore suggested that PWG provide a short progress reports to SPOA’s April meeting, and a more substantive update in June.

Cath Rose, Sue Janota
Jack Straw, Georgina Pacey

February 2016
1. Introduction

1.1. One of the core priorities of the Wider South East (WSE) Political Steering Group is to explore opportunities for collaborative working with a view to overcoming barriers to housing delivery.

1.2. At its last meeting in February 2016, the WSE Political Steering Group tasked officers to draft a report collating key learning from recent publications on barriers to housing delivery. This report sets out some of the common themes and key recommendations for encouraging and incentivising housing delivery arising from recent reports, and identifies possible opportunities for collective working across the WSE.

1.3. WSE Council leaders and the Mayor of London want to find ways to tackle barriers to ensure locally-approved plans/development progresses as swiftly as possible, alongside necessary infrastructure. Several recent reports have addressed the barriers to delivery, for example the Mayor of London’s Outer London Commission ‘Removing the Barriers to Housing Delivery’ (March 2016); IPPR London Housing Commission ‘Building a New Deal for London’ (March 2016); Localis/SEEC work ‘Clearing the Hurdles’ (2013). The National LGA has also established a Housing Commission to look at barriers to housing delivery, however recommendations have not yet been published.

2. What are the barriers to housing delivery?

2.1. The WSE faces a critical shortage of housing supply and demand is set to increase not just in London but also in the East and South East. Working collectively poses an opportunity to meet the scale of the challenge.

2.2. Data on current housebuilding performance. SE (21,900 in 2014/15 – source CLG live table no.253). Add figures for London and East. [Also consider looking at CLG Live table no.122 for total additions to housing stock ie not just new-build, but also conversions etc].


2.4. Some of the challenges hindering local ability to meet housing targets arise from:

**LAND**
- Land banking and speculative land prices.
- Cost of cleaning up brownfield sites for housing.
- Finding land (at the right price and in the right location).

**CAPACITY**
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- The business model for building for private sale promotes slow building and release onto the market.
- Insufficient building of affordable homes and homes for rent at scale.
- Limited competition within the building industry undermines competition. SMEs struggle to access finance for Brownfield clean-up and cannot compete with large developers where there are high land prices.
- Offsite manufacturing has the potential to revolutionise housebuilding, but is a major risk for a developer to invest in unless they are sure of demand.
- Skills shortages in sectors relevant to the house building industry.
- Undersupply and costs of materials for housing development.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**
- Slow progress/ existing deficits on infrastructure investment and delivery.
- Slow or no investment on upgrading road and public transport links that could unlock sites for jobs and housing growth.

**PLANNING**
- Tens of thousands of planning permissions granted but not implemented
- The need to maximise efficiency of the planning system while avoiding constant change as this creates uncertainty for developers and undermines delivery.

3. Context

3.1. As the WSE collaboration arrangements continue, the Government’s controversial Housing and Planning Act received royal Assent and the Local Plans Expert Group (LPEG) have proposed measures to address the slow progress in the preparation of up-to-date Local Plans. Moreover, with less than a third of Local Planning Authorities having an NPPF-compliant up-to-date plan, Government has set a deadline of ‘early 2017’ for Local Planning Authorities to produce a plan.

3.2. This changing landscape combined with the ongoing challenges relating to the provision of much needed housing requires strong leadership and collaboration to boost the ability of councils to meet the challenges.

4. What opportunities are there for collaboration?

4.1. This report draws on a number publications in recent months relating to barriers to housing delivery with the aim of highlighting a range of measures and recommendations that provide opportunities for active collaboration across the WSE to tackle these challenges.

a) **Accelerating Infrastructure Delivery:** Greater fiscal devolution to the Mayor of London and to Local Authorities across the Wider South East can boost local infrastructure provision and enable local authorities to forward fund essential infrastructure needed to derive housing and economic growth. The OLC’s barriers to housing delivery report also recommends that CIL regulations be revised to allow charging authorities to borrow against future CIL income and use CIL receipts to repay interest on loan finance, which is currently prohibited. These two recommendations are issues on which joint lobbying could be undertaken. Devolution of further fiscal powers to councils across the WSE would be of benefit not just to London but to councils across the WSE. The relaxation of the rules surrounding the use of CIL, local
authority discretion to charge developer contributions on sites of all sizes and national investment to support schemes that are too big for local funding could also enable more housing and economic growth.

b) **Incentivising build out rates and tackling genuine land banking:** With regards incentivising build out rates and tackling genuine land banking, the OLC recommends adopting a “carrot and stick” approach, for example through appropriate planning support for stalled schemes or keeping a register of non-planning barriers which are holding back housing production on large sites and addressing these issues once resources and funding become available. Where there are no outstanding issues preventing the commencement of development and where house production has not commenced within 3 years, the Commission recommends CPO action or a tax mechanism equivalent of council tax on unbuilt approved properties in order to incentivise delivery. Councils in the East and South East may like to see a shorter period than 3 years, an option which could also be explored collectively. They would support use of discretionary powers to tax land that remains undeveloped as proposed in the work by SEEC and Localis.

Notably, SEEC members are also very interested in the promoter vs builder issue. They are worried that promoters focus on maximising profit on their land at the expense of delivering houses quickly. Would be interested to see some options to encourage builders in lieu of promoters.

c) **Increasing and diversifying housing supply:** Notably the OLC report recommends using a range of spatial options, including consideration of selective green belt release in London, as is already happening in South East and East of England. It is also suggested that releasing green belt land could also reduce London’s reliance on large brownfield sites for housing delivery and help to increase both competition, overall housing delivery and industry capacity. The NLP also suggests that local planning authorities could benefit from advice on how to undertake Green Belt reviews.

It is recommended that, in light of national Green Belt policy and potential alternative sources of housing capacity, the Mayor of London could undertake an initial assessment of the potential development capacity that exists within London’s Green Belt. This was an issue raised by many councils in the East and South East during the roundtables. An opportunity to discuss the possibility with the New Mayor of London would be welcome.

d) **Providing more affordable homes:** The London Housing Commission report suggest that the Mayor of London should issues London wide guidance on negotiating affordable housing with developers. It is evident that the provision of affordable housing is a key priority for the Mayor of London, as it is for the WSE as a whole. As such it is recommended that the WSE political steering group might wish to consider working collectively on producing guidance on negotiating affordable housing with developers which can be utilised by councils individually and collectively.

Check out [Housing & Finance Institute](http://www.housingfinanceinstitute.org.uk) for any relevant work on viability

---

1 Pg.12 of Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (April 2016) Early Adopter and the Late Majority: A Review of Local Plan Progress and Housing Requirements
e) **Review of employment and industrial land designation:** TFL has suggested that a review of employment and Industrial land designations and policy could ensure a successful economy is balanced with much needed housing development – for example strategic industrial locations next to stations could be re-designated, with a relocation strategy for industrial occupiers where housing potential exists.

f) **Improving the speed and certainty of the planning system:** The OLC also recommends that local authorities be given more flexibility to set their own planning application fees locally to ensure that there are sufficient public sector planning resources to drive the necessary levels of housing and economic growth in London. Councils in the East of England and South East would also welcome such flexibility, and this may be an issue on which the WSE Political Steering Group wishes to take collective action.

g) **Increasing competition in the house building industry and boosting housing delivery by local authorities:** Limited competition within the building industry undermines incentives to build. Opportunities for collaboration across the WSE may exist with regards to enabling finance to support more SMEs, and supporting innovative council-led partnerships/alternative development models (eg LLPs) and smaller developers, by giving them first refusal to a proportion of small public sites for development.

The OLC recommends that local authorities could play a key role in closing the gap between current rates of housing completions by the private sector and housing associations and London’s overall housing need. This same principle is considered to apply to the East of England, and the OLC’s recommendation that local authorities should be able to apply to government for more HRA borrowing headroom in order to deliver new homes by demonstrating a viable, costed and deliverable business plan is one that is likely to be viewed positively by councils across the WSE and provides a further opportunity for joint action across the WSE.

h) **Enhancing the capacity of the house building industry:** THE OLC recommends examining the constraints inhibiting modern off-site methods of construction in more detail in partnership with industry experts and work closely with the construction industry, educational and training providers, Government and the LEPs to ensure that the capital has sufficient numbers of construction workers and skilled construction workers and trade people to deliver the increased volume of new build housing that is required. These two issues are also priorities for councils in the South East and East of England. As a next step, it would be beneficial for the WSE to engage LEPS and partners collectively to explore how the public and private sector can work better collectively to address these challenges, and possible joint lobbying for local authority control of adult skills budgets to better target funding to the training needed/grow the construction sector workforce. Developing skill programmes as part of major infrastructure projects, similar to that set out in the TFL Housing Prospectus may also provide opportunities for the WSE.

i) **Collaboration on Growth Corridors:** The Wider South East Political Steering Group could look to support growth corridors, linking development and infrastructure investment on
strategic routes. The most advanced example is the London-Stansted-Cambridge corridor with the West Anglia Taskforce expected to report findings by mid-2016.

5. Next Steps for WSE Collaboration

5.1. There are a number of opportunities for collaboration, and in light of limited resources it is recommended that the WSE Political Steering Group agree to a phased approach to collaboration and joint lobbying.

5.2. It is suggested that the WSE Political Steering Group consider:

   **Joint Lobbying**
   a. Joint Lobbying for devolution of fiscal powers to councils across the WSE and the Mayor of London, including relaxation of the rules surrounding the use of CIL, local authority discretion to charge developer contributions, national investment for schemes too big for local funding, more headroom for HRA borrowing and local authority control of adult skills budgets.
   b. Consider short high-level joint report on the role of local authorities in the delivery of housing with recommendations to Government and industry, including proposals to allow councils to incentivise take up of planning permissions.

   **Cooperation and Sharing of Good Practice**
   c. In order to incentivise build out rates and tackle land banking the WSE political steering group could coordinate planning support for stalled schemes and/or learning and good practice could be shared in order to support councils to improve practices across the WSE (For example, local case studies of stalled sites that have been incentivised through use of CPO action or other means).
   d. Share experiences of strategic green belt reviews and the role this can play in meeting objectively assessed housing need.

   **Engaging Industry**
   e. Jointly developed guidance on negotiating affordable housing with developers to secure more affordable housing in London and the WSE.
   f. Seek input from industry (including via LEPs) to help shape next steps/progress recommendations, particularly on enhancing the capacity of the house building industry and increasing competition to enable SMEs to play a more active role in the delivery of housing.

5.3. Coordinated lobbying on infrastructure, including “growth corridors” is tackled in a separate paper.
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Summary

The Political Steering Group meeting on 10 March 2016 confirmed the importance of identifying strategic cross-regional areas with infrastructure in need of improvement and growth potential across the Wider South East. Group members highlighted the considerable combined lobbying power, which could be used in engaging with Government and Treasury. This could also help to tackle housing barriers – one of the other priority areas of common concern. However, it would be necessary to focus resources on just a few strategic infrastructure schemes. So, the Steering Group tasked officers to identify and analyse potential areas and to provide Group members for their next meeting on 18 July with a selection of strategic opportunities for collaborative action and joint lobbying on strategic infrastructure improvements.

Chapters 1 and 2 of this paper provide the context for an overview of strategic infrastructure areas crossing boundaries between the South East, East of England and/or London, which is included in chapter 3. The aim is to explore areas that are most suitable for joint lobbying. Political Steering Group members will be asked to ‘shortlist’ which areas to focus on. Their decision should be made on the basis of the following principles: EELGA/SEEC to refine:

- Strategic nature of potential infrastructure improvements
- Potential strategic benefits in terms of growth and prosperity for wider area
- Added value of strategic/collaborative support that could be provided
- Deliverability of potential infrastructure improvements

There is also the opportunity for identified strategic areas to be reflected within the London Plan alongside relevant Local Plans for their potential for growth and infrastructure improvements.

As follows, an overview of potential actions for each of the potential strategic infrastructure areas:

**Oxford – Cambridge and beyond**
More detailed work is required with SEEC and EELGA as well as the relevant counties and local authorities, Network Rail, Highways England and the LEPs to agree potential priorities for key infrastructure improvement on this corridor. It is likely that they would centre around supporting the existing consortium and the rail improvements in the Central section of the East West Rail route and around road improvements to the Oxford – Cambridge Expressway.

**Ashford - Oxford**
SEEC: To be included

**Dover - Southampton**
SEEC: To be included

**London–Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough**
It would be unnecessary to duplicate the existing successful partnership arrangements and initiative including lobbying Government. However, key lessons could potentially be learnt and transferred to support infrastructure improvements in other areas.

**London – Ipswich – Norwich**
Improvements to strategic transport could significantly support economic growth and development. In collaboration with the LEP, Network Rail, the counties and local authorities potential priorities for key development opportunities within the area could be taken forward.
**Thames Gateway Essex: London – South Essex and London Gateway Port**
With the Strategic Group and now the Estuary Commission arrangements are being put in place to support development and infrastructure improvements within the Gateway. It will be important to explore how to engage best with these arrangements, how to complement them and what specific improvements to focus on. The results of the ELTOS study should inform this, and any major road improvements should be accompanied by sustainable transport measures to prevent additional road congestion.

**Thames Gateway Kent: London – North Kent and Channel Tunnel**
With the Strategic Group and now the Estuary Commission arrangements are being put in place to support development and infrastructure improvements within the Gateway. It will be important to explore how to engage best with these arrangements, how to complement them and what specific improvements to focus on. The results of the business case for the extension of Crossrail to Dartford/Ebbsfleet via Bexley should inform this.

**Thames Gateway: South Essex – North Kent**
With the Strategic Group and now the Estuary Commission arrangements are being put in place to support development and infrastructure improvements within the Gateway. It will be important to explore how to engage best with these arrangements, how to complement them and what specific improvements to focus on. Specifically with regards to the Crossing it will be important to work with Highways England and look into financing options for the scheme and promote a clear plan to deal with the consequential pressure on the surrounding road network.

**London – Gatwick - Brighton**
Improvements to strategic transport could support economic growth and development. It is however recognised that there are significant environmental constraints.

**London – Surrey incl. southern access to Heathrow**
Improvements to strategic transport within this very congested area will be important for its future growth and development. It is however recognised that there is the Green Belt as well as significant environmental constraints.

**‘Western Wedge’: London – Reading incl. western access to Heathrow**
The delivery of improved strategic transport links to Reading could be a real catalyst for strategic collaboration on development and economic growth within this area.

**London to Luton-Bedford and to Milton Keynes**
More detailed work is required with EELGA as well as the relevant local authorities, transport operators and LEPs to agree potential priorities for key infrastructure improvement on this corridor. It is likely that they would centre around some of the potential rail improvements.

**Potential water resources route (Oxfordshire reservoir - bulk transfer from River Severn)**
If/when it emerges that one of the above or similar cross-regional supply measures would be required to meet future needs in the WRSE and/or the WREA area(s), the joint planning and implementation of such a supply scheme could be facilitated. This would require close collaboration with WRSE/WREA and its key stakeholders including the relevant water companies, the regulator Ofwat, the Environment Agency and relevant local authorities on this ‘water resource route’.

**Flood risk management along the River Thames catchment**
The joint planning and implementation of strategic flood risk management measures that have a significant impact elsewhere, i.e. downstream from the Thames Valley in London or downstream from London within the estuary, could be considered in collaboration with the
Environment Agency and relevant local authorities. Required funding for such measures could then also be discussed with Government.
1 Introduction

1.1 During 2015 the Mayor, the East of England Local Government Association (EELGA) and South East England Councils (SEEC) have been exploring options for more effective collaboration across the Wider South East (WSE). From the Wider South East Summit in December 2016, which endorsed new collaboration arrangements, four priority areas of common concern emerged, including ‘making the case for strategic infrastructure investment’. It was highlighted that joint lobbying for transport and infrastructure investment across the WSE might help make the case for key strategic schemes.

1.2 The Political Steering Group meeting on 10 March 2016 confirmed the importance of identifying strategic cross-regional areas with infrastructure in need of improvement and growth potential across the WSE. Group members highlighted the considerable combined lobbying power, which could be used in engaging with Government and Treasury. This could also help to tackle housing barriers – one of the other priority areas of common concern. However, it would be necessary to focus resources on just a few strategic infrastructure schemes. So, the Steering Group tasked officers to identify and analyse potential areas and to provide Group members for their next meeting on 18 July with a selection of strategic opportunities for collaborative action and joint lobbying on strategic infrastructure improvements.

1.3 The above should be considered within the wider planning context. Within the WSE there are 156 local authorities. The statutory Duty to Cooperate (DtC) requires local planning authorities to cooperate on strategic issues. However, across the WSE, authorities face distinctively different challenges depending on their local characteristics (e.g. urban/rural, connectivity, development constraints) and local attitudes towards growth. Local Plans are also at very different stages, and according to PINS’ Local Plans progress update (see https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/505051/Copy_of_LPA_Strategic_Plan_Progress_-_29_February_2016_-_Gov_uk.pdf), currently, 23 of local authorities within the WSE (around 15%) don’t have a strategic ‘Core Strategy’ component of a Local Plan in place. They include one in London, 9 in the South East and 13 authorities in the East of England: Aylesbury, Basildon, Brentwood, Bromley, Broxbourne, Castle Point, Central Bedfordshire, East Herts, Epping Forest, Guildford, Harlow, Hart, Medway, North Herts, Runnymede, South Downs NP, Tendring, Thanet, Uttlesford, Waverley, Welwyn Hatfield and Windsor & Maidenhead.

1.4 Following the Mayoral elections in London, the London Plan will also be reviewed. The Mayor has a Duty to Inform and Consult on the preparation of this Plan. Its Key Diagram includes growth areas and coordination corridors that point beyond London’s boundaries (Policy 2.3). They may – alongside more recent initiatives – provide a starting point, but they will need to be reviewed as part of the Full Review of the London Plan. This work on strategic infrastructure areas may also inform the Review.
2 Understanding relevant Wider South East relationships

2.1 The East of England, the South East and London are linked through a complex set of relationships and interactions. Key linkages are highlighted below.

a) Population and migration patterns

2.2 Together, London and the wider South East have a population of almost 25 million – accounting for 35% of UK’s population and about 45% of England’s population. The South East is the largest of the three with a population of 8.9 million, London has a population of 8.6 million while East of England has a population of 6.0 million. These are record highs for all three regions.

2.3 London is growing the fastest of three regions and between 2013 and 2014 it grew by 122,000, the largest single year increase in its history. London is currently growing faster than the East and South East, though all three are growing quicker than the national average, and this is forecast to continue (see Figure 1 within Annex 1). London’s growth is from a mixture of natural change and international net-migration while for the Wider South East it is primarily domestic net-migration and natural change.

2.4 Migration between London and the South East / East of England is an important component, with net out-migration from London - following the recession - increasing over recent years significantly (see Figure 2). Figures 3 to 5 further illustrate the scale of the migration flows within the WSE and put them into context including national and international flows. Over 60,000 people migrate annually from London to the South East and almost 35,000 to the East of England (net flows).

2.5 The GLA has recently extended its population projection models to produce local authority level population and household projections for all districts in England. These trend-based projection models are conceptually similar to those used to produce subnational population and household projections by ONS and DCLG respectively. They allow users to explore scenarios with future migration trends based on a longer series of past behaviours than the 5-6 years used in ONS’s official projections.

2.6 In 2015 Londoners bought 63,000 homes outside of the capital spending an average of £375,000. This adds up to a total of £24 billion (Figure 2a). The majority relocated to areas in the South of England (88%). However, the highest growth was in areas further from the capital, particularly in relatively more affordable markets in the Midlands and North of the country.

b) Economic links

2.7 London and the WSE together represent the nation’s economic power house. In 2013/14, £127 billion of tax revenue was estimated to have been generated through economic activity in London (21% of total UK tax revenue). In the South East it was
£104 billion (17%) and in the East of England nearly £60 billion (10%)\(^1\). The WSE overall is also accounting for nearly half its GVA (in 2014 London 22.5%, South East 14.8% and East of England 8.6%)\(^2\) and supporting over 13 million jobs (annual job growth 2009 to 2014 in London 107k/a, in South East 36k/a and in the East 18k/a). But there is considerable variation of employment growth across the WSE (see Figure 6a).

2.8 Alongside London, there are several other significant economic centres within the WSE such as Reading, Milton Keynes and Cambridge. There are also the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) that have been established. There are 11 LEPs within the WSE. With the exception of the London LEP they have all developed Strategic Economic Plans – primarily to support their Growth Deals. The WSE partners commissioned an overview of the strategic housing and transport objectives within these documents that were driven by economic ambitions. The work highlighted the significant differences in the LEPs’ approaches. Their spatial priorities put together create an inconsistent picture (see Figure 6a)\(^3\).

2.9 Almost all top origins and destinations for migration of business to/from London are within the WSE (see Tables 1 and 2 as well as Figures 7 and 8 for wider spatial overview). Birmingham is the only exception in terms in-migration. With regards to out-migration, it should be noted that employment associated with it tends to relocate fairly equally to the WSE and the rest of the UK. Further details can be found in GLA Economics’ Working Paper 73 (https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/working_paper_73.pdf).

### Table 1: Top 10 in-migrating firms, 2008-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Firms per year (average)</th>
<th>Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hertsmere</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping Forest</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton and Hove</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Rivers</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TBR Observatory 2015 (TBR ref: W5/S11 and S12)

### Table 2: Top 10 out-migrating firms, 2007-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Firms per year (average)</th>
<th>Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hertsmere</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping Forest</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Rivers</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton and Hove</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watford</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartford</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TBR Observatory 2015 (TBR ref: W7/S11 and S12)

2.10 Specifically in terms of strategic capacity for industrial, logistics and related use there are also important linkages between London, the East and the South East. The total supply of industrial land in the areas surrounding London equates to around 70% of supply in London itself. Most London Property Market areas are


\(^2\) https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/current_issues_note_46.pdf - page 11

\(^3\) Full report available on this website: http://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/organisations-we-work/policy-and-infrastructure-collaboration-across-wider-south-east
larger than the hinterland adjacent to them. The area north of London’s boundary is the only one to have a higher amount of industrial land than its adjacent London Property Market area. London has seen a higher rate of industrial land release than adjacent areas. Total stock there has decreased by 4.0%, while in London supply has decreased by 15.8%. This may point to opportunities for accommodating some demand from London within the WSE. Further details including boundaries for the areas surrounding London can be found in Chapter 5 of the Industrial Land Supply and Economy Study the GLA published in 2015.

c) Transport/commuting patterns and growth

2.11 There is substantial commuting between London and the South East / East of England with 790,000 people commuting daily into London and 270,000 commuting out of London (2011 figures).

2.12 Since 1991 in-commuting to London and out-commuting from London have increased, this trend is forecast to continue (see Figure 9) according to TfL transport models based on GLA population/employment projections. But while between 2011 and 2041 in-commuting has been forecast to go up by 170k, from 2011-2015 it has actually already increased by 94k. Figure 10 illustrates spatially the scale of change in terms of commuting into Central London. The growth in the number of jobs meant that 66,000 more people commuted from outside Greater London into Central London in 2011 than in 2001. Looking specifically at the City of London, half of the City’s workers lived outside of Greater London in 2011, and residents from outside London took up half of the increase in jobs between 2001 and 2011. Figure 11 shows that from Epping Forest, Elmbridge and Thurrock more than 20,000 people commute daily into London. Figures 12 and 12a illustrate the variety of commuter movements between London and the East and South East in terms of scale of commuting and modal share. Finally, Figures 13 links commuting and population growth.

2.13 It should be noted that DfT and TfL have been proposing the transfer of responsibility from the DfT to TfL for all suburban rail services that operate mostly or wholly within Greater London. Rail franchises due for renewal within the next few years include:

- 2017 South West Trains
- 2018 South Eastern
- 2021 (or later if contract extension) Thameslink, Southern and Great Northern

2.14 In terms of rail freight the major flows to London in 2012 by weight were aggregates for the construction industry, mainly from the South West and East Midlands (together accounting for 68% of goods). For goods loaded on to rail in London, approximately 40% was moved to the South East. In addition, considerable volumes of rail freight pass through London en route to and from other regions. See Figure 23 (to be relocated) for rail freight sites in London. Further data about freight?

d) Other strategic infrastructure interdependencies
2.15 Beyond transport there are other strategic infrastructure relationships across the boundaries between the South East, East of England and London. Relationships that can be of a genuine strategic nature – as opposed to merely local cross-boundary – include water supply, flood risk, minerals and waste.

2.16 Water supply: Thames Water projects a 10% deficit (213 megalitres per day) by 2025 rising to 26% (522 megalitres per day) by 2050 in London alone, if no additional supply was identified. Water supply companies operate across regional boundaries (there are nine companies and over 70 water resource zones within the WSE), but they collaborate at a strategic level through Water Resource South East (WRSE) and Water Resource East Anglia (WREA). These are partnerships of water companies, regulators and other stakeholders who work together to develop regional strategies. Their work could result in new water supply options (such as new reservoirs or bulk transfer) with large strategic supply catchments. See also section 3l.

2.17 Flood risk: The River Thames is by nature a strategic asset as it flows across regional boundaries from the Cotswolds to the estuary, and development activities in particular upstream can have significant impacts downstream. There are over 500,000 homes, 40,000 commercial and industrial properties within the tidal Thames floodplain alone as well as numerous infrastructure, heritage and environmental assets. The Environment Agency’s Thames Estuary 2100 plan and its implementation as well as the new Flood Risk Management Plan, which covers the whole of the Thames River Basin District aim to address flood risk at a strategic level. See also section 3m.

2.18 Minerals and Waste: With regards to minerals, there are very limited internal reserves (in particular in London) and so there is a high dependency on imports (Channel, East Midlands, South West and continental Europe), but data on the movement of aggregates is limited. In terms of waste, the main requirement for Waste Planning Authorities outside London is to know how much waste from London to plan for. Across the WSE minerals and waste authorities face similar challenges including high land values, competing land uses, and road congestion. For both minerals and waste regional technical working groups still exist.

2.19 Waste water, energy, digital infrastructure, green and social infrastructure are not considered to have a similarly large scale strategic dimension.
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1 Potential spatially specific areas for strategic infrastructure improvements
   a) Background: Spatial policies and ideas

   1.1 There are historic and existing spatial policies to address the WSE relationships. Spatial geographies outside London have been largely of polycentric nature. Over the last 30 years various iterations of regional planning sought to promote sub-regions. Both the East of England and the South East Plan (Figures 14 and 15) included policies for sub-regional areas on their boundaries including the Thames Gateway (Essex/Kent/London), the Milton Keynes/Bedford/Luton area and on London’s boundaries (London Arc to the north, London Fringe to the south and the Western Corridor / Blackwater Valley to the west). The Thames Gateway, Milton Keynes & South Midlands as well as the London Stanstead Cambridge corridor had also already been identified by the Government back in 2003 as Growth Areas (Figure 16).

   1.2 From a London perspective the London Plan Key Diagram (Figure 17) reflects on the above as growth and coordination corridors (Policy 2.3) with the addition of the Wandle Valley corridor towards the south. More recently in 2014, the London Infrastructure Plan considered options for accommodating longer term growth. One option explored – for illustration and as a starting point for discussion – growth potential alongside improved transport infrastructure capacity outside London.
(Figure 18). SEEC’s recent ‘Missing Links’ report\(^1\) focuses more on orbital routes largely defined by major roads/motorways (Figure 19).

1.3 A range of private planning consultancy firms have also recently published reports with ideas for strategic growth and/or infrastructure areas. Grant Thornton’s ‘Where Growth Happens’\(^2\) (Figure 20) suggests amongst its nine Growth Corridors the following:

- London-Milton Keynes
- London-Cambridge
- London-Essex
- London-Brighton
- London-Southampton
- London-Bristol

1.4 AECOM’s ‘London 2065’\(^3\) includes a ‘City Region Key Diagram’ that broadly builds on the current London Plan Key Diagram, but its ‘future growth corridors’ reach out further and more explicitly into the WSE. Its ‘Western Wedge’ extends from Oxford to Guildford.

1.5 The following list includes strategic infrastructure areas crossing boundaries between the South East, East of England and/or London. The aim is to explore areas that are most suitable for joint lobbying. Political Steering Group members will be asked to ‘shortlist’ which areas to focus on. Their decision should be made on the basis of the following principles (EELGA/SEEC to refine):

- Strategic nature of potential infrastructure improvements
- Potential strategic benefits in terms of growth and prosperity for wider area
- Added value of strategic/collaborative support
- Deliverability of potential infrastructure improvements

1.6 There is also the opportunity for identified strategic areas to be reflected within the London Plan alongside relevant Local Plans for their potential for growth and infrastructure improvements.

1.7 In advance of the ‘shortlist’ further work/detail is required on the presentation of these areas and their potential to support growth and economic development as well as their delivery. Issues around the planning/timing, relative costs, the degree to which funding has been secured for the relevant infrastructure improvements as well as potential innovation need to be understood. This will further inform the Potential Actions for each of the following areas and provide a better basis for the shortlist based on above principles.

1.8 Annexes 1 and 2 provide a TfL overview of a wide range of radial corridors building on the Mayor’s Transport Strategy, which is in the process of being reviewed. They do not match exactly the transport related areas discussed below, but could also

---


inform the prioritisation. Figure 22 includes a TfL perspective on selected National Rail enhancements and potential development opportunities.

b. Oxford – Cambridge and beyond

The East West Rail route would strengthening the orbital public transport connection between Oxford and Cambridge, which forms the northern side of the London-Oxford-Cambridge ‘Golden Triangle’ with links also to London via potential Crossrail 1 extension north west (see also [3k] London – Bedford/Milton Keynes corridor below) and via Crossrail 2 (see also [3e] London – Cambridge corridor below). This is further illustrated in Figure 22. Cambridge, Milton Keynes and Oxford support thriving local economies. The corridor also goes through several LEPs, in particular the South East Midlands LEP and the Oxfordshire LEP and the Cambridge & Peterborough LEP at both ends. Within the area of the corridor the road link from the A34/M40 via Oxford to Cambridge could also be improved.

East West Rail itself is divided into an Eastern, Central and Western section (see Figure x). Within the overall scheme, the Central section is the most difficult and costly part of the route to reinstate, as the former railway has been dismantled and the land disposed of since the line was closed in the 1960s. However, a preferred route via Sandy has recently been announced by Network Rail. A consortium is working with Network Rail to identify how the rail network may be enhanced to deliver new train services and connections across the region.

Figure x

Potential Action:
More detailed work is required with SEEC and EELGA as well as the relevant counties and local authorities, Network Rail, Highways England and the LEPs to agree potential priorities for key infrastructure improvement on this corridor. It is likely that they would centre around supporting the existing consortium and the rail improvements in the Central section of the East West Rail route and around road improvements to the Oxford – Cambridge Expressway.

c. Ashford - Oxford
The development of the Ashford-Redhill-Guildford-Reading-Oxford rail corridor (see Figure 19) as a strategic route through the South East, including train lengthening/additional services, a Redhill flyover and electrification of the North Downs Line, has potential to encourage modal shift and improve commuter, leisure and business access to and between these employment and retail centres. The route also has significant potential to release capacity on train routes to and from central London and relieve congestion on the M25.

On the Kent end of the area it could provide connections to HS1 and the Channel Tunnel (see 3h). The area should also link to the proposed East-West Rail at Reading (see 3b).

**Potential Actions:**
- **SEEC:** To be completed

**d. Dover - Southampton**

Upgrades of the A27/M27/A259 road corridor as well as the corresponding rail route along the south coast could improve capacity, journey times and reduce bottlenecks/congestion. It would support economic growth and regeneration in the coastal and university towns through Sussex. Such improvements would also provide better road access for passengers and freight to the ports at Southampton, Portsmouth, Newhaven, Shoreham and Dover.

Current plans deal with the route in a piecemeal way which would not deliver the full benefits of a strategic approach to improvements along the full length of the route. This orbital route improvement would also reduce congestion on the M25 and trains travelling via central London.

**Potential Actions:**
- **SEEC:** To be completed

**e. London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough**

This area was initially identified by Government as a Growth Area in 2003 and then highlighted in the London Plan and the East of England Plan (Cambridge sub-region and London Arc). The area is broadly covered by the Hertfordshire LEP, South East LEP and Greater Cambridge & Peterborough LEP.

The area includes three motorways, two main railway lines (West Anglia and East Coast Mainlines) and one international airport (Stansted) (see Figure x).

The London Stansted Cambridge Consortium is an established partnership that supports the development of the corridor. At the centre of the required infrastructure improvements are the West Anglia Mainline and Crossrail 2. A West Anglia Task Force has been established to look into potential opportunities for enhancing the West Anglia Mainline. These potential investments could improve rail links as well as helping to support housing and economic development opportunities across the Corridor. The Task Force is looking at options including four-tracking the railway in the Upper Lea Valley, and having a branch of Crossrail 2 to serve the Corridor. There work will report
in summer 2016. According to the Consortium, it is expected that the West Anglia improvements alone will deliver 9,000 additional homes by 2018.

Key development areas along the West Anglia route include the Upper Lea Valley, Harlow, Bishop’s Stortford, Stansted and Cambridge. The M11 Motorway runs on a similar route. There are also growth and development opportunities further north in the Peterborough and Northamptonshire area (e.g. Corby and Wellingborough).

**Potential Action:**
It would be unnecessary to duplicate the existing successful partnership arrangements and initiative including lobbying Government. However, key lessons could potentially be learnt and transferred to support infrastructure improvements in other areas.

**f. London – Ipswich – Norwich**

This area (see Figure x) includes the New Anglia LEP, which supports a campaign to improve the Greater Eastern Mainline. The Great Eastern Mainline Taskforce called for a travel time of 60 min from London to Ipswich and 90 min from London to Norwich. In September 2015 the DfT published an invitation to tender for the Greater Anglia franchise, which will start in October 2016. It includes these travel times as a requirement as well as an increase in frequency and modernisation of the train stock. Required investment in the Mainline is expected to be near £500 million. According to the LEP this could create around 50,000 additional jobs. Their Strategic Economic Plan
indicates additional housing growth of around 50,000 within Greater Norwich and along the A11 route. Improvements to the A12 could also be considered.

**Figure x**

Potential Action:
Improvements to strategic transport could significantly support economic growth and development. In collaboration with the LEP, Network Rail, the counties and local authorities potential priorities for key development opportunities within the area could be taken forward.

g. **Thames Gateway Essex: London – South Essex and London Gateway Port**
The Thames Gateway area has been identified as a Growth Area for over 30 years, with the most recent policy direction set out in the three, now defunct, Regional Plans. The South East LEP extends further to the north and south. A Thames Gateway Strategic Group including the Government Minster responsible for Thames Gateway, and representatives from the Thames Gateway Kent Partnership, the South Essex Growth Partnership, the GLA as well as the relevant local authorities has been established to promote the benefits of development and investment across the Gateway, including the potential to create 270,000 homes and 390,000 jobs. A high-profile Thames Estuary Commission (spreading further to the east), chaired by Lord Heseltine, has also just been announced by Government, which will also look at maximising the opportunities of planned infrastructure improvements. It will develop a vision for the area and a delivery plan in time for the 2017 Autumn Statement.

TfL is working with strategic partners including Essex County Council on the East London Transport Option Study (ELTOS) assessing a range of transport options to relieve longer term forecast capacity issues on the C2C/A13 corridor. A potential Crossrail 2 eastern extension as well as Great Eastern Mainline improvement will benefit rail services to London. In terms of the A13 the delivery of a widening scheme would be important to support growth at in particular at Purfleet, Lakeside and the London Gateway Port. The Port alone is expected to create 12,000 jobs. Improvements
of the A127 would in addition support growth at Southend, Basildon and Brentwood, with proposals for Dunton Hill Garden Village and Brentwood Enterprise Park. The South East LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan estimates that over 100,000 additional jobs and 50,000 additional homes could be created overall within this area.

A potential Crossrail 2 eastern branch could unlock the full potential for growth in East London and South Essex. Crossrail 2 could split north-east of Angel with one branch going east to Hackney Central and out through Newham and Barking and Dagenham. This new line would then link to the existing Essex Thameside network, with Crossrail 2 services potentially terminating at Basildon and Grays. Benefits of the Eastern branch proposals, according to a report commissioned by Barking and Dagenham, Essex, Hackney and Newham councils, include support for the expected growth with the area, reduced journey times from South Essex and East London to Central London and additional capacity for commuters.

**Potential Action:**
With the Strategic Group and now the Estuary Commission arrangements are being put in place to support development and infrastructure improvements within the Gateway. It will be important to explore how to engage best with these arrangements, how to complement them and what specific improvements to focus on. The results of the ELTOS study should inform this, and any major road improvements should be accompanied by sustainable transport measures to prevent additional road congestion.

### h. Thames Gateway Kent: London – North Kent and Channel Tunnel

The Thames Gateway area has been identified as a Growth Area for over 30 years, with the most recent policy direction set out in the three, now defunct, Regional Plans. The South East LEP extends further to the north and south. A Thames Gateway Strategic Group including the Government Minister responsible for Thames Gateway, and representatives from the Thames Gateway Kent Partnership, the South Essex Growth Partnership, the GLA as well as the relevant local authorities has been established to promote the benefits of development and investment across the Gateway, including the potential to create 270,000 homes and 390,000 jobs. A high-profile Thames Estuary Commission (spreading further to the east), chaired by Lord Heseltine, has also just been announced by Government, which will also look at maximising the opportunities of planned infrastructure improvements. It will develop a vision for the area and a delivery plan in time for the 2017 Autumn Statement.

TfL and the GLA are working with Kent County Council, Bexley, Dartford, Gravesham, the Ebbsfleet Development Corporation and the Thames Gateway Kent Partnership on the extension of Crossrail 1. A feasibility study and initial business case has been prepared on the extension from Abbey Wood to Ebbsfleet and Gravesend. This study demonstrates that this would support growth at Bexley Riverside, Ebbsfleet Garden City and elsewhere in north Kent. The Thames Gateway Strategic Group has now commissioned an Outline Business Case for presentation to the Treasury for the Autumn Statement 2016. There is also potential for economic growth and development along the HS1 route towards Ashford and the Channel Tunnel to make best use of the potential future capacity on HS1 domestic services. The South East LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan estimates that 7,000 additional jobs and 8,500 additional homes could be created along the HS1/M20 route.

**Potential Action:**
With the Strategic Group and now the Estuary Commission arrangements are being put in place to support development and infrastructure improvements within the Gateway.
It will be important to explore how to engage best with these arrangements, how to complement them and what specific improvements to focus on. The results of the business case for the extension of Crossrail to Dartford/Ebbsfleet via Bexley should inform this.

i. Thames Gateway: South Essex – North Kent
The Thames Gateway area has been identified as a Growth Area for over 30 years, with the most recent policy direction set out in the three, now defunct, Regional Plans. The South East LEP extends further to the north and south. A Thames Gateway Strategic Group including the Government Minster responsible for Thames Gateway, and representatives from the Thames Gateway Kent Partnership, the South Essex Growth Partnership, the GLA as well as the relevant local authorities has been established to promote the benefits of development and investment across the Gateway, including the potential to create 270,000 homes and 390,000 jobs. A high-profile Thames Estuary Commission (spreading further to the east), chaired by Lord Heseltine, has also just been announced by Government, which will also look at maximising the opportunities of planned infrastructure improvements. It will develop a vision for the area and a delivery plan in time for the 2017 Autumn Statement.

The Lower Thames Crossing is a significant infrastructure scheme aiming to relieve heavy congestion at the existing Dartford crossing as well reduce pressure on the A2 and provide better routes for international freight. It is expected to unlock economic growth, supporting the development of new homes and jobs in the area. This new crossing, together with other crossings proposed in East London, could directly catalyse the development of an additional 27,000 homes in East London and a further 20,000 homes in Essex and Kent. Highways England recently consulted on the preferred location (Location C) and different route options for a new crossing further east from the existing Dartford crossing. Three potential route options have been identified north of the river in Essex and two south of the river in Kent (Figure x).

Figure x

Source: Highways England

Potential Action:
With the Strategic Group and now the Estuary Commission arrangements are being put in place to support development and infrastructure improvements within the Gateway. It will be important to explore how to engage best with these arrangements, how to complement them and what specific improvements to focus on. Specifically with regards to the Crossing it will be important to work with Highways England and look into financing options for the scheme and promote a clear plan to deal with the consequential pressure on the surrounding road network.

j. **London – Gatwick - Brighton**

This area includes parts of the former South East Plan’s London Fringe Sub-region and the London Plan’s Wandle Valley Coordination corridor. The Coast to Capital LEP sits within the centre of the area. Grant Thornton includes London – Brighton amongst his Growth Corridors.

Brighton Mainline improvements would be at the centre of this area from London to Brighton via the Gatwick Diamond area. Last year Terms of Reference were agreed for a strategic case for investment along this rail corridor, but it is not clear if this is being progressed. In terms of roads, the M23 motorway is being considered for the Smart Motorway scheme to help with efficiency and smoother traffic flows.

According to the LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan there is growth potential along the corridor in particular at Croydon, Gatwick, Burgess Hill and Brighton with the potential to deliver around an additional 18,000 jobs and 15,000 homes.

The Government’s decision on aviation and the future of Gatwick Airport expected at the end of this year will be a key factor for the scale and phasing of growth and infrastructure improvements in this area.

**Potential Action:**

Improvements to strategic transport could support economic growth and development. It is however recognised that there are significant environmental constraints.

k. **London – Surrey incl. southern access to Heathrow**

The area was recognised within the former South East Plan as London Fringe. Within AECOM’s suggestions, the area is part of a wider Growth Corridor reaching from Oxford to Guildford, and Grant Thornton includes London – Southampton amongst his Growth Corridors. The area is broadly within the Enterprise M3 LEP, which also continues further into Hampshire.

Existing transport links to London in this area are overcrowded. Crossrail 2 and the potential Metroisation of inner suburban service should help to address this.

The area may benefit from a Southern Rail Access to Heathrow though this would depend on the exact routing this potential new rail line. More generally, the Government’s decision on aviation expected at the end of this year will be a key factor for the scale and phasing of growth and infrastructure improvements in this area. The London Borough of Hounslow and Heathrow Airport Limited have established a Working Group to develop and deliver a vision for an expanded Heathrow that would reflect its potential role within the wider sub-region. The Group’s membership predominantly comprises officers from local authorities to the west of London, with GLA and TfL officers attending as observers.
In terms of roads, the M3 motorway is currently being upgraded to a Smart Motorway to help with efficiency and smoother traffic flows.

**Potential Action:**
Improvements to strategic transport within this congested area will be important for its future growth and development. It is, however, recognised that there is the Green Belt as well as significant environmental constraints.

1. **Western Wedge**: London – Reading incl. western access to Heathrow
   This area was initially identified by the London Plan and the former South East Plan. Grant Thornton’s suggestion extents the corridor further to Bristol, and AECOM widens it to reach from Oxford to Guildford. The Thames Valley Berkshire LEP sits within the centre of the area. Reading is the largest town in close proximity to the west of London with a substantial level of economic activities and significant attractiveness for inward investment.

   From a transport perspective connectivity and capacity of the strategic transport links between Reading and London will improve considerably. Crossrail services will provide a direct service into central London. Great Western Mainline improvements with electric trains on Thames Valley services will provide a very significant increase in peak capacity into London. At Paddington there will be an interchange with Crossrail as well as HS2 at Old Oak Common.

   Reading will also benefit from the Western Rail Access to Heathrow. More generally, the Government’s decision on aviation expected at the end of this year will be a key factor for the scale and phasing of growth and infrastructure improvements in this area. The London Borough of Hounslow and Heathrow Airport Limited have established a Working Group to develop and deliver a vision for an expanded Heathrow that would reflect its potential role within the wider sub-region. The Group’s membership predominantly comprises officers from local authorities to the west of London, with GLA and TfL officers attending as observers.

   In terms of roads, the M4 motorway is being considered for the Smart Motorway scheme to help with efficiency and smoother traffic flows.

   **Potential Action:**
The delivery of improved strategic transport links to Reading could be a real catalyst for strategic collaboration on development and economic growth within this area.

- **London-Luton-Bedford and to Milton Keynes**
  This area (see Figure x) was initially identified by Government as a Growth Area e.g. in 2003 and then highlighted in the three Regional Plans. The South East Midlands LEP covers large (north eastern) parts of this area, the Thames Valley Buckinghamshire LEP the western part and the Hertfordshire LEP the south eastern part. The area also lies in the middle of the London-Cambridge-Oxford ‘Golden Triangle’ and East West Rail runs through its centre (see section 3b).
Beyond Thameslink (Bedford route) and Midlands rail service improvements there is also the opportunity for an extension of Crossrail 1 to Tring on the route to Milton Keynes (West Coast Mainline). The new HS2 rail link has in addition the potential to release capacity on the rail network of the area for local, commuter and regional rail services.

Road improvement along the M1 route could also be important and consider the Smart Motorway scheme to help with efficiency and smoother traffic flows.

Potential Action:
More detailed work is required with EELGA as well as the relevant local authorities, transport operators and LEPs to agree potential priorities for key infrastructure improvement on this corridor. It is likely that they would centre around some of the potential rail improvements mentioned above.

n. Potential water resources route (Oxfordshire reservoir - bulk transfer from River Severn)

There could be significant water supply deficits in some areas of the WSE, if no additional supply is identified. Water Resource South East (WRSE) is developing a regional strategy for an area similar to the South East and London (Figure x). Their work on regional supply options seeking to boost supply in water supply zones that are in deficit is due in early 2017 aiming to inform the preparation of the Water Resource Management Plans of the individual water companies serving the area. These are due for consultation by 2018.
There will be some options where this may require strategic water transfer across large distances including the following on a line to the west/north west of London:

- A new reservoir at Abingdon in Oxfordshire which would also serve parts of London – this has already been under consideration for a considerable time
- Bulk water transfer from the River Severn to serve parts of London

**Show above on diagram**

**Potential Action**

If/when it emerges that one of the above or similar cross-regional supply measures would be required to meet future needs in the WRSE and/or the WREA area(s), the joint planning and implementation of such a supply scheme could be facilitated. This would require close collaboration with WRSE/WREA and its key stakeholders including the relevant water companies, the regulator Ofwat, the Environment Agency and relevant local authorities on this ‘water resource route’.

**o. Flood risk management along the River Thames catchment**

The River Thames flows across regional boundaries from the Cotswolds through parts of the South East and London to the estuary on the Kent and Essex boundary (*Figure x*). There are significant assets at risk within its catchment, and development activities in particular upstream can have significant impacts downstream. The Environment Agency’s Thames Estuary 2100 plan and its implementation as well as their new Flood Risk Management Plan, which covers the whole of the Thames River Basin District, aim to address flood risk at a strategic level.

Specifically with regards to the Thames Barrier, the Environment Agency owns and operates this flood defence structure as part of an integrated system of river walls, embankments and gates along the Thames Estuary in London, Kent and Essex. These provide a high standard of flood defence. As set out in the TE2100 plan, the EA estimates that continued improvements to the current defences should ensure a continued high standard of protection up to around 2070. After that a new barrier is
likely to be needed - most likely outside London. On current sea-level-rise projections planning for a new Barrier would need to start around the middle of the century.

**Potential Action**

The joint planning and implementation of strategic flood risk management measures that have a significant impact elsewhere, i.e. downstream from the Thames Valley in London or downstream from London within the estuary, could be considered in collaboration with the Environment Agency and relevant local authorities. Required funding for such measures could then also be discussed with Government.

**Figure x: Map of the Thames river basin district**
AGENDA & DISCUSSION TOPICS

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Discussion: London & Wider South East political engagement, including:
   - Feedback from political Summit on 11 December.
   - Preparation for WSE Political Steering Group on 10 March, outline agenda below. Your input is welcome on key actions/next steps to help shape our briefing for SE members, particularly on the priorities for early joint action:
     - Agreeing terms of reference.
     - Membership of political group and officer group (SSPOLG).
     - Priorities for early joint action: London Plan review; tackling barriers to housing delivery. Infrastructure and data/evidence will also be looked at.
     - Next steps/actions.
   - Technical/other officer support needed, including making links to existing SE officer/political networks and officers with specific topic expertise.
   - New London Mayor and London Plan review growth options, including preparation for GLA Workshop on 8 March.

3. Discussion: Delivering local housing plans – tackling barriers to delivery:
   - SEEC/SESL and London/East members identify this as a priority for action. We aim to produce a SE report with recommendations to Government/industry, also feeding into any joint Wider SE work.
   - Your suggestions/comments are welcome on initial scoping ideas (short discussion paper to be circulated separately before meeting).

4. Discussion: Influencing developing policy and consultations:
   - Housing & Planning Bill – is there a need for SE-specific lobbying, beyond what LGA is doing nationally (specifically, on impacts on stockholding councils, and possible outsourcing of planning application processing)?
   - New Homes Bonus consultation.
   - National Planning Policy consultation.
   - LGA Housing Commission.

5. Updates on work since last meeting (Oct 2015):
   - Making the case for SE strategic transport investment – ‘Missing Links’ campaign.
   - SEEC letter to Baroness Williams of Trafford.
   - SEEC input to Government’s Local Plans Expert Group.
   - SEEC Data Dashboard.

6. Arrangements for future meetings, invitees & topics – inc links to Wider South East Strategic Spatial Planning Officers Liaison Group (SSPOLG).
Annex M - Greater London Authority response to Tandridge District Council Issues and Approaches Local Plan

REATER LONDON AUTHORITY
Development, Enterprise and Environment

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

26 February 2016

Dear Ms Thompson,

Issues and Approaches – Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation

Thank you for giving the Mayor of London the opportunity to comment on your Local Plan Issues and Approaches Consultation.

The Mayor welcomes the District’s approach to housing need set out in your Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Council wish to consider further the delivery options that meet that identified housing need.

In terms of employment the intensification of sites required to address the need identified within its Economic Needs Assessment would be welcomed. Given the District’s good access to the motorway network (M25/M23 in particular), it would also be useful to understand better your initial thoughts on the future consideration of land for industry and logistics.

As Housing Market and Functional Economic Areas are defined tightly despite the District’s significant interrelationships with its neighbours including London. These are demonstrated in particular through the significant proportion of commuting into the capital, which underscore the importance of collaboration and the Duty to Co-operate.

The Mayor supports the Council’s objectives related to transport. In order to achieve them, he would welcome your collaboration to explore options to improve bus services from/into London, including route extensions and supporting infrastructure in particular to serve new developments. For further details please see Transport for London’s comments attached. This could also be reflected in the Council’s further policy development. The Council also wish to consider development opportunities arising from improved capacity and connectivity of the District’s railway stations through Thameslink service enhancements.

If you would like to discuss the matters raised above further, please contact Jorn Peters (Jorn.peters@london.gov.uk).

Yours sincerely

Stewart Murray
Assistant Director – Planning
cc: National Planning Casework Unit, DCLG
Alex Williams, TfL

Annex

Specific Response by Transport for London

TfL bus services run into the district, providing links to Coulsdon, Purley and Croydon from Caterham on the Hill, the Caterham valley and Warlingham, and from Tatsfield to New Addington (for Tramlink).

The council’s objectives for infrastructure are:

- Objective 14 Support and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport; considering the economic impact this may have on the district.
- Objective 15 Work with partners and service providers to maximise funding that will assist in the delivery and improve accessibility of infrastructure, services and facilities necessary for the district.

TfL would support these objectives, and would be happy to work with the council to help meet them, for example by enhancing existing TfL bus services, extending routes to serve new developments and/or securing supporting bus infrastructure, such as stops and shelters and bus standing, in new developments. Funding will obviously be a key issue and we would expect developers to fund such bus service enhancements through s106 agreements, for example by pump priming route extensions, and/or s276 agreements, for example provision of bus stops and shelters. Policy support for this approach would be welcomed in later iterations of the local plan.

You set out a number of approaches to deliver housing and jobs in the district. Clearly, if your vision of ‘the use of sustainable public transport encouraged lessening congestion’ is to be delivered, planning for higher development densities where public transport is already, or could be made good is a sensible approach. Again TfL would welcome the opportunity to work with the council to explore options to improve bus services in the areas mentioned above, so that it can inform your site allocations and detailed policies later in the plan process. Also for consideration in this respect, some of the district’s railway stations will also benefit from peak-hour Thameslink services from 2018, which will provide more capacity and better connectivity into central London.
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AGENDA & DISCUSSION TOPICS

1. **Welcome and introductions** *(note of last meeting 22 Feb 2016 attached for info), including update on officer membership.*

2. **Discussion: Shaping forthcoming member/officer Wider South East (WSE) meetings and actions, including:**
   - Feedback from GLA London Plan workshop 8 March and WSE Political Steering Group on 10 March; and update post-Mayoral election.
   - Preparation for next WSE Officer Working Group (formerly ‘SSPOLG’) on 17 June, to then feed into next Political Steering Group on 18 July. Your input on political members’ agreed priority agenda items/draft papers for discussion are welcome:
     - Tackling barriers to deliver locally approved housing plans – possible joint actions *(draft WSE officer paper to follow)*
     - Infrastructure & transport – jointly making the case for key schemes *(draft WSE officer paper attached)*
     - Data & evidence, including demographic projections – pros/cons re developing a shared understanding *(draft WSE officer paper to follow?)*
     - Including preparation/key issues for SE officers attending GLA technical workshop on projections on 14 June.
   - Technical/other officer support needed, including making links to existing SE officer/political networks and officers with specific topic expertise.

3. **Discussion: Influencing developing policy and consultations:**
   - CLG Select Committee *inquiry* into Local Plans Expert Group (LPEG) recommendations to improve the local plan-making process – discussion re possible South East input to inquiry (deadline 27 June), further to SEEC’s recent *response* to LPEG recommendations.

4. **Updates on work since last meeting (Feb 2016):**
   - SEEC *response* to Government’s National Planning Policy consultation.
   - SEEC/SESL *input* to LGA Housing Commission.
   - SEEC *response* to Government’s New Homes Bonus consultation.
   - Joint SEEC/EELGA/London Councils *letter* to Lord Adonis supporting Crossrail 2.
   - SEEC *response* to DfT/TfL consultation re suburban rail services.

5. **Future meetings & topics**
GATWICK DIAMOND LOCAL AUTHORITY MEMBERS MEETING

27th July 9am Crawley Town Hall Committee Room A

Agenda

1. Apologies

2. Introductions - ALL

3. Background to this Board and Terms of Reference and Memorandum of Understanding (See attached MoU as background paper) – CL/CV

4. Gatwick Diamond LSS refresh – JD/Consultant

5. Gatwick Diamond Post 2030 Infrastructure Study– WSCC

This Gatwick Diamond Post 2030 Infrastructure Study has been prepared by AECOM on behalf of the West Sussex and Surrey local authorities to provide a view of potential future development between 2030 and 2050 with and without a second runway at Gatwick and the infrastructure requirements to support that growth.

The Board have been asked to review and endorse this study as a useful document for setting out key infrastructure challenges and bidding for funds.

6. AOB

Gatwick Diamond Refresh Member Workshop

The second half of this meeting will be used for a member workshop as part of the refresh of the Local Strategic Statement. This part of the meeting will be led by the appointed consultant – Chilmark Consulting Ltd.

Date of Next Meeting – tba – September
## List of Members

### LIST OF THOSE ATTENDING

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horsham DC</strong></td>
<td>Cllr Claire Vickers (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer - Chris Lyons (Lead Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crawley BC</strong></td>
<td>Cllr Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer Diana Maughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Sussex DC</strong></td>
<td>Cllr Andrew MacNaughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer Claire Tester/John Cheston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mole Valley DC</strong></td>
<td>Cllr Sarah Seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer Jack Straw/Guy Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reigate &amp; Banstead</strong></td>
<td>Cllr Tony Schofield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer Cath Rose/Alison Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tandridge DC</strong></td>
<td>Cllr Peter Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer Marie Killip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrey CC</strong></td>
<td>Cllr Mike Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer Sue Janota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WSCC</strong></td>
<td>Cllr John O’Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer Caroline West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Mr Mayor

Draft Mayor’s Transport Strategy

I am writing on behalf of the Surrey Planning Officers Association which represents the heads of planning of the Surrey local authorities, in response to your consultation on the Draft Mayor’s Transport Strategy. Growth in London and the Wider South East will put considerable pressure on existing transport networks to support commuting and freight traffic and together with London’s future development are extremely important issues for local authorities in Surrey.

We support the ambition of the Mayor to work with partners to open Crossrail 2 by 2033. The scheme will release extra train paths between Wimbledon and Waterloo, while potential investment by Network Rail will provide a number of strategic improvements including the Woking flyover that will release capacity on the South West Main Line. More capacity and improved connectivity will help to tackle existing congestion problems and help local planning authorities in Surrey accommodate their own local growth needs. Crossrail 2 should not be seen as a precursor to housing growth outside London to accommodate London’s growing population.

We welcome recognition of the role of the Wider South East as part of the economic powerhouse of the country along with London and agree that our collective economic success depends on improvements to the connectivity and capacity of the strategic transport network. However, we are concerned that the eight ‘strategic corridors for infrastructure investment’ identified in Figure 35 of the strategy are seen as continuing London’s growth corridors outwards into the Wider South East leading to the suggestion that they should be the focus for opportunities to help meet housing needs arising in Greater London.

Much of Surrey is subject to significant environmental constraints such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Special Protection Areas and flooding as well as Green Belt constraints that mean that authorities may not be able to meet their own housing needs (which already include an element of housing to cater for migration from London) and their own local economic and growth ambitions. Therefore, it should not be assumed or suggested that there could be capacity along the Western/Surrey Corridor and the Gatwick/Brighton Corridor to help accommodate London’s unmet housing needs and that they should be considered as areas of search for the GLA to seek willing growth partners. Figure 35, Proposal 70 and related supporting text needs to be changed to remove any suggestion that these strategic corridors for infrastructure investment are possible growth corridors for unmet housing need in London.

We would like to see clarification in the final strategy that responsibility for development planning in the Wider South East rests with local planning authorities, and a reiteration of the Mayor’s commitment to work constructively with local authorities in the Wider South East to plan and deliver development that is sustainable. It is vital that the Mayor, working with London authorities, makes every effort to meet housing needs arising within Greater London.
in London, including exploring opportunities to release Green Belt land. Surrey authorities are already having to make the difficult decision of releasing Green Belt land to meet their own needs through their local plans.

The corridors and orbital links in Figure 35 do, however, reflect the thirteen priority transport schemes/corridors in the Wider South East agreed by the GLA and South East England and East of England councils as being in need of investment now to meet existing demands and to address current congestion and capacity issues on the transport network. Therefore, we do support the strategy including references to these priority schemes, which are intended to deliver mutual economic benefits for areas outside London as well as in London, and welcome the Mayor’s support in lobbying for investment for planned improvements and their early implementation.

We welcome recognition by the Mayor that the success of the proposed expansion at Heathrow Airport will only be possible with improved public transport access and we support the requirement for this. However, a Southern Rail Access was recognised as being needed to support T5 and the Airports Commission considered it to be justified now to meet demands from the existing two runway operation. Provision of this rail link will make a major contribution to the economy of London and the wider sub-region, supporting businesses and encouraging growth and employment and is critical to improving air quality around the airport. Therefore, we would like to see the final transport strategy include Southern Rail Access in the list of enhanced surface access projects initiated to meet current demand and not just be considered in relation to meeting additional demand arising from the expansion proposals.

At Gatwick, passenger numbers are increasing and the airport has a considerable focus on expanding its operations as a single runway airport. We support the reference to the need for new longer trains to Gatwick as part of the Brighton Mainline upgrade which could encourage modal shift among airport passengers.

Yours sincerely

Ian Maguire
Chair, Surrey Planning Officers Association.
**AGENDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introductions and apologies</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Current Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gatwick Diamond LSS review</td>
<td>JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of draft document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next steps – members meeting, stakeholder engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future project lead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Plans and Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coastal West Sussex LSS. Update</td>
<td>JD/JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• London Plan – feedback from meetings and SSPOLG etc</td>
<td>SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The latest issues arising from London and the review of the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Devolution</td>
<td>SJ/CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3SC bid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Local Plan Updates</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. AOB</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chair of meeting and agenda</td>
<td>JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Date of next meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 30 November, 2pm, Committee Room A, Crawley Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Circulation**

Elizabeth Brigden, Crawley Borough Council
Karol Kjakubczyk, Epsom and Ewell
Julia Dawe, Horsham District Council
John Cheston, Mid Sussex District Council
Guy Davies/Jack Straw, Mole Valley District Council
Cath Rose/ Rosie Sterry, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
Sarah Thompson/Marie Kilip, Tandridge District Council

Sue Janota, Surrey County Council
Caroline West, West Sussex County Council

Chris Lyons, Horsham District Council (attendance depends on the agenda)
Surrey Chief Executives – January 2017

Progress report by Surrey Planning Officers on work toward a Local Strategic Statement

Background

1. In July 2014, Surrey Leaders’ Group agreed to establish a Surrey Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership (SSPIP) to facilitate joint working to address strategic issues and deliver on strategic priorities.

2. SSPIP was formed in response to various issues and pressures, in particular:
   - to assist Surrey authorities with their ongoing work and cooperation when preparing Local Plans and satisfying the Duty to Cooperate legal requirement;
   - to help make a stronger case for infrastructure investment in Surrey; and
   - to help address emerging pressures from London, notably unmet housing needs, with the advantage of having a collective voice to engage with the Mayor/GLA.

3. The Duty to Cooperate requires authorities to demonstrate how they have engaged “constructively, actively and on an on-going basis” with neighbouring authorities and other organisations on strategic planning matters. Strategic planning matters may have different relevant functional geographies, for example housing market areas, economic market areas and retail catchment areas (see maps attached). These geographies differ between authorities and can extend beyond the county boundary. Co-operation between the districts, the County Council and other service providers is also important for dealing with infrastructure issues such as transport and education.

4. Within this overall context, SSPIP envisaged the development of a planning and investment framework comprising:
   a. a non-statutory Local Strategic Statement (LSS) that sets out shared objectives around spatial, infrastructure and economic issues and a broad direction for spatial planning on strategic priorities;
   b. a Memorandum of Understanding setting out how councils will work together towards an LSS and more generally on strategic planning; and
   c. an Investment Framework to support the delivery of the strategic priorities in the LSS including a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure funding and delivery that builds on the Surrey Infrastructure Study.

While it was acknowledged that an LSS for the county area of Surrey in itself could not fully satisfy the requirements of the duty, nonetheless, it would make a significant contribution to joint working to address strategic issues and align spatial, infrastructure and economic priorities and help each planning authority fulfil its requirements.

Moving towards an LSS

5. The preparation of the LSS was intended to follow a two stage, ‘bottom up’ approach: completion of an evidence base comprising up to date assessments of housing need, Green Belt, infrastructure needs and economic development needs and then using this evidence to develop the LSS. It was
originally envisaged that the first stage would take about 9 months and be complete by mid-2015 when Leaders would review the position and agree how to move into stage 2.

6. Stage 2 was envisaged to require an additional piece of work to assess potential housing provision across Surrey, based on land supply evidence from existing Local Plan work and consider to what extent any housing shortfall might be addressed taking into account wider land use demands, particularly employment land and the ‘balance’ of housing and employment provision and environmental constraints. Bringing together all the evidence would then provide the basis for facilitated discussions with Leaders to enable them collectively to drive the development of a shared and evidenced position on the broad priorities for development in Surrey. It was envisaged that stage 2 would take a further 3 months to complete in terms of having a written up draft of the LSS. At that point Leaders would decide whether to approve the LSS.

7. A detailed progress report was presented to Chief Executives on 17 July 2015 and to the Leaders in September 2015 and SPOA presented a further progress report to Chief Executives in January 2016. The Memorandum of Understanding and Terms of Reference agreed in principle by Surrey Leaders in July 2014 have now been formally agreed by each of the local authorities and there has been considerable progress made on the first stage of work to compile an evidence base involving completion of Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs) and Green Belt assessments, and assembling an overview of infrastructure needs and economic growth ambitions.

An interim LSS 2016 - 2031

8. Despite the aspiration to complete the evidence base by mid-2015, differing positions and timetables for Local Plan preparation and available resources have in reality meant some districts have progressed further than others and there are still gaps that need to be filled before an LSS looking to 2036 can be developed. Consequently, and in view of the progress being made on the 3SC devolution discussions and the London Plan Review, SPOA asked its Planning Working Group of planning policy leads across Surrey to give initial consideration to the format and content of a high level position statement that could provide the basis of an ‘interim’ LSS. This would enable Surrey authorities collectively to articulate their growth ambitions and spatial priorities for the short to medium term and engage on strategic issues as they progress Local Plans, and also in sub-regional and regional discussions.

9. If agreed, the attached document is intended to serve as a high level position statement that articulates Surrey’s collective position on strategic planning priorities until the evidence base is fully complete. The draft interim LSS has been prepared through a bottom up approach drawing together what is in existing and emerging Local Plans to give an overview of shared challenges, strategic objectives and the spatial priorities/key locations for growth already identified. The next step would be to consult on the interim LSS with neighbouring local authorities and partner organisations and, once Leaders have reviewed the evidence and agreed to progress, move to ‘Stage 2’ of what was originally proposed.

**Recommendation**

Chief Executives are asked to consider the draft document and endorse the development of an interim LSS and recommend that the Memorandum of Understanding be signed and the document be presented to Surrey Leaders for their consideration.
Examples of functional geographies relating to strategic planning matters

SHMA study areas

Catchment areas of major retail centres
Gatwick Diamond Members’ Meeting, Crawley Borough Council Offices 26 June 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attendance</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Claire Vickers (Chair) – Horsham District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark McLaughlin – Horsham District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallie Lappage – Crawley Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Peter Smith – Crawley Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Blomfield – Mid Sussex District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Janota – Surrey County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Mike Goodman – Surrey County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Killip – Tandridge District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline West – West Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie Sterry – Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Davies – Mole Valley District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Jones - Chilmark Consulting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Bob Lanzer – West Sussex County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllrs from Mid Sussex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr from Mole Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr from Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Presentation by David Jones, Chilmark Consulting, of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement Refresh 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Highlighted it was a Refresh of the 2012 LSS – that document was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>published with different membership of group and in a different</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy and economic landscape;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of new LSS-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meeting Duty to Cooperate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Framework for co-operation on multi-authority, strategic planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and policy co-ordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategic tool for prioritising key development and infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capitalise on natural growth/potential of Gatwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cross-border and strategic role at Local Plan examinations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supporting emerging plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Forces for Refresh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing records date to 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Extended geographic coverage and membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing, economic and investment growth (Gatwick, Coast to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital and Greater Brighton City Deal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changes in legislative and policy framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changing trends in retailing, housing, economic growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Refreshing Strategic Issues
- GD area is significant economic driver of SE, London and UK economy
- Pressures from elsewhere in SE
- Underperformance in attracting higher skilled activities in some pockets
- Balancing housing needs
- Congested transport links
- Town centres focus
- Safeguarding countryside
- Climate change

## Vision
“By 2031 the Gatwick Diamond will be a world-class, internationally recognised business location, achieving sustainable prosperity and growth”.

### Priority Themes
1. Achieving a sustainable economy and prosperity, including supporting low carbon growth
2. Investing in urban and rural centres
3. Delivering a choice and mix of homes
4. Education and Skills
5. Infrastructure
6. High Quality Natural Environment

### 3. Actions
- Mid Sussex – SB to brief Portfolio Holder
- Reigate and Banstead – RS to brief Portfolio Holder
- M Killip to provide text for Garden Village
- S Janota to provide text for Sub-National Transport Body
- MM to provide text, agree with County, for a station to the north of Horsham.

Completed
Completed
Completed
Completed
Completed
Dear Mr Khan,

**Draft New London Plan (February 2018)**

This representation is on behalf of the **Gatwick Diamond Group of Local Planning Authorities** and has been prepared by Planning Officers.

More information on the Gatwick Diamond Grouping can be found at [http://www.gatwickdiamond.co.uk](http://www.gatwickdiamond.co.uk).

The constituent authorities may submit additional views to those included below.

The Gatwick Diamond Authorities welcome the invitation to comment on the draft London Plan given the close relationships between the respective planning areas in terms of functional economic, housing, infrastructure, community and other links.

This interrelationship is recognised in the Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement which has been recently revised and can be found here [https://www.horsham.gov.uk/planningpolicy/planning-policy/gatwick-diamond](https://www.horsham.gov.uk/planningpolicy/planning-policy/gatwick-diamond).

It is noted that, to a greater extent than previously, the draft London Plan recognises that London’s housing needs should and will be provided for within the administrative London area and not be displaced. This includes recognition that affordable housing priorities are essential. This is welcomed as being of significant importance to the proper planning and sustainable growth and prosperity in the Gatwick Diamond area.

The Gatwick Diamond Authorities recognise that planned housing growth does offer advantages to the area. The Diamond Area has experienced substantial housing growth, with some linked to the displacement of London-based housing need. Some of this is unplanned, operating through planning appeals and delivering housing, some of which is not in sustainable locations. This adds to environmental stress, increased car dependency and environmental pollution.

Additional housing creates stress upon existing infrastructure and undermines environmental policies and the metropolitan green belt. This is prejudicial to and operates against efforts to promote the economic and employment growth of the area. At the same time, very high increases in house prices, partially due to the failure of London to provide sufficient housing for London’s specific need including affordable housing has made housing affordability for a large section of the population in the Gatwick Diamond Area, including young people and key workers, an unattainable dream. This creates for the Gatwick Area community stress and mitigates against achieving high economic potential and prosperity.
The Gatwick Diamond authorities recognise the importance of the metropolitan green belt and metropolitan open land in London. However the Mayor has ruled out any consideration of a review of green belt within London. It is unclear if this is intended to be binding upon the local plans produced by the London boroughs. In any event, this would seem to be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the draft revised National Planning Policy Framework (5 March 2018).

Outside of London and consistent with the NPPF, councils are required to consider and justify the green belt boundaries in appropriate circumstances, which may include meeting objectively assessed needs. The precedent has been set in many local plans. The Gatwick Diamond authorities consider that an objective, evidence-based approach is also appropriate within London and the case for not doing so seems to be based on a political rather than an objective judgement. This requires attention and the Gatwick Diamond authorities are happy to assist the adjacent London boroughs with an appropriate joint review.

There remains ambiguity in the draft London Plan where it is suggested that existing levels of migration of households to areas outside London will be maintained. Clarification is sought.

The Gatwick corridor is alluded to in the draft London Plan as a strategic infrastructure investment priority. The Gatwick Diamond authorities welcome the support of the draft London Plan in drawing attention to this, however the authorities are keen to ensure that the promotion of the Gatwick corridor does not mean a stretch of continuous urban development from Greater London to the South Coast. The Gatwick Diamond authorities are keen to maintain strategic, open gaps between adjacent towns.

Some of the current limitation in movement in the corridor, such as rail, is due to restrictions and lack of infrastructure improvements within the London area. An example is the need for improvements to the signalling and track in Croydon Borough. The upgrade of the Brighton main line is welcomed. Recognition of the North Downs Line as a strategic infrastructure priority is also supported.

Gatwick Diamond Authorities are concerned at the unqualified reference in para 10.8.7 of the Plan that the Mayor “believes that expansion at Gatwick could deliver significant benefits to London and the UK more quickly, at less cost, and with significantly fewer adverse environmental impacts”. There is support in the Gatwick Diamond area for Gatwick’s continued development as a single runway, two terminal airport, but we do not believe that the case has been made for a second runway. Although we understand the concerns over the possible environmental and social implications of Heathrow expansion, Government has decided that Heathrow is the right place for additional airport capacity in the South East. It is therefore disappointing that the draft London Plan is seeking to reopen this debate.

Previously the London Plan sought to link infrastructure investment outside the London region with housing and other growth in the south east. There has been a change in direction in the draft London Plan to avoid this prescription. The Gatwick Diamond Authorities would like this to be explicitly ruled out to avoid any future ambiguity.

Instead when it comes to channelling unmet need, the draft London Plan seeks to encourage partnership working with specific areas outside of London to meet mutual objectives. This is welcomed.

However these new partnerships are seemingly few and far between and the idea is relatively undeveloped with a lack of detail as to the timing and delivery arrangements, such that these partnerships are considered unlikely to pass the test of soundness, were it to be applied to a Local Plan. There is a concern that if these untired and unproven arrangements and relationships fail to deliver, the default will revert to the previous approach.

Gatwick Diamond authorities are aware that in local plan examinations, Planning inspectors have added additional numbers to local housing targets to provide for London’s unmet need. There is insufficient certainty and robustness in what the draft London Plan proposes to be persuasive if the tests of soundness which apply outside London were applied to the draft London Plan. While the
draft London Plan is not obliged to be tested to such a level of rigour, the London Boroughs’ Local Plans which will continue to have a role are not able to escape this requirement.

In contrast to the seeming consensual approach with authorities outside of London, the draft London Plan is far more prescriptive with the approach to densification and housing target numbers for London Boroughs, particularly outer London Boroughs. The proportion of the identified housing need between inner/outer London has altered significantly in the draft London Plan and the level of involvement in what previously was considered to be matters to be dealt with at an individual Borough basis has greatly increased. This involvement has even been increased to the extent that GLA officers have suggested that the need for statutory Local Plans in the boroughs could be regarded as optional. There is, it is said, enough in policy terms in the draft London Plan to encourage sufficient densification to meet the housing target through development management in the Outer London Boroughs without an up to date Local Plan.

The Gatwick Diamond authorities would identify their concerns as:

1. That substantial higher housing numbers in the outer London boroughs will exacerbate commuting because patterns of movement over the London boundary are complex and two way.
2. That there is potential for better meeting a significant proportion of London housing needs by continuing the focus and level of housing growth in inner London.
3. That densification of the suburbs and the new mechanisms suggested by the draft London Plan are relatively untested and unproven. Together with a restrictive Green Belt policy, this could lead to under-provision of housing numbers against the housing requirements, and under-provision of family housing against needs, pushing unmet demand beyond the Greater London boundaries.
4. That under-providing against the identified housing need over the ten years to 2028/29 will add up to the size of a small town (10,000 dwellings), even if housing targets are met and there is no strategy to deal with this.
5. The Gatwick Diamond authorities are able to exercise the duty to cooperate and other liaison processes with the outer London boroughs in the south of London through the opportunity to discuss and engage in the process of the making of those local plans. This process will be subverted by the draft London Plan.
6. That unqualified support for Gatwick Airport expansion without requiring the same need to ensure it would not result in “additional environmental harm” as it does for Heathrow (para 10.8.7 of the draft London Plan) is a serious omission.
7. The concept of willing partners working together, such as between the GLA and other authorities beyond the London boundary, is supported. This approach should also apply to within London and the relationships between the GLA and the outer London Boroughs, otherwise there is a risk that disruption and a breakdown of working relationship will jeopardise the provision of sufficient housing within London as a whole to meet London’s needs.
8. There is a substantial risk of non-delivery of the draft London Plan housing need targets. The Gatwick Diamond authorities support the need for a monitoring framework and risk management plan, which other Local Authority Groupings, such as SEEC, are also highlighting.

Yours sincerely,

Claire Vickers
Chairman, Gatwick Diamond Members’ Group & Cabinet Member for Planning & Development, Horsham District Council
From: Celeste Giusti <[redacted]>
Sent: 10 September 2018 14:01
To: LocalPlan
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Local Plan GLA response
Attachments: Tandridge Submission consultation - final.docx.pdf

Dear Sarah

Please find attached a response from the GLA.

Thanks

Celeste

Celeste Giusti  
Principal Strategic Planner  
London Plan Team  
Development, Enterprise and Environment  
Greater London Authority

#LondonIsOpen

**GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY NOTICE:**
The information in this email may contain confidential or privileged materials. For more information see [https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/email-notice/](https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/email-notice/)
Dear Ms Thompson

Draft Local Plan Consultation (Regulation 19)

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on your draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) Consultation.

As stated in our previous response, the Mayor welcomes the District’s approach to housing need set out in your Strategic Housing Market Assessment. It should be noted that the Greater London Authority’s latest projections include consistent outputs for all local authorities in England and form the basis for housing need in the draft London Plan. They are available on the London Datastore: https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/2016-based-projections-national-outputs.

The District is located in close proximity to the draft new London Plan’s Strategic Infrastructure Priority called ‘Brighton Mainline (London – Gatwick - Brighton (see Policy SD3 and Figure 2.15 of the draft new London Plan).

Given the District’s good access to the motorway network (M25/M23 in particular), the Mayor welcomes your draft Plan’s commitment to identify at least 15.3ha of additional employment land for B1, B2 and B8 uses.

As Tandridge borders London, we would be grateful if you would consider extending some of the Mayor’s strategic transport policy objectives to the district including the promotion of Healthy Streets, rebalancing the transport system towards walking, cycling and public transport, improving air quality and reducing road danger.
If you would like to discuss the matters raised above further, please contact

Yours sincerely

Julieanna McLoughlin
Chief Planner

Cc: National Planning Casework Unit, MHCLG
    Lucinda Turner, TFL