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1 Introduction

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

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

1.3 The publication of the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (published March 2014) emphasise the importance of ‘the duty’. The PPG includes detailed advice on the duty¹, and the following key messages, in particular, are emerging:

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

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

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


² Letter from Inspector to Mid-Sussex District Council dated 2nd December 2013.
In complying with the duty to cooperate, Government Guidance recommends that local planning authorities ‘scope’ the strategic matters of the Local Plan document at the beginning of the preparation process taking account of the ‘functional geography’ of the specific matter and identify those local authorities and prescribed bodies that need to be engaged.

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

The 2016 Duty to Cooperate Statement was a further update, and set out the steps taken to comply with the ‘duty’ in preparing the Local Plan: Sites Consultation document, which was consulted upon under Regulation 18 between 4 November 2016 – 30 December 2016.

This document is a further update and sets out the steps taken since the Local Plan: Sites Consultation up to the Local Plan: Garden Village consultation, which is to take place from 14 August 2017 – 9 October 2017.

This update should be read in conjunction with the December 2014 Scoping Statement, the 2015 and 2016 updates.
2 The Purpose of this Statement

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

2.2 Since then, the Council has continued to prepare its Local Plan, and alongside both Regulation 18 consultations Local Plan: Issues and Approaches and Local Plan: Sites Consultation, a Duty to Cooperate Statement has been prepared. This 2017 update, reflects the further steps taken in preparation of the Local Plan: Garden Villages Consultation (2017).

2.3 The steps taken to fulfil the ‘duty’ as set out in this update, are proportionate to the stage in the plan-making process and reflect the nature of the Local Plan: Garden Village Consultation document. The types of engagement which have taken place under the duty are predominantly focussed on the garden village vision, principles and objectives, deliverability, neighbouring authorities’ timetables and delivery strategies, preparing evidence based documents and infrastructure requirements.

2.4 Since the Local Plan: Sites Consultation, the Council have agreed a preferred strategy. The strategy is to deliver development through a combination of a garden village which would deliver sustainable and comprehensive large scale development that followed Garden Village principles, and some limited development of our urban and semi-rural settlements as defined in the Council’s Settlement Hierarchy (2015).

2.5 The approach for a large urban extension or new settlement had been set out in Approach 6 of the Local Plan: Issues and Approaches document. However, as this stage of plan making was about the different approaches to development and not the locations, no areas for a new settlement were identified and views were being sought on the concept. The Local Plan: Sites Consultation moved to the next step and identified through a robust and consistent methodology explained in the Spatial Approaches topic paper: Sites Consultation (2016), two broad locations that could be considered under approach 6. These were land at South Godstone and land at Blindley Heath.

2.6 Around the time of the Local Plan: Sites Consultation, three new sites were submitted for consideration through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and which accorded with the Council’s methodology for considering broad locations. To ensure a robust and consistent approach was undertaken on these areas, the same methodology that the other broad locations had been subject to was applied to these three locations and appropriate evidence gathered to ensure comprehensive consideration of the suitability of each of these locations, including landscape assessment. The application of this methodology reduced the locations to two and once added to the original two identified in the Local Plan: Sites Consultation provided the Council with four locations.

---

3 https://www.tcpa.org.uk/garden-city-principles
4 These two locations are also explored further in the Spatial Approaches topic paper: Garden Village consultation (2017) which accompanies the 2017 Regulation 18 Local Plan document.
5 Land at Alderstead and Tollsworth Farm, Chaldon was found to be an unsuitable location and no further considered.
2.7 The four locations are:

- South Godstone;
- Blindley Heath;
- Land west of Edenbridge; and
- Redhill Aerodrome.

2.8 More information on this is available in the Spatial Approaches Topic Paper: Garden Village Consultation (2017).

2.9 It is logical to accept that development of a garden village scale may cross administrative boundaries; this is the case with two of the locations being considered. Land west of Edenbridge is partially within Sevenoaks and Redhill Aerodrome crosses into the borders of Reigate and Banstead. As such the duty to cooperate is essential to the delivery of not only a sound plan but to considering these sites further. Whilst the complexities of the duty are more profound for these locations, it is no more important than ensuring that proper cooperation is undertaken for the remaining two locations in South Godstone and Blindley Heath which are located wholly within Tandridge District. The implications of these two locations still have cross-border and strategic implications, such as the impacts for the A22 which run from Croydon south to Mid Sussex areas and therefore the duty to cooperate applies to those affected authorities that have a relationship with the A22, for example. There is also development being proposed along the entire M23 and A23 corridors, stretching from London to the South Coast, which will have implications for the users of that transport network. As such, it will be important to liaise with affected authorities and the highways authorities to understand the full extent of the impact from cumulative development on the M23 / A23 network as part of the plan making process.

2.10 As such, this document focuses on the duty to cooperate relevant to the four garden village locations and therefore is set out slightly differently to the previous Duty to Cooperate Statements.
3 Legislative Framework and National Guidance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.8 Whilst local authorities will need to show how the duty is being taken forward on an on-going basis through the Authority’s Monitoring Report (AMR), the Council will go beyond this and update this document at each regulation of the plan preparation.

Local Plans

3.9 In September 2015, the Planning Minister (Brandon Lewis) set up a new expert panel to consider how to simplify and streamline the making of local plans. The report by the Local Plan expert group was published in March 2016 and set out a wide ranging number of recommendations. One of the recommendations included giving “more bite” to the duty to co-operate, for example, by requiring Local Planning Authorities to test and challenge a neighbouring authority’s claim that they cannot assist with unmet housing needs.

3.10 In February 2017, the Government published the Housing White Paper that considered some of the recommendations made by the Local Plan Expert Group. One recommendation in the Housing White Paper 2017, identified that there should be incentives to encourage Local Planning Authorities to use the duty more effectively in respect of housing provision.

3.11 Another recommendation brought forward from the Local Plan Expert Group Report into the White Paper was the need for a standardised methodology on calculating the Objectively Assessed Need, which normally features heavily in Duty to Cooperate discussions. However, it has been suggested by Government officials that the standardised methodology will not be published until April 2018 and therefore we must continue to work within the existing framework.

Recent cases

3.12 A recent case where a Local Planning Authority failed their Duty to Cooperate was St Albans. The St Albans Local Plan contained four broad locations for residential development, releasing areas of Green Belt land for development. Two of these locations were at land East of Hemel Hempstead, adjoining the neighbouring authority of Dacorum. The major concern was how the sites were to be counted towards housing provision, both in St Albans and Dacorum. This decision has presented St Albans with the need to resolve differences over evidence base matters, and will require them to meet housing need in an area with high housing demand, housing affordability issues and significant Green Belt constraint.

3.13 As such, there will be a need for St Albans to identify more land for development and as there is not enough previously development land and non-green belt land within the District, a more comprehensive and effective review of Green Belt land will be required. In addition, the evidence highlighted that St Albans was a single Housing Market Area and therefore the ability to meet unmet needs in other Housing Market Areas through the duty to cooperate was slightly weakened.
3.14 This case demonstrates the importance of duty to cooperate on sites adjoining neighbouring authorities, a need for a comprehensive Green Belt review and dealing within unmet need in an authority that is not within a defined Housing Market Area, which are all points relevant to the Tandridge District Council Local Plan.

3.15 As such, this statement shows the ongoing discussions the Council has on duty to cooperate matters relating to the garden village locations and the impact they could have on the wider area. Whilst it is early in the plan making process and there are no preferred locations at this stage, any garden village location will need to feature in Memorandum of Understandings and Statements of Common Ground to ensure consideration of unmet need and that the duty has been met.
4. **Establishing the principles of a garden village development with neighbouring authorities first**

4.1 Two of the potential garden village locations; Redhill Aerodrome and Land West of Edenbridge, are partially within neighbouring authorities; Reigate and Banstead and Sevenoaks respectively.

4.2 Consequently, for these sites to be considered further, the principles for development in this location must be established.

4.3 For an allocation to be made in the Tandridge District Local Plan for either of these locations, consensus must be reached that the location would also be an allocation in the adjoining authorities Local Plan. Table 1 below sets out the timetable that both Reigate and Banstead and Sevenoaks are working to.

### Table 1: Timetable of plan preparation for Reigate and Banstead and Sevenoaks Councils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authority</th>
<th>Development Plan</th>
<th>Emerging Plans</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reigate and Banstead Borough Council</strong></td>
<td>• Core Strategy (2014) &lt;br&gt;• The Borough Local Plan (2005) &lt;br&gt;• Relevant Surrey minerals and waste plans</td>
<td>• Development Management Plan (scheduled for adoption in November 2018)</td>
<td>• Review of the Core Strategy required in 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sevenoaks District Council</strong></td>
<td>• Core Strategy (2011) &lt;br&gt;• The Allocations and Development Management Plan (ADMP, 2015) &lt;br&gt;• Relevant Kent minerals and waste plans</td>
<td>• New Local Plan for the period 2015-2035. Issues and Options consultation scheduled for summer 2017, with adoption in 2019.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reigate and Banstead Borough Council**

4.4 Reigate & Banstead Borough Council has an adopted Core Strategy which sets an ‘urban areas first’ focus for the plan period to 2027 but also recognises that urban extensions are likely to be needed within this period to meet the borough’s housing target. The Core Strategy identifies a number of areas of search for these urban extensions; however these do not include the Redhill Aerodrome site.

4.5 As seen from table 1 above, Reigate and Banstead Council is working up its Development Management Plan which will include urban extension site allocations in the areas of search identified in the Core Strategy. As part of its work on the Development Management Plan, RBBC is also considering whether additional land needs to be safeguarded for development...
beyond the plan period (reflecting policies in the National Planning Policy Framework). Any land safeguarded through the Development Management Plan would need to be formally allocated through a future local plan review (for example, a review of the Core Strategy or an Area Action Plan (AAP)). RBBC is appraising a range of options for land safeguarding, one of which is the Redhill Aerodrome site.

4.6 Should both authorities conclude that the Aerodrome represents a suitable and sustainable development option, the site could feasibly be allocated via an Area Action Plan that both Councils would work jointly on. From our initial discussions, set out in minutes from a meeting held on 29 May 2017 (Appendix A), this is not something that Reigate and Banstead Council are opposed to but further work on the location and overcoming the other issues (as set out in the Local Plan: Potential Garden Village Locations and below) is required before either authority will be in a position to decide whether this location should be taken forward. The two authorities are agreed that this should include (but not be limited to) transport access and implications, healthcare and education impacts and provision, and measures that would be required to mitigate flood risk and landscape and biodiversity impact.

Sevenoaks District Council

4.7 Sevenoaks District Council is to publish their Local Plan: Issues and Options for a 9 week consultation on 3 August 2017. The plan sets out a number of approaches that can be seen in table 2 below.
Table 2: Sevenoaks Local Plan: Options for delivery strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Baseline'</td>
<td>All 'committed' development since 2015: a) Built schemes (2015-17) b) Schemes with permission at 31-3-2017</td>
<td>726 1836 = 2,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximising supply in existing built up areas: - Suitable urban sites submitted through call for sites - Sites allocated in the ADMP - Increasing densities on existing ADMP allocations - Sevenoaks Station airspace development - Regeneration of Swanley town</td>
<td>338 415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following elements are not mapped: - Windfall estimate (46pa x 15) - Rural exceptions sites</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total for Baseline and Maximising Supply (using 5,000 ensures some built in flexibility)</td>
<td>5072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 | 'Brownfield' | Delivering growth on suitable 'brownfield' land in the Green Belt (using 1,500 ensures some built in flexibility) | =1,563 |
| 2 | 'Exceptional Circumstances' | Delivering growth initiatives on Green Belt land where exceptional circumstances may exist: - Sevenoaks Town (Northern Masterplan) - Westerham (Relief Road) - Edenbridge (Health and Education Hub) - Swanley/Hextable | Unconfirmed |
| 3 | 'Combination' | Baseline + Max Supply + 1 'brownfield' approach + 2 'exceptional circumstances' approach | 5,000 |
|    | | | = 6,500 + TBC |
| 4 | 'New Settlement' | A large urban extension or new settlement | TBC |
| 5 | 'Transport Hubs' | Green Belt close to 'Transport Hubs' | TBC |


4.8 Sevenoaks preferred option is Approach 3 (i.e. maximising growth in existing settlements and then considering a combination of brownfield land in the Green Belt and land where an ‘exceptional circumstances’ case can be substantiated).

4.9 Page 26 of the Sevenoaks Local Plan (cabinet version) explains approach 2 ‘Exceptional Circumstances’, and provides more information on delivering growth initiatives on Green Belt land where exceptional circumstances may exist, and in particular where Edenbridge
features in this approach. It states “**Edenbridge** – there is a Neighbourhood Plan process ongoing although it is not currently considering an exceptional circumstance case. Provision of new health and post-11 education hub is likely to be important if any case were to be made”.

As can be seen from table 2 above, approach 2 alongside the baseline situation, maximising supply and brownfield approaches create approach 3 – ‘combination’. As Approach 3 is the Councils preferred option, there is scope for development in Edenbridge. However, the number of homes and location in Edenbridge within the Issues and Approaches Paper is ‘unconfirmed’.

4.10 However, the West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) undertook a consultation for how health services can be provided in Edenbridge in the future between 1 February and 26 April 2017. The West Kent CCG preferred option was option 1a – ‘New build, new sites, new day care services, no in patient beds, to be located on either Kent County Council land on the south side of Four Elms Road: near the Eden Centre, or Cooper’s Estate land on south, side of Four Elms Road: slightly further out of the town. West Kent CCG had also considered option 2a or 2b to build a new combined hospital/surgery on the existing sites of Edenbridge and District War Memorial Hospital, Mill Hill, although this was not preferred.

4.11 In addition, a meeting held with Tandridge District Council and Sevenoaks District Council (SDC) on 3 May 2017 and 17 May 2017 (Appendix B) identified that the Edenbridge (potential garden village) location to the west was not in line with Sevenoaks emerging issues and options development strategy and consultation draft and as such would be unlikely to be a site that was included in the final SDC draft Local Plan.

4.12 Although the above sets out a CCG preferred location for development to the east of Edenbridge, no final decision has been made, and as such it would be premature to no longer consider the Edenbridge location before the consultation on Tandridge Local Plan: Potential Garden Villages Locations.

4.13 This position has been checked with both Reigate and Banstead and Sevenoaks Council as an accurate record. The authorities are agreed that both potential locations should be considered further and subject to appropriate robust evidence gathering and appraisal before making a final decision on the preferred garden village location.
5. **Considering the potential locations with all appropriate duty to cooperate bodies**

5.1 Once the principles of a garden village location within a neighbouring authority have been considered, each garden village location with duty to cooperate bodies has to be discussed. Tables 3-6 set out duty to cooperate in relation the four potential garden village locations.

### Table 3: Duty to Cooperate on South Godstone Garden Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with</th>
<th>District Councils / County Councils</th>
<th>Other statutory bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mid-Sussex DC</td>
<td>• Homes and Communities Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Croydon LBC</td>
<td>• Coast to Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surrey County Council</td>
<td>• Local Nature Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• West Sussex County Council</td>
<td>• Clinical Commissioning Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Mayor of London</td>
<td>(CCGs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transport for London</td>
<td>• English Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highways England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Natural England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Civil Aviation Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The National Health Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioning Board (NHS England)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Office of the Rail Regulator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions taken**

Between the Duty to Cooperate Statement update of November 2016 and Local Plan: Garden Village Consultation (2017), the Council have been continuing to prepare and collate evidence, set out a preferred strategy and shortlisted four potential locations for a garden village. In addition to the statutory consultation requirements, the Council has drafts with Duty to Cooperate bodies on landscape, and ecology evidence, Duty to Cooperate Statement and where relevant, worked within them on the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the Transport and Accessibility Assessment.

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

1. Infrastructure Meetings between May and June 2017 (set out in Appendix C)
2. Meeting with Mid Sussex on 8 August 2017 setting the main issues with the locations (Appendix D)
3. Workshop on 9 August 2017 on the Local Plan: Garden Village Proposals (set out in Appendix E)
4. General ‘duty’ meetings/teleconferences with Mid Sussex and Croydon to discuss their emerging evidence, and Local Plan updates
5. Work on Surrey Local Strategic Statement
6. Finalisation of Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement
7. Work on the Surrey Infrastructure Update 2017
8. Ongoing discussions with Natural England and other LPAs regarding HRA and impacts on international sites, particularly in light of recent High Court judgements. LPAs include Mid Sussex, Tunbridge Wells, Wealden, South Downs NPA, Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead, Lewes, Crawley and Sevenoaks.

What will happen next up to Regulation 19?

1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation
2. Consider the role the garden village location will have in the Surrey LSS and any update to the Gatwick Diamond LSS
3. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression
4. Another Duty to Cooperate meeting to update authorities on refined and preferred approach
5. Seek opportunities for joint evidence bases, where appropriate.
6. HRA to assess impacts on international sites, as advised by Natural England. Requires ongoing partnership working with relevant LPAs to agree methodologies, share evidence and assess ‘in combination’ effects.
7. Meet with Mid Sussex, West Sussex and Surrey County Council to discuss modelling cumulative impacts of development along the A22 / A264 corridor.
9. If the preferred location, work with all affected parties to prepare an Area Action Plan.
Table 4: Duty to Cooperate on Blindley Heath Garden Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Councils / County Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mid-Sussex DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Croydon LBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surrey County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• West Sussex County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Mayor of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transport for London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actions taken

Between the Duty to Cooperate Statement update of November 2016 and Local Plan: Garden Village Consultation (2017), the Council have been continuing to prepare and collate evidence, set out a preferred strategy and shortlisted four potential locations for a garden village. In addition to the statutory consultation requirements, the Council has drafts with Duty to Cooperate bodies on landscape, and ecology evidence, Duty to Cooperate Statement and where relevant, worked within them on the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the Transport and Accessibility Assessment.

In addition the other activities with the duty to cooperate bodies have been ongoing:
1. Infrastructure Meetings between May and June 2017 (set out in Appendix C)
2. Meeting with Mid Sussex on 8 August 2017 setting the main issues with the locations (Appendix D)
3. Workshop on 9 August 2017 on the Local Plan: Garden Village Proposals (set out in Appendix E)
4. General ‘duty’ meetings/teleconferences with Mid Sussex and Croydon to discuss their emerging evidence, and Local Plan updates
5. Work on Surrey Local Strategic Statement
6. Finalisation of Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement
7. Work on the Surrey Infrastructure Update 2017
8. Ongoing discussions with Natural England and other LPAs regarding HRA and impacts on international sites, particularly in light of recent High Court judgements. LPAs include Mid Sussex, Tunbridge Wells, Wealden, South Downs NPA, Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead, Lewes, Crawley and Sevenoaks.

What will happen next up to Regulation 19?
1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation
2. Consider the role the garden village location will have in the Surrey LSS and any update to the Gatwick Diamond LSS
3. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression, generally and
specifically in relation to this location, and informal officer engagement as appropriate

4. Another Duty to Cooperate meeting to update authorities on refined and preferred approach

5. Seek opportunities for joint evidence bases, where appropriate

6. HRA to assess impacts on international sites, as advised by Natural England. Requires ongoing partnership working with relevant LPAs to agree methodologies, share evidence and assess ‘in combination’ effects.

7. Meet with Mid Sussex, West Sussex and Surrey County Council to discuss modelling cumulative impacts of development along the A22 / A264 corridor.


9. If the preferred location, work with all affected parties to prepare an Area Action Plan.
Table 5: Duty to Cooperate on Redhill Aerodrome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Councils / County Councils</td>
<td>Between the Duty to Cooperate Statement update of November 2016 and Local Plan: Garden Village Consultation (2017), the Council have been continuing to prepare and collate evidence, set out a preferred strategy and shortlisted four potential locations for a garden village. In addition to the statutory consultation requirements, the Council has shared drafts with Duty to Cooperate bodies on landscape, and ecology evidence, Duty to Cooperate Statement and where relevant, worked within them on the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the Transport and Accessibility Assessment. In addition the other activities with the duty to cooperate bodies have been ongoing: 1. Infrastructure Meetings between May and June 2017 (set out in Appendix C) 2. Meeting between Tandridge and Reigate &amp; Banstead Leader and CEXs to discuss the proposals of this location held on 24 May 2017 (Appendix A) 3. Workshop on 9 August 2017 on the Local Plan: Garden Village Proposals (set out in Appendix E) 4. General ‘duty’ meetings/teleconferences with Reigate and Banstead to discuss their emerging evidence, and Local Plan updates 5. Work on Surrey Local Strategic Statement 6. Finalisation of Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 7. Work on the Surrey Infrastructure Update 2017 8. Ongoing discussions with Natural England and other LPAs regarding HRA and impacts on international sites, particularly in light of recent High Court judgements. LPAs include Mid Sussex, Tunbridge Wells, Wealden, South Downs NPA, Mole Valley, Reigate &amp; Banstead, Lewes, Crawley and Sevenoaks 9. Discussion with affected authorities and Highways England and Department of Transport on the possibility of an M23 spur road (Appendix G) 10. Further Regulation 18 consultation on Local Plan: Potential Garden Village Locations (August 2017 – October 2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other statutory bodies</td>
<td>What will happen next up to Regulation 19?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reigate and Banstead Borough Council</td>
<td>1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surrey County Council</td>
<td>2. Consider the role the garden village location will have in the Surrey LSS and any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Mayor of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transport for London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M23/A23 affected authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Homes and Communities Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coast to Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Nature Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• English Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highways England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Natural England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Civil Aviation Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The National Health Service Commissioning Board (NHS England)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Office of the Rail Regulator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
update to the Gatwick Diamond LSS

3. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression, generally and specifically in relation to this location, and informal officer engagement as appropriate

4. Another Duty to Cooperate meeting to update authorities on refined and preferred approach

5. Seek opportunities for joint evidence bases, where appropriate.

6. Continue to liaise with Highways England in relation to M23 spur road, including facilitating a forum with the affected authorities along the M23/A23 corridor;

7. HRA to assess impacts on international sites, as advised by Natural England. Requires ongoing partnership working with relevant Lpas to agree methodologies, share evidence and assess ‘in combination’ effects.


9. If the preferred location, seek agreement to progress joint work on an Area Action Plan.
### Who the Strategic Matters need to be discussed with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Councils / County Councils</th>
<th>Other statutory bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks District Council</td>
<td>Homes and Communities Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent County Council</td>
<td>Local Nature Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mayor of London</td>
<td>Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highways England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Civil Aviation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The National Health Service Commissioning Board (NHS England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Office of the Rail Regulator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actions taken

Between the Duty to Cooperate Statement update of November 2016 and Local Plan: Garden Village Consultation (2017), the Council have been continuing to prepare and collate evidence, set out a preferred strategy and shortlisted four potential locations for a garden village. In addition to the statutory consultation requirements, the Council has drafts with Duty to Cooperate bodies on landscape, and ecology evidence, Duty to Cooperate Statement and where relevant, worked within them on the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the Transport and Accessibility Assessment.

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

1. Infrastructure Meetings between May and June 2017 (set out in Appendix C)
2. Meeting between Tandridge and Sevenoaks Leader and CEXs to discuss the proposals of this location held on 3 May 2017 and with officers on 17 May 2017 (Appendix B)
3. Workshop on 9 August 2017 on the Local Plan: Garden Village Proposals (set out in Appendix E)
4. General ‘duty’ meetings/teleconferences with Sevenoaks to discuss their emerging evidence, and Local Plan updates
5. Work on Surrey Local Strategic Statement
6. Finalisation of Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement
7. Work on the Surrey Infrastructure Update 2017
8. Ongoing discussions with Natural England and other LPAs regarding HRA and impacts on international sites, particularly in light of recent High Court judgements. LPAs include Mid Sussex, Tunbridge Wells, Wealden, South Downs NPA, Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead, Lewes, Crawley and Sevenoaks.

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

1. Analyse and take on board comments from Regulation 18 consultation
2. Consider the role the garden village location will have in the Surrey LSS and any
update to the Gatwick Diamond LSS
3. Meetings with other authorities on their Local Plan progression, generally and specifically in relation to this site, and informal officer engagement as appropriate
4. Another Duty to Cooperate meeting to update authorities on refined and preferred approach
5. Seek opportunities for joint evidence bases, where appropriate.
6. HRA to assess impacts on international sites, as advised by Natural England. Requires ongoing partnership working with relevant LPAs to agree methodologies, share evidence and assess ‘in combination’ effects.
8. If the preferred location, seek agreement to progress joint work on an Area Action Plan.

5.2 Other Information

5.3 Land at Alderstead and Tollsworth Farm in Chaldon was submitted to be considered through the Council’s Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment. For more information on this location, please see the Spatial Approaches Topic Paper: Garden Villages Consultation (2017) or the Interim HELAA 2017: Broad Locations. As part of the process, the location was discussed at meetings with the London Borough of Croydon and Reigate and Banstead prior to it no longer being considered as a potential location for Garden Village as a result of evidence gathering. Minutes of the meeting can be found in Appendix F.
Appendix A – Reigate and Banstead Borough Council and Tandridge District Council meeting

Leader and CEX Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/time: 24 May (Reigate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Martin Fisher - TDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Victor Broad - RBBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Round - TDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr (Dr) Lynne Hack - RBBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jory - RBBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Meeting opened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Cllr Fisher and Ms Round set out Tandridge’s Preferred Strategy – to deliver development through a combination of a new garden village and some limited development of our urban and semi-rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The five locations being considered for the garden village were explained, including the Redhill and Chaldon sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Redhill – It was agreed that the location could only be accessed if a M23 spur road was provided and that due to the proximity of the hospital it was being promoted in line with the NHS healthy towns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Chaldon – It was agreed that there was not much detail on this location at this stage but access was an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Reigate and Banstead explained that they were continuing to work on their Development Management Policies Document with consultation in early 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Agreement was made to continue to work together and share evidence where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Both parties agreed that the meeting had been constructive and positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Meeting ended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B – Sevenoaks District Council and Tandridge District Council meetings

Leader and CEX Meeting

Date/time: 3 May (Sevenoaks)

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cllr Martin Fisher - TDC</th>
<th>Cllr Peter Fleming - SDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louise Round - TDC</td>
<td>Pav Ramewal - SDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- Meeting opened.
- Cllr Fisher and Ms Round set out Tandridge’s Preferred Strategy – to deliver development through a combination of a new garden village and some limited development of our urban and semi-rural areas.
- The five locations being considered for the garden village were explained, including the Edenbridge site.
- Cllr Fleming and Dr Ramewal explained that Sevenoaks were still working on collating evidence for their Local Plan and aiming to go out for a Regulation 18 consultation in the summer. It was also explained that the Edenbridge site was not in line with SDC’s emerging issues and options consultation draft and as such would be unlikely to be a site that was included in the final SDC draft Local Plan.
- Agreement was made to continue to work together and share evidence where appropriate.
- Both parties agreed that the meeting had been constructive and positive.
- Meeting ended.

Officer Meeting

Meeting – Sevenoaks District Council and Tandridge District Council
17th May 2017, 2pm
Oxted

Sevenoaks District Council – Hannah Gooden, Antony Lancaster
Tandridge District Council – Sarah Thompson

1 Duty to Co-operate

The authorities share a boundary to the west of Sevenoaks District.

2 Tandridge DC Local Plan update

Strategy agreed by members in March:
- Focus on urban areas
- Edge of settlement around tier 1 and tier 2 where EC exist (TBC)
- Neighbourhood Plans relationship / insetting smaller settlements
- Garden village (5 locations under consideration, one W of Edenbridge)

TDC to share ‘exceptional circumstances’ pro forma
Additional Reg 18 consultation later in summer regarding garden village options. Need careful comms strategy to ensure Edenbridge residents understand it is a TDC consultation

Reg 19 publication scheduled for spring/summer 2018.

OAN 9,400. SHMA review required before Reg 19. Highly likely to be a shortfall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Sevenoaks DC Local Plan Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Reg 18 Issues and Options consultation scheduled for Aug-Sept 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Will be a DtC workshop as part of the consultation – likely to be held in August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Second Reg 18 in spring 2018 / Reg 19 later in 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spatial Strategy**

- Maximising supply in existing settlements (density, airspace development, town centre regeneration)
- Brownfield land in the Green Belt (in sustainable locations)
- Green Belt around top tier settlements where an exceptional circumstances case could be made e.g.
  - Sevenoaks Town – in relation to Bat & Ball/Quarry
  - Westerham – relief road
  - Edenbridge – health and education hub

OAN 12,400 – unlikely to be able to meet full need. Currently looking about 8k.

HG to provide link to Westerham consultation led by Squerryes estate

http://www.visitwesterham.org.uk/which-way-westerham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Potential areas for discussion / co-operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Cross-boundary site west of Edenbridge – TDC planning to undertake landscape and ecology work (needs to be carried out in May), to provide an assessment of the site in relation to the garden village proposal. SDC intends to assess the area submitted under ‘call for sites’ process in the same way as it does for other submitted sites (internal assessment process)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and this will feature in the next iteration of its Strategic Housing Land and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) due in 2018. Site within TDC August consultation TDC-SDC should discuss a comms strategy

- Ashdown Forest – recent meeting hosted by South Downs NPA. Discussion re Wealden sharing data in relation to transport modelling and assumptions. Air quality data. New SNAP proposal (Shared Nitro-Deposition Action Plan). Mid Sussex currently in examination and looking at management– LEZ/electric vehicles etc. Need to demonstrate co-operation and progress on a way forward at examination. HRA likely to be more significant than for previous plans.

- Housing White Paper – keeping in loop re consultation. Likely to be delayed due to elections etc

- Statement of Common Ground / Protocol – TDC have an MoU with Mid Sussex. SDC to look at this and discuss again at next meeting in Nov, when spatial strategies should be clearer. Will need to elevate to include member involvement at a later stage and potential for this document to form a statement of common ground, if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Future meetings</th>
<th>6 monthly meetings, alternate locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Next meeting in November in Sevenoaks. Potential dates:

15 November or 22 November
2pm, Sevenoaks?

Please let us know if either of these are suitable

15 November works for us.
Appendix C – Infrastructure Meetings

TDC Infrastructure Delivery Plan Meeting
TANRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL & SERVICE PROVIDERS
DATE: 04 May 2017, 2pm, Conference Room 5, Council Office

Participants: Ronnie Godfrey (Oxted Health Centre), David Hill (Oxted Health Centre), Caroline Towers (Whyteleafe Health Centre), Katie Taylor (Caterham Valley Medical Practice), Kathryn Teasdale (Caterham Valley Medical Practice), Sarah Thompson (TDC), M. Ngaluafe (TDC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update with progress on the Local Plan current status, and timeframe. | • ST gave an update on the last consultation which was a site specific consultation  
• The next version of the LP will be clearer with the sites that will go forward and the types of mix.  
• Current work is being carried out that involves analysing the comments from the last consultation, gathering further evidence  
• Next infrastructure meetings to be held in October 2017.  
• In the October meeting, the Council will have a firmer idea of the sites that will go forward, the kind of development (2/3 bedroom houses), number of houses. | MNG to set up the October meetings in July 2017. |
| Council’s Preferred Strategy – garden village | • March 2017: a Preferred Strategy was approved, outlining the areas which will be considered to accommodate development. The view is that the LP will deliver development through:  
• 1) some limited development of urban area and semi-rural area. These areas are in Lingfield, Smallfield, Whyteleafe, Warlingham and Oxted.  
• 2) Garden Village in locations of Blindley Heath, S. Godstone, Land west of Edenbridge, land at the edge of Chaldon and Redhill Aerodrome. There are no specific boundaries but broad areas  
• With a Garden Village, the suggested number of dwellings is unknown and could not be built out until years 10 to 15 of the plan. | |
- With a large scale development; developers need to be tied to delivering the required infrastructure.
- One method of delivering infrastructure is by forward funding so as to unlock development. Money to be paid back by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) that will be collected from the development.
- Another strand of the Strategy is to support Neighbourhood Plan which focuses on parish areas. NP looks more at the details and characters of development.
- Mentioned that the Council met with the CCG to gain an understanding of their strategy; the MCP model was discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provider’s views, strategy, extension (upwards)</th>
<th>Caterham Valley Medical Centre:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- They now have a new room, by converting an existing room to a clinical room.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of patients is 9,400 with 4 Partner GPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To meet increase in demand would mean expansion within the building by possibly reconfiguring the existing practice or taking up room from other business within the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Waiting room in the current set up needs to expand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recruitment is always a challenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A real issue is care homes and the amount of time and high prescribing costs associated with the patients from these units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They have started to undertake wellbeing work and re-educating people to relieve the nurses so that they no longer deal with people with certain issues, for example, giving up smoking, obesity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Whyteleafe**

- No room within the interior; even if they can recruit, there will be no room for a new GP.
- Need to extend in order to deal with pressure or close their list if there is a significant increase.
- Parking is an issue.
- On the possibility of moving to a new site, something that has been looked at but there is the rent reimbursement from NHS which will not

---

MNG: to look into planning applications granted adjacent from surgery.
MNG: Contact Vanessa from NHS England for catchment areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is required from the Council</th>
<th>Ongoing communication is important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set up next set of meetings for October 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oxted**

- A new application for an extension is being put together before they seek a pre-application discussion.
- Expansion upwards is not possible, as the foundations cannot support this proposal. They had already queried this.
- Cited rent reimbursement, recruitment and retention as continuous problems.
- There is potential to use downstairs of the practice but it would mean the existing companies having to relocate.
- Also raised concerns with Care Homes and the effect of those types of development on resource, requiring extra need and support.
- Mention of 4 hubs within East Surrey (the MPC model).
- Discussion of NHS England having catchment areas that would be helpful for us to have.
- Talks about a health campus with TDC and the CCG.
**LOCAL PLAN INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**  
**TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL (TDC) & SERVICE PROVIDERS – Highways England (HE)**  
**DATE: 9 May 2017, Conference Room 4**

Participants:  David Bowe (HE), Janice Burgess (HE), Marie Killip (TDC), Piers Mason (TDC) and Minnie Ngaluaf (TDC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update on progress of the Local Plan (LP)- current status, and timetable. Next stage of meetings. | • MK – gave a brief update on where we are with the Local Plan.  
• Preferred Strategy was approved in March 2017 on areas to be considered to accommodate development. These areas are at the edge of settlements in urban areas, such as Godstone, Caterham, Smallfield, Oxted, Lingfield. In addition, the Council will be consulting on the Garden Village before we progress to Regulation 19. | |
| Council’s Preferred Strategy – garden village | • In addition to the edge of settlement in the urban area sites is a garden village. The Council will be consulting on the Garden Village before Regulation 19. This includes the site at Redhill Aerodrome. | |
| Service Provider’s views, strategy. | • No contact with the developers for Chaldon  
• Dene Lane issues on A23 – possible roundabout: if there is a proposal that warrants revisiting the roundabout scheme, then further discussion is needed.  
• Split responsibilities over J6, lights are the responsibility of HE and roundabout is SCC.  
• Capacity at J6 is a concern. Late June/early July to hold collaborative meetings  
• Is there significant economic benefit for a new junction M23. Where would that come from?  
• Blindley Heath/South Godstone – HE discussions needed, not just discussion with SCC  
• Redhill Aerodrome – site going forward depends on a junction off the M23  
• The SMART motorway which is due to start later this early or early next year needs to be taken into account in the plans that come forward. Also need to | HE to provide a “shopping list” to the Council for Thakem and Blindley Heath garden village sites.  
HE: to check if Thakem had been tasked following their meeting(s) with HE to provide information |
and 7 and impacts from GOD010 and GOD001 sites.

- **M23 – Junction 8**

  take into account the impact on Junction 9 from RA site; will it be compliant with the layout
  - A development of 4500 does not warrant a new junction.
  - The developer is promoting the site on the connection from motorway to East Surrey hospital with a higher scheme to include retail, primary school. From HE, there has to be an element of employment on the site but it may be in conflict with the large industrial site in Horley.
  - Need committed agreement from HE of whether a junction is a go ahead in advance to Regulation 19.
  - Several issues with an overlap with RB who are in a different stage in their Plan.
  - The safety of the proposed junction is important.
  - Council needs a “shopping list” from HE outlining the work that Thakem needs to carry out to demonstrate and make the case to the Department of Transport that a junction is viable.
  - Paramount that the proposal stacks up economically, meets standard policy and safety standard.

**Junction 6**

- Godstone and Blindley Heath will have an impact on Junction 6.
  The capacity at the junction will have bearing on the allocation of some sites.

**Transport Modelling**

- SCC’s transport modelling would look at the impact and mitigation for both HE and SCC.
  SCC will take into account HE’s view on the new modelling regarding peak flows.
- Blindley Heath/South Godstone – HE discussions needed, not just SCC.

**What is required from the Council**

- Continue engagement
- Meet in late June/early July 2017
**LOCAL PLAN INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

**TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL & SERVICE PROVIDERS**

Transport, Waste and Minerals, Flooding – Surrey County Council (SCC)

DATE: 10 May 2017, Council Chamber 2pm

**Participants:**  Zena Curry (Area Highway Manager, SCC) Paul Fishwick (Transport Programme Manager, LTS & Major Schemes, SCC), Glen Westmore (Sustainable Drainage, SCC), Dough Hill (Flooding, Strategic Network Resilience Manager, SCC), Caroline Prince (Transport Planner, SCC), William Bryans (Transport Studies and Network Management, SCC), Katelyn Symington (Principal Planning Policy Officer, Waste and Minerals SCC), Richard Parkinson (Waste Group Manager, SCC), Sue Janota (Spatial Planning Manager, SCC), Caroline Smith (Transport Development Planning Team Manager - East, SCC), Sarah Thompson (TDC), Marie Killip (TDC), Vivienne Riddle (TDC), Becky Smith (TDC), Minnie Ngaluwe (TDC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update on the Local Plan (LP), current status and timetable. | • ST gave an update on the Local Plan; the last round of consultation was site specific and ran from November to December 2016.  
• Work is being carried out to analyse comments from the last consultation and gathering further evidence.  
• By October 2017, the Council will have a clear idea on the sites that will go forward, the types of mix and number of houses. This is a key time to gather information needed to help with drafting the IDP, and reviewing of the CIL. |  |
| Council’s Preferred Strategy – garden village | • The Council’s Preferred Strategy was approved in March 2017. The view is that the LP will deliver development through:  
1) Limited development of urban area and semi-rural area in Lingfield, Smallfield, Whyteleafe, Warlingham and Oxted.  
2) Garden Village, large scale development  
3) The third strand of the strategy is to support Neighbourhood Plan focusing on parish areas, the details and characters of development. |  |
| Service Providers’ Views Waste and Minerals | • Safeguarded sites  
• TWO CRCs in district and potential for CRC sites North |  |

With regard to the safeguarded sites, SCC is currently putting together a list of key development criteria.
| additional or better located facilities. | • With the budget cuts and tightening of funding, SCC is looking to reduce rather than expand.  
Transport (SCC)  
• Access arrangement on A22 and junction with A264 Felbridge  
• Bus services?  
• Transport Modelling  
Flooding  
• Projects in the District  
• Concerns |
| --- | --- |
|  | • Redhill Aerodrome site – the plan needs to factor in the existing network. SCC can look at a new CRC site but there has to be a business case to warrant relocating.  
• Important to take into account how to deal with the capacity from new development if an existing CRC site closes and how and where to move a new site to.  
• Lambs site: need further discussion with SCC.  
• An economic report  
• Ask for ongoing dialogue |
|  | • Congestion in the villages on the A22 and A25: this is existing concern voiced by the SCC Transport in their consultation comments.  
• Junction 6&7 and M23 – The SMART Motorway work is due to start in early 2018 which SCC and HE are liaising on. This work needs to be taken into account.  
• Concern was raised on the S Godstone B Road to Junction 6 and currently there is no identified funding for any improvement works.  
• With regard to Junction 6, LEP has been looking at optimisation of the traffic lights, perhaps tweaks can be achieved in the short term.  
• As opposed to the potential effect on Junction 6 which would arise from a garden village development either at BH or S Godstone.  
• From SCC point of view, it is more sustainable to have 1 larger site than 2 smaller sites – Sarah need to check this with you if my understanding is correct?  
• Access arrangement on A22 and junction with A264 Felbridge: requires significant mitigation work, a congestion spot. Potentially the improvement work can be funded via CIL, although not necessarily the full amount.  
• Atkins is carrying out work with East Sussex and with County but SCC has yet to see hear from them. |
- Expressed that concern was raised by HE re SCC transport modelling regarding peak hours — the first authority to test the new modelling system is Runnymede.
- SCC's primary concern in the transport modelling is the local network; there is a difference between the motorway peak hours and the peak hours for the local road network.
- SCC confirmed they are working with HE to have an agreement and due to discuss this with HE by October 2017.
- Ashdown Forest High Court Decision will have an effect on air quality impact assessment anywhere where there is cumulative impact. It was suggested to look at EIA studies re air quality. It may require an extra modelling to be carried out. Policies that are put in place needs to take into account the phasing and financial contribution towards air quality.

**Cycling**
- Belinda Purcell is liaising with SCC on the cycling network route work being carried out for the District. It needs to be tied into the national network and the projected completion date for this work is October 2017.

**Flood Prevention**
- There are three main schemes in the District, Caterham Hill, Burstow and Smallfield FAS, however there are smaller projects as well.
- A preliminary Flood Scheme will be signed off next month and The Flood Risk Management was published last month.
- Important to work at preventing flooding.
- With policies, there are opportunities to take a strong approach with both the minor and larger scheme. And to direct policies to area where there are known existing problems.
- Once the sites that are going to go forward are known, need to look into the detail for fluvial and ground water.

**Garden Village Transport**
- SCC is in the process of putting together comments on the five sites by end of the month.
- RA – the proposed dual carriage by the Developer will cause major traffic issue. Reigate and Banstead are promoting the employment/industrial area in
Horley in their Economic Strategy which would have a conflict with potential employment in the RA site.

**General**
- SCC Transport Strategy is being revised and TDC is booked in for 2018 which ties in well with the timeframe for Tandridge’s IDP.

| What is required from the Council | • Continuous engagement  
| • Meeting set up for October 2017 |
Participants: Alison Murphy (Water Resource Manager, SES Water), Daniel Woodworth (Infrastructure Asset and Leakage Manager, SES Water), Sarah Thompson (Head of Strategic Planning Policy, TDC), Minnie Ngaluafe (Community Infrastructure Levy Officer, TDC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update with progress on the Local Plan and current status | **TDC Update:**  
  - ST updated the group on Regulation 18 Issues and Approaches, second round of Regulation 18 which was site specific (this consultation ran from November to December 2016).  
  - The Council’s Preferred Strategy was approved in March 2017. The view is that the LP will deliver development through:  
    4) Limited development of urban area and semi-rural area in Lingfield, Smallfield, Whyteleafe, Caterham Warlingham, Oxted and Godstone.  
    5) A Garden Village,  
  3) The third strand of the strategy is to support Neighbourhood Plan focusing on parish areas, the details and characters of development. | |
| Update from SES Water (SESW) | **SESW is working on their long term Plan 2020-2060 which will go out for consultation in the new year (2018) but first it will go to Defra before it is published. The Plan takes into account population growth, looking at the relationship between population and houses, also assessed occupancy. The Plan recognises that the number of people will still go up even if the houses are not built as the people are living longer and babies are still being born.** | |
| Garden Village | **By Autumn 2017, the Council will be able to engage with infrastructure providers in relation to a list of sites that need to be tested against future infrastructure capacity and requirements. This is a key time to gather** | |
**Service Providers’ Views**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>General</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Options sites – some will be easier to service than others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SESW had worked with other authorities where they were given high level plans of the potential sites. The information was then put through the hydrology model to assess potential impact and capacity on the network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It would be useful for SESW to have access to the annual monitoring reports to help with the modelling process in identifying which development has been built out or not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can apply 110/household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SESW emphasized the importance that developers put in place rainwater harvesting or rainwater efficiency fitting; the latter is preferable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Also that drainage does not cause more run-off, in particular paying attention that there is permeable surface to recharge. To ensure water goes back to the ground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With regard to drainage, SESW is of the view that it is important to put in place a scheme that does not slow down the run-off. Developers should offset the increase in water usage by reducing leakage and consumption. Developers can retro-fit existing homes with devices to reduce leakages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5 Broad Areas**

**Redhill Aerodrome**

• Redhill Aerodrome would not pose any issues as there is a large water-main near the site.

**Edenbridge site**

• The site is in an extremity area of the network which is limited by reservoir capacity. It is not an area that is fully resilient at the moment. It will require mains infrastructure at roughly a length of 10-15 kilometre of reinforcement.

**S. Godstone**

---

```
List of information from TDC to provide SESW in Autumn

1. Location of the development
2. Expected connection to existing infrastructure, usually in the form of the location of the access road from existing roads. SESW would then assume that the water main connection would be required at this location as a default option.
3. Size of the development. Ideally in number of units. If TDC have any breakdown of property types this is also useful.
4. Details of any phases to the work. Is the development likely to grow in the future?
5. Details of any commercial or public amenities (schools,
```
- SEW is looking to firm up reinforcement in the area.

Chaldon

Chaldon would be a difficult site to service

Rating the five broad area sites starting with the sites which poses the least issue: RA, BH, S Godstone, Lingfield, Chaldon, Edenbridge

Caterham Masterplan
- There is potential to add some additional homes in the area.
- Small developments are not potentially a problem. Although should be aware of the cumulative impact so this can be factored into the Plan making process.
- Drainage important in the area in particular with the flooding issues
- Water supply not an issue, some reinforcement may be required but not too much of a problem.

| What is required from the Council | • Continuous dialogue  
• Meet in October 2017 when the Council has a firmer idea of the number of houses, the sites and types of mix.  
• Provide information on the list provided by SESW to enable a network capacity check for a specific development/developments. | • MNG to set up a meeting in the Autumn.  
• TDC to provide the information asked by SEW to do a network capacity check. |
Participants: Kath Harrison (SCC), Matthew Lamburn (SCC), Elaine Dunlop (SCC), Sue Janota (SCC), Selina Rajan (SCC), Oliver Gill (SCC), Jennifer Henderson (SCC), Rose Wilson (SCC), Sarah Thompson (TDC) and Minnie Ngaluaf (SCC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update with progress on the LP and current status | • An update was given on the progress of the LP, starting with the High Level Reg. 18 consultation which looked at the way to deliver development in the District.  
• This was followed by a second round of consultation which ran in November – December 2016. This was a sites consultation.  
• The Council should have a clear idea of the sites that will go forward, the type of mix.  
• There is a possibility of another round of consultation specifically on the Garden Village sites but not yet confirmed. | |
| Garden Village | Council in March 2017 approved its preferred strategy | |
| Service Providers’ Views | Public Health  
• recreation sites  
• Air quality (impact) |  
Education  
• Expansion of de Stafford School  
• Requirement as | Public Heath  
• On the recreation site, concern that recreation sites are available and accessible for the short and long term benefits.  
• With air quality – work is being carried out in conjunction with CCG on monitoring and management of the potential impact, looking at traffic level.  
• ST mentioned the recent Ashdown Forest High Court judgement and the impact of the decision. Council’s such as TDC will need to have a management plan in place to address the impact of traffic on air quality. Education |
| a result of a garden village (primary and secondary provision) | • The consultation on the expansion of de Stafford School was approved  
• Generally, there were more students in the District than expected and highly likely that any free spaces will be filled up from next year.  
• Downs Way/St Mary’s primary school will in future amalgamate.  
• For a garden village, the minimum would be a for a 3FE primary. Secondary schools are not well distributed in the District.  
• Chaldon GV site: there are issues with traffic and concern that concentration in one area is not good from an education perspective  
• Edenbridge: Not highly in favour of having schools in the border with another county where there will be competition with students from the bordering county. |

| What is required from the Council | • Next sets of meetings to take place in October 2017 | MNG to set up the October 2017 meeting. |
## Update with progress on the LP and current status

ST gave an update on the Local Plan status. The Council has agreed its preferred strategy in March 2017 to develop in:

- Urban areas
- Edge of settlement (sites around tier 1 and 2) that meet exceptional circumstance
- Garden village and to support neighbourhood plans.

Regulation 19 is a project for next year and to adopt the Local Plan by early 2019.

## Garden Village

- The Council may go out with a separate consultation specifically on the Garden sites.
- A large strategic site will require a lot of infrastructure to make it sustainable.

## Service Providers’ Views

- **General View**
- **Housing data**
- **SW’s Guiding Principles**

Important work based on population growth, looking at up to 2040. What is the anticipated growth? – and alongside that, monitor sites

Look at the longer range plan

Figure based on 5 year supply.

The Council to let CM know 5 year supply.

Capacity Issue:

- Need to look at our proposal and the Local Plan once it has been adopted.
- 4000 new dwellings is quite high based on current plans which go up to 2035.

MNG to forward latest 5 year supply to CM.
| What is required from the Council | Continuous engagement  
Next meeting in October 2017 where the Council will have a clearer idea of the sites that are going forward. | MNG to set up meeting in October 2017. |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Southern Water’s Guiding Principles:
- For policies to reflect SW principles with regard to meeting the increased demand for services as a result of new development; meet strict environmental standards in the treatment of wastewater; promoting sustainable use of water resources and wastewater assets and protect sensitive development from odour pollution.

- The issues that SW has to consider are land availability, any environmental constraints and capacity increase.
### LOCAL PLAN INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

**TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL (TDC) & SERVICE PROVIDERS**

Surrey and Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust and TDC

DATE: 23 May 2017, 2pm, Conference Room 3

Participants:  Ian Mackenzie (Surrey and Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust), Sarah Thompson (TDC) and Minnie Ngaluaf (TDC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Update with progress on the Local Plan LP and current status** | • TDC has carried out two consultations to date. The first round of Reg. 18 consultation was a high level one looking at issues and approaches.  
• The last consultation which ran from Nov. to Dec. 2016 was site specific.  
• The Council agreed its Preferred Strategy in March 2017. The view is that the LP will deliver development through:  
  6) Limited development of urban area and semi-rural area in Lingfield, Smallfield, Whyteleafe, Caterham Warlingham, Oxted and Godstone.  
  2) A Garden Village and 5 sites are being considered, Chaldon, S. Godstone, Edenbridge, Blindley Heath and Redhill Aerodrome.  
  3) The third strand of the strategy is to support Neighbourhood Plan focusing on parish areas, the details and characters of development. | |
| **Garden Village Redhill Aerodrome in particular due to proximity to the hospital** | • The Blindley Heath and S. Godstone sites (as referred to above) were included in the last consultation.  
• The Council may go out for another consultation specifically on the 3 sites Chaldon, Edenbridge and Redhill Aerodrome which were submitted after the last consultation. | |
| **Service Providers’ Views** | **RedHill Aerodrome**  
• Has there | **RedHill Aerodrome**  
• A new junction on the M23 is fundamental to the delivery of this site.  
• As the site falls within two Districts, if it were to be considered as a preferred garden village site, a lot of factors has to be ironed out. For example, both Reigate and Banstead and TDC have to agree on a joint Area Action Plan (detail planning), the Landscape capacity issues in particular Green Belt. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCG</th>
<th>East Surrey Hospital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The current project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There have been discussions with the Developer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The hospital is applying to remove the Green Belt in the Eastern border of the their land which abuts into the land that the Developer is buying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working on ecology and landscape study with the aim to have a draft by June to R&amp;B Council and formerly submit early autumn and for the consultation to carry out from January 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The hospital has a number of development plans they want to pursue to include Health care, nursing house providers, and different types of health care facility in the region of 120 beds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re Highways, SCC carried out a transport modelling (high level) back in September 2016 and will be carrying out another modelling. With the first one, it was identified that another lane would be needed on the A23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive of the Redhill Aerodrome scheme for a number of reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It will benefit access to the hospital, provide key worker housing, the potential for a health village with housing that is connected to the hospital (digitally), highway improve benefits and employment for the hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Hospital has land to expand (76 acres) which can accommodate or work with the CCG model MCP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The hospital has the advantage of having 70 acres providing the opportunity to expand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is required from the Council</th>
<th>Continuous engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meet in October 2017 when the Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MNG to set up October 2017 meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Update with progress on the LP and current status** | - Going through the comments from the last consultation.  
- ST updated the group on the current local plan status that the Council had agreed in its preferred strategy in March 2017 to develop  
  1. urban areas  
  2. sites around tier 1 and tier 2 settlements that meet exceptional circumstances  
  3. Support neighbourhood plans  
  4. A garden village                                                                 | N/A            |
| **Garden Village**                         | - ST explained that the Council were looking at five potential locations for the Garden village. These sites are:  
  Land at Tolsworth and Alderstead Farm, Chaldon  
  Blindley Heath  
  South Godstone  
  Land west of Edenbridge (east of Lingfield)  
  Redhill Aerodrome Three  
  
  3 sites came into the mix in the last consultation and may need to be consulted on.  
  Regulation 19 consultation will be next year.                                                                                                                   | N/A            |
| **Service Providers’ Views**               | - Caterham and Smallfield area are in the EA’s plans.  
- The EA may be looking at Lingfield as well.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | NP to email flood work carried out in Croydon where the culvert was                                         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any general concerns</th>
<th>Potential impacts or issues that the Council should be aware of on the given broad areas (garden village site)</th>
<th>Current projects - CIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• With Redhill Aerodrome, there will be a need to open up the culvert which is causing flooding. There is scope for enhancement for open channel.</td>
<td>• Third party contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The above flooding work needs to be carried out before work was to start on site or in the first phase of development.</td>
<td>• Example: Smallfield FAS, projected plan for the delivery and proposed expenditure and total cost of project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is an example of this type of work done in Croydon – details to be sent to the Council.</td>
<td>• With Blindley Heath and S.Godstone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• With Blindley Heath and S.Godstone:</td>
<td>• There are hotspots within the drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to check with Doug Hill at SCC re wet spot on A22 (Blindley Heath).</td>
<td>• Potentially less flooding concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to check with Doug Hill at SCC re wet spot on A22 (Blindley Heath).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current projects**

Caterham Bourne is Croydon and SCC lead. Second year options stage and costing is being considered.

Caterham Hill
Currently on Year 1 stage
Evidence being pulled together, includes looking at historical data.
Needs ground water modelling to be carried out which is very complicated.
Once all the above have been done, a business case with the options should be realised by 2018/2019.
Updates to be shared with the Council.

Smallfield
SCC led and mostly relating to surface water.
Currently into its second year
A strategic business case which identifies options and economics of the project should be realised by Autumn 2017.

What is required from the Council
Next set of meeting in October 2017

opened up.

- MNG to contact Dough Hill at SCC re information on wet spot on the A22 at Blindley Heath.
- NP to email the Council update from Dough Hill’s Team re Caterham Hill Project.
### Update with progress on the LP and current status

ST gave an update on the Local Plan status. The Council has agreed its preferred strategy in March 2017 to develop in:
- Urban areas
- Edge of settlement (sites around tier 1 and 2) that meet exceptional circumstance
- Garden village and to support neighbourhood plans.
Regulation 19 is project for next year and to adopt the Local Plan by early 2019.

### Garden Village

- The Council may go out with a separate consultation specifically on the Garden sites.
- A large strategic site will require a lot of infrastructure to make it sustainable.

### Service Providers’ Views

- **General View**
- **Housing data**
- **SW’s Guiding Principles**

Important work based on population growth, looking at up to 2040. What is the anticipated growth? – and alongside that, monitor sites
Look at the longer range plan
Figure based on 5 year supply.
The Council to let CM know 5 year supply.

**Capacity Issue:**
- Need to look at our proposal and the Local Plan once it has been adopted.
- 4000 new dwellings is quite high based on current plans which go up to 2035.

**Outcome/Action**

- MNG to forward latest 5 year supply to CM.
- The issues that SW has to consider are land availability, any environmental constraints and capacity increase.

**Southern Water’s Guiding Principles:**
- For policies to reflect SW principles with regard to meeting the increased demand for services as a result of new development; meet strict environmental standards in the treatment of wastewater; promoting sustainable use of water resources and wastewater assets and protect sensitive development from odour pollution.

| What is required from the Council | Continuous engagement  
Next meeting in October 2017 where the Council will have a clearer idea of the sites that are going forward. | MNG to set up meeting in October 2017. |
## Update with progress on the LP and current status

ST gave an update on the Local Plan status.
The Council has agreed its preferred strategy in March 2017 to develop in:
- Urban areas
- Edge of settlement (sites around tier 1 and 2) that meet exceptional circumstance, Oxted, Caterham, Smallfield, Lingfield and Godstone
- Garden village
- and to support neighbourhood plans.

Regulation 19 is project for next year and to adopt the Local Plan by early 2019.

## Garden Village

ST explained that the Council were looking at five potential locations for the Garden village:
- Land at Tolsworth and Alderstead Farm, Chaldon
- Blindley Heath
- South Godstone
- Land west of Edenbridge (east of Lingfield)
- Redhill Aerodrome

## Service Providers’ Views

- **Any initiatives planned that would help with delivery of the LP.**
  - PT asked whether it is possible to look at having different AH requirements at the various areas of development with higher percentage requirement at the Garden village, followed by edge of settlement sites then in existing (urban) sites.
  - MK stated that we need to update the SHMA and this cannot be done without knowing the mix of usage (piece of work being carried out by Jason Thomas)
  - Any housing initiatives will need to be factored into the policies such as schemes in the pipeline. Planning Policy will need input from Housing once

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update with progress on the LP and current status</td>
<td>ST gave an update on the Local Plan status. The Council has agreed its preferred strategy in March 2017 to develop in: Urban areas, Edge of settlement (sites around tier 1 and 2) that meet exceptional circumstance, Oxted, Caterham, Smallfield, Lingfield and Godstone, Garden village, and to support neighbourhood plans. Regulation 19 is project for next year and to adopt the Local Plan by early 2019.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Village</td>
<td>ST explained that the Council were looking at five potential locations for the Garden village: Land at Tolsworth and Alderstead Farm, Chaldon, Blindley Heath, South Godstone, Land west of Edenbridge (east of Lingfield), Redhill Aerodrome.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Providers’ Views</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Any initiatives planned that would help with delivery of the LP.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Any concerns** | the sites that are going to be taken forward are known.  
- Self-build needs to be factored into the policies.  
- Garden village will help to provide affordable housing, however it will not resolve all housing needs in the District.  
- Regarding the provision of 100% AH, will need to be looked at on a case by case.  
- It can only be 100% AH if it is owned by the Council. |

| **Open space** | SH wanted to bring to our attention that we would be adopting highway verges. |

| **What is required from the Planning Policy Team** | Continuous engagement  
Another set of Infrastructure meetings in October 2017 | MNG to set up October 2017 meeting. |
**LOCAL PLAN INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**  
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL & SERVICE PROVIDERS  
SUSSEX COMMUNITY RAIL PARTNERSHIP  
DATE: 30TH May 2pm, Conference Room 4

Participants:  Tim Barkley (Sussex Community Rail Partnership), John Phillips (Sussex Community Rail Partnership), Sharon Gray (Sussex Community Rail Partnership), Sarah Thompson (TDC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update with progress on the LP and current status | ST updated the group on the current local plan status that the Council had agreed its preferred strategy in March 2017 to develop  
- urban areas  
- sites around tier 1 and tier 2 settlements that met exceptional circumstances  
- Support neighbourhood plans  
- A garden village | N/A |
| Garden Village | ST explained that the Council were looking at five potential locations for the Garden village  
- Land at Tollsworth and Alderstead Farm, Chaldon  
- Blindley Heath  
- South Godstone  
- Land west of Edenbridge (east of Lingfield)  
- Redhill Aerodrome | N/A |
| Service Providers’ Views  
- Any concerns or matters that the Council should be aware of. | Oxted Railway Station – JP mentioned that there is no real time information at the bus shelters outside the station. ST mentioned that there was a consultation for Regen Oxted and they should comment on this). There is an opportunity to improve the sustainability / accessibility of the station. There is also a lack of cycle parking. The service to and from East Grinstead is to be extended in 2018 and therefore could be a more attractive location for commuters. Whilst this is only some peak time services at first, it could be extended in the future.  
Godstone – Bus services on the A22 at South Godstone can be more positively | - JP / TB and SG to responded to Regen Oxted consultation |
**Possible infrastructure requirements in rail stations within the district – Oxted, Hurst Green, Lingfield, Dormans, Godstone and Nutfield.**

**Station Accessibility Projects in small station (GTR)**

**Station Travel Plans to include Oxted**

---

promoted. There is no direct access to Gatwick from here. The Tonbridge – Redhill line services need to be more positively promoted due to low numbers of users outside peak times.

Hurst Green – Not much car parking

Lingfield – Accessibility is an issue. There was a lift scheme at Ham Street and such a scheme could be explored as part of the Local Plan.

Dormansland – there is an issue with parking and a site has been identified that could help alleviate this issue in the Dormansland Neighbourhood Plan. Would support this approach.

Nutfield – Limited use apart from at peak times. There are only limited bus services at South Nutfield.

**Afternote:**

Oxted has been included in a list of 43 stations for which Station Travel Plans are being promoted by Mayer Brown for GTR. Recommendation for station improvements will be firmed up to be put to the GTR.

---

**What is required from the Council**

The Community Rail Partnership has undertaken a number of key projects that could be considered:

- Tourism attractions that can be visited by rail and bus
- Creation of a North Downs Line Community Rail Partnership from Reigate to Guildford that could improve east to west links.
- Improvements made to subways
- Training and educating in schools or community centres to encourage use of sustainable transport.

The Community Rail Partnership holds three meetings a year for the Oxted-East Grinstead/Uckfield Line and Tonbridge-Redhill/Reigate Lines Steering Group but also hold an annual joint stakeholder conference. This year it is being held at 2pm, 9 October 2017 at the Eden Centre, Edenbridge.

---

To check whether Oxted was included within this list. ST to speak to Belinda Purcell (Corporate Policy Officer) to see if this has been mentioned.

Confirmed by JP that Oxted has been included.

Mark Bristow to attend the annual stakeholder conference on 9 October 2017.
### Update with progress on the Local Plan and current status

EDA gave an update on what the Council has carried out to date and in moving forward with the Local Plan:

- The Council has carried out 2 Regulation 18 Consultations. The first was very high level, Issues and Approaches, looking broadly at how development can be delivered in the District.
- The second round of consultation ran from Nov – Dec. 2016, a site specific consultation where the sites were presented in respect of the evidence gathered.

The Council approved its Spatial Strategy in March 2016 which sets out the preferred locations for development:

- For the short to medium period; these would be development within and at the edge of the settlements (Tier 1 and 2) and where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.
- Garden Village type development (see below for details).

EDA clarified that the meetings are to identify projects over the local plan period for the Infrastructure Delivery Plan document which will support the Local Plan. This is a separate process from the CIL.

Reviewing the CIL will come later and subject to potential changes and direction from central Government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Matter/Issue</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update with progress on the Local Plan and current status | EDA gave an update on what the Council has carried out to date and in moving forward with the Local Plan:  
- to the Council has carried out 2 Regulation 18 Consultations. The first was very high level, Issues and Approaches, looking broadly at how development can be delivered in the District.  
- the second round of consultation ran from Nov – Dec. 2016, a site specific consultation where the sites were presented in respect of the evidence gathered.  
The Council approved its Spatial Strategy in March 2016 which sets out the preferred locations for development:  
- For the short to medium period; these would be development within and at the edge of the settlements (Tier 1 and 2) and where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.  
- Garden Village type development (see below for details).  
EDA clarified that the meetings are to identify projects over the local plan period for the Infrastructure Delivery Plan document which will support the Local Plan. This is a separate process from the CIL.  
Reviewing the CIL will come later and subject to potential changes and direction from central Government. | N/A |
| Garden Village | Further sites were received during the second round of consultation that will AT to provide details of Crime |
need to be assessed. So there will be another consultation, around summer time, that focuses specifically on the 5 Garden Village sites: Chaldon, Land east of Edenbridge, S. Godstone, Blindley Heath and Redhill Aerodrome.

- Other Officers in Surrey Policy to be added to the Database and included in the future dialogue and to be informed of future consultations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Providers’ Views</th>
<th>Prevention Officer for Tandridge and Daniel Gutierrez.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Any concerns</td>
<td>• The Caterham station is in a poor state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developer contributions /CIL</td>
<td>• Currently there are 71 dedicated uniformed officers and 6 dedicated officers who serve the District but the OAN figure will result in the need for increase in officers as well as improvement and provision of a range of facilities such as equipment, CCTV, fleet vehicles etc. The potential additional personnel requirements were over the development plan period were provided in the notes in preparation for the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The comments submitted by AT prior to the meeting are detailed and helpful in particular for reviewing the CIL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AT explained that the methodology of the costing is a standard methodology and applied consistently within Surrey and Sussex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• With a Garden Village, a large development will require a Police Station to serve it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussed the difference between CIL and Planning Obligations and site specific infrastructure will have to be secured via S106 Agreement rather than the CIL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is required from the Council</th>
<th>MNG to set up October meetings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain dialogue and set up meeting in October 2017 when the Council has a clear idea of where development may go, mixture etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With regard to the CIL funding, MNG explained that Members in the last round of CIL bid (2016) expressed a desire to switch the CIL bid (for strategic fund) from an annual bid to a 3 year cycle. The current governance structure is being reviewed and to be reported to Planning Policy Committee on June 27 for approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MNG to discuss police funding with Sarah Thompson and to be included in the next CIL Working Group meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D – Mid Sussex Meeting

**Date/ Time:** Tuesday 8 August 2017, 3pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Attendees:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lois Partridge (LP) – MSDC</td>
<td>Sarah Thompson (ST) - TDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Blomfield (SB) - MSDC</td>
<td>Marie Killip (MK) - TDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Little (SL) – TDC (note-taking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda:**

1. Introductions
2. Local Plan Progress – TDC
3. Garden Village Consultation and cross-boundary issues (TDC)
4. Local Plan progress – MSDC
5. Future work (both)

**Notes:**

- Introductions were made by all those present.
- Discussions started with TDC’s Local Plan progress. ST explained about the development of the Garden Village consultation (and the workshop that MSDC have been invited to on 9 August).
- ST explained that at the March 2017 committee meeting, the Preferred Strategy was approved. Support of proposals identified in neighbourhood plans forms part of the Strategy.
- ST and MK explained that South Godstone and Blindley Heath garden village locations will have implications on the A22.
- SB and LP noted that, through the Mid Sussex Sites Allocation DPD, new sites may come forward in East Grinstead. The cumulative impact of any proposals for a Garden Village in Tandridge, and further development in East Grinstead would need to be considered in terms of highways impact and of impact on the Ashdown Forest Special Area of Conservation.
- There was agreement that a meeting should be arranged for early October, preferably with the respective highways authorities, to discuss how transport modelling of planned development in both districts can be undertaken.
- SB and LP explained that they were working through their District Plan Examination, and looking at a major modifications consultation later this year. The Council anticipates that the Inspector’s Report will be published in December, with adoption of the Plan in late January.
- SB explained that MSDC is starting work on a Site Allocation DPD, which should be completed by Spring 2020.
- SB also noted that it would be useful for both Councils to continue to share data with further actions and proposals concerning Blindley Heath / South Godstone.
- All parties recognised the implications of the recent *Wealden* decision in relation to the Ashdown Forest, in relation to nitrogen deposition and the need for suitable mitigation measures to be identified.
- The meeting concluded with final clarification of the continued working relationship between MSDC and TDC, and the need to update the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). It was agreed the MOU should be updated to reflect working practices in respect of joint HRA assessments for cross boundary planning applications.
Appendix E - Workshop with Neighbouring Authorities and Statutory Bodies

Statutory Bodies workshop

**Date/Time:** Wednesday 9 August, 11am

**Attendees:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Brown (KB)</td>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>Sarah Thompson (ST) - TDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Burgess (JB)</td>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>Marie Killip (MK) - TDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Smith (VS)</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Sarah Little (SL) - TDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Murphy (AM)</td>
<td>SES Water</td>
<td>Mark Bristow (MB) - TDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Mayall (CM)</td>
<td>Southern Water</td>
<td>Claire Tester (CT) - High Weald AONB Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Janota (SJ)</td>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
<td>Andy Taylor (AT) – Sussex Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Trowbridge (PT)</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda:**

6. Garden Village Consultation presentation  
7. Q&A  
8. Workshop

**Notes:**

- Introductions were made around the room.
- The background to the garden village consultation was explained.
  - Vision of Garden Village to achieve – Focused on innovation and long-term project.
  - Objectives based on the Garden Village principles were highlighted and explained.
  - The four broad locations were identified and liaisons with neighbouring authorities were explained. Identifies each of the high level site issues and which authorities this would effect.
- Duty to Cooperate updated but is an ongoing process. The Duty to Cooperate statement has been updated but this will continue to be updated along the process.
- Highways England mentioned establishing a forum for the affected authorities that are allocating development along the A23/M23 and it was agreed that Tandridge District Council could facilitate this.
- Water companies also highlighted that they were bound by certain thresholds and policies that must be adhered to and that this should be reflected in the Plan by continuing discussions with the relevant authorities.
- Statutory bodies were encouraged to comment on the consultation and highlight any issues they had with the proposals.
- It was also agreed that we would continue to liaise with statutory bodies and that they would set out their data requirements so that we could provide them with the necessary information as soon as possible.
- Workshop ended.
**Date/ Time:** Wednesday 9 August, 2.30pm

**Attendees:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Mankoo-Flatt (TMF)</td>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Thompson (ST)</td>
<td>TDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Partridge (LP)</td>
<td>Mid Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Killip (MK)</td>
<td>TDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Gooden (HG)</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Little (SL)</td>
<td>TDC (note-taking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie Legg (SL)</td>
<td>Epsom and Ewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Davis (GD)</td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Corbett (MC)</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey Ashworth (KA)</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Dennington (SD)</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda:**

9. Garden Village Consultation presentation  
10. Q&A

**Notes:**

- Introductions were made around the room.
- The background to the garden village consultation was explained.  
  - Vision of Garden Village to achieve – Focused on innovation and long-term project.  
  - Objectives based on the Garden Village principles were highlighted and explained.  
  - The four broad locations were identified and liaisons with neighbouring authorities were explained. Identifies each of the high level site issues and which authorities this would effect.
- It was noted that the Duty to Cooperate document was updated and would sit alongside the consultation document but is an ongoing process.
- Explained that the Regulation 19 document is to be published next year and that transport modelling and viability testing need to be undertaken prior to this and provides opportunities to work together, where appropriate.
- Discussions were had about the housing trajectory and the likely unmet need TDC may have and what help others could provide to meet the need.
- It was explained that the Council were undertaking an exceptional circumstances test on all appropriate sites, and would appreciate sight of any other exceptional circumstances methodologies that people have undertaken.
- Employment needs were discussed and it was identified that TDC were updating their Employment Needs Assessment. This should recognise large strategic employment sites in neighbouring authorities such as Hooley and Burgess Hill.
- The impact of the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC designation was discussed and that Mid Sussex Inspectors report would be helpful to clarify this issue further, and that potential solutions should be looked at jointly.
- Everyone shared experience of delivering large sites and the most appropriate ways to secure infrastructure.
- Meeting comes to an end with final clarification of continued working relationship between neighbouring authorities and TDC, and the need to prepare MOU and Statement of Common Ground.
## London Borough of Croydon and Tandridge District Council Meeting

### Date/time: 29 June (Croydon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louise Round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Thompson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- Meeting opened.
- Ms Round and Mrs Thompson set out Tandridge’s Preferred Strategy – to deliver development through a combination of a new garden village and some limited development of our urban and semi-rural areas.
- The five locations being considered for the garden village were explained, including the Chaldon site.
- Chaldon – It was agreed that there was not much detail on this location at this stage but access was an issue.
- Ms Round explained that on 27 June, the Planning Policy Committee had to agree to carry out a Regulation 18 consultation on the garden village locations and encouraged Croydon to make representations.
- Croydon explained that they had finished their Examination on their Local Plan and were waiting for the Inspectors Report.
- Agreement was made to continue to work together and share evidence where appropriate.
- Both parties agreed that the meeting had been constructive and positive.
- Meeting ended.
Appendix G – M23 Spur Road Discussions

Coast to Capital Letter about M23 (4 April 2017)

Arun House
Hurst Road
HORSHAM
West Sussex
RH12 2DN

04 April 2017

Jim O’Sullivan
Chief Executive, Highways England

By email

Dear Jim,

M23 Northern Section: the London-Gatwick Road Corridor

I was very pleased to see the publication last week of the Highways England (HE) Route Strategies, as a basis for your consultation on developing schemes for inclusion in the Road Investment Strategy 2.

I am writing as part of that consultation to seek a closer dialogue with HE and the Department for Transport (DfT) on the specific issues around the road corridor between Croydon and Gatwick/Crawley. This forms part of the M25/M23 network identified in your consultation document. But I am also keen to engage HE on wider work that is being done by Coast to Capital LEP and our partners to properly understand strategic issues that are possibly outside the scope of your consultation document.

Summary

Coast to Capital is the Local Enterprise Partnership for the whole M23 corridor, and our area includes the coastal area of West Sussex, Brighton and Hove and Lewes, as well as East Surrey and Croydon. Ours is not a city region, but achieves a high level of economic performance, particularly driven by activity in Brighton, in Gatwick and the surrounding towns, and in Croydon.

In preparing our response to the Government’s recent consultation on the Industrial Strategy, we have become increasingly aware of the critical role of the London-Gatwick road corridor in sustaining our economic growth. We have come to the conclusion that this part of the network has not had the focus and salience that it deserves in national...
investment decision making up to now. This may be because of the complexity and varied ownership of the roads, and the very diverse political geography of the area.

The London-Gatwick road corridor comprises the northern section of the M23, associated sections and junctions of the M25, crucial sections of the A23 in both Surrey and Croydon, and roads feeding onto/parallel to these including the A25, particularly as the A23 and the A25 form part of the M25 and M23 Tactical Diversion Routes.

We would like a more detailed engagement with HE to help us understand the issues that affect our road network and in particularly the links between SRN and non-SRN roads which have disproportionate economic importance. This will allow us to represent the interests of our region properly in the RIS2 process.

**Strategic issues**

The London-Gatwick road corridor plays a number of significant functions in relation to the economy of our region:

- The M23/A23 provides the connecting road between Gatwick airport, the second largest airport in the UK, and London. While the airport is significantly dependent upon rail links for its passenger growth, it does continue to generate road traffic from passengers, the 30,000 staff working on the airport campus and in terms of freight and logistics.
- The Gatwick Diamond, comprising towns around the airport including Crawley, Horley, Redhill, Reigate, Horsham, Burgess Hill and others, also supports a thriving economy with a £24 billion GVA contribution. This economic activity generates significant road demand, particularly linking workers from across the wider south east to jobs around the airport.
- Croydon is the fastest growing borough in London, and its economy is increasingly linked into that of the Gatwick Diamond and the wider south east. Close access to the M25 drives significant travel from the Borough and other parts of south London to destinations across the South East.
- The London-Gatwick corridor also includes three significant points of interaction between our regional road network and the M25. As well as the main Junction 7, there is also significant traffic using J8 (Reigate) and J6 (Godstone) to travel down towards the Gatwick Diamond.

The strategic importance of this road network to our region and the wider south-east and national economy is, however, often overlooked because it does not fit neatly within the political geography of the region. Unlike city-region economies we have no single planning authority, no single transport authority, and no natural link to HE and motorway network to address the strategic importance of roads to our regional economy.

Key roads in the London-Gatwick corridor are run by HE, Surrey County Council, Croydon Council and Transport for London (TFL). We are dealing with the consequences of the decision taken in the 1980s not to extend the M23 into London, and as our regional economy has grown many of the specific issues overlooked then
are now presenting significant challenges in terms of congestion, journey time, safety, air pollution and resilience.

**Our ask**

Coast to Capital and our partners would like to work further with HE to develop a more detailed business case on the potential options around investing in this critical road corridor, as part of your Route Strategy consultation. The goal of this would be to build a comprehensive understanding on the demands that will be placed on this road network over the next 20 years, in order to support the growth of our regional economy.

A recently completed rail study commissioned by the DfT on the Brighton main line between the coast and London anticipated growth on the corridor will double over the next 40 years. Investment in the rail network particularly focused on Croydon to remove an identified bottleneck would reduce pressures on strategic road network particular on the A23/M23 corridor. We want to work with HE and the DfT on how this essential investment can be delivered.

We have prepared a brief overview of the main strategic issues in our region, and would identify six key issues which we think should be worthy of further study. Because of the lack of strategic focus on this section of the road network over the last 20 years, some of these issues are still very localised. Detailed work is currently underway on some of them. But we believe that, taken together, it would be sensible to develop a single work programme to support the development of this transport corridor and of our regional economy. We would like to engage the expertise and resources of HE in order to gain a proper understanding of the issues around this critical road corridor.

Our six key challenges are:

**1: Economic growth and changing land use patterns in the Gatwick Diamond**

The sub-region around Gatwick airport is one of the engines of our economy. It is home to 800 international businesses and is a major employment destination within the South East. The region has grown significantly in recent years, and local plans in West Sussex and East Surrey anticipate further growth in housing and business space in coming years. Our ask is to work with HE to properly forecast demand on M23 J10 and J9 which serve the Gatwick Diamond, as well as to understand future demands on the M23 particularly anticipating the goals of Local Plans and the possible construction of new housing settlements as part of this.
Issue 2: Capacity on M25 Junctions 6, 7 and 8

We welcome the Route Study’s focus on the demands on these key junctions of the M25, which link the national route network into our regional economy. Each of these junctions is already highly congested. We would like to work further with HE to properly reflect the importance of this infrastructure to towns such as Reigate, Redhill, Oxted and Caterham in order to support the sustainable growth of our region.

Issue 3: Surrey strategic road network

Surrey County Council is planning a strategic analysis on the demands on its road network around the M23 Northern Corridor. This will include analysis of the investment needed to support the development of the A23, as well as wider development in the County. We would like to work more closely with HE in order to ensure that this work is properly coordinated within the wider issues contained within the Route Strategy.

Issue 4: Hooley

The village of Hooley carries a disproportionate impact from the narrowing of the M23 from three lanes to one lane at its northern end. This is exacerbated by the lack of direct access from Redhill and Reigate onto and off of the M25, which leads many vehicles to use Hooley as a turning point to join the motorway. The growth in our regional economy is generating clear safety, congestion, noise and air pollution issues in the village which need to be addressed.

Issues 5: Star Lane junction and rat running

Congestion at Hooley and at M25 junctions 6, 7 and 8 is leading to significant rat running from across Croydon and north Surrey, where motorists use country lanes that run parallel to the motorway as an alternative to joining the M25. While this road network is the responsibility of local authorities, many of the issues that it suffers are generated directly by the operation decisions of the M25. We would urge close cooperation with HE to help understand these and to develop practical solutions to this disproportionate weight of traffic particularly at rush hour.

Issue 6: A23 link to Coulsdon

Running for about three kilometres north from Hooley, motorway traffic uses a single- and dual-lane local road for around four kilometres before accessing the Coulsdon bypass in order to go into Croydon. Along this stretch of road HE responsibility passes to Transport for London. As at Hooley, this road is not fit for purpose, with pedestrian-controlled crossings and on-street parking affecting high-volume traffic coming off of a motorway. Pressure on this stretch of the road is increasing with a number of high-volume local housing developments in the Coulsdon area in recent years. Again, we
would like to bring HE into discussion with TfL and other authorities to identify a sustainable solution to this problem.

**Going forward**

Coast to Capital and our partners in the region would like to begin a strategic dialogue with HE in order to build a shared understanding of these issues and to maximise the influence that we can have on your Route Strategy consultation. We would particularly like to explore the availability of funding from HE to help deepen our analysis of these issues and to identify a proportionate solution to the problems that we face. I look forward to hearing from you.

I am copying this letter to colleagues in Surrey and Croydon Councils, to other transport authorities in the region and to John Hayes MP in the DfT.

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Sharrock
Chief Executive
Affected authorities letter (23 June 2017)

Chief Executive

John Jory

Rt Hon. Chris Grayling MP
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

Our ref: JJ/ae
Date: 23rd June 2017

Dear Chris,

I am writing to seek your help.

As you know from our discussions over the last 6 months or so, Thakeham Homes is promoting the development of Redhill Aerodrome for between 4,500 and 6,500 new homes. The site, currently used by small scale light aircraft and helicopter operators, is within the Green Belt, and falls within both Reigate & Banstead Borough and Tandridge District. All aviation uses would be lost as a result of any future development of the airfield, although the air ambulance service would be relocated in the vicinity as part of the development.

Whilst the planning merits of the scheme still need to be tested, it would offer benefits by assisting Tandridge and Reigate & Banstead boroughs in meeting longer term housing needs. With the support of our Executive, RBBC is seeking to proactively influence the type and tenure of new homes being considered by the site promoter (for example, retirement bungalows, supported living etc). Both Councils are currently considering how to respond to this proposal in policy development terms and need to come to a view over the Summer.

Development of the site would be dependent on securing a new junction from the M23. It is understood that any new junction would be funded by the development, and that initial conversations between Rob Boughton (MD of Thakeham) and John Hayes MP have been positive. Securing a new motorway junction would bring considerable advantages for the borough. It could only help to reduce pressure on the road network in Reigate and Redhill to the benefit of local businesses and residents, as well as providing improved access to East Surrey Hospital which is currently poor. Without it, I cannot see the development proceeding.

So, it would be very helpful to have a clear statement of support from you and your department for the delivery of a new motorway junction (on the basis that this would be funded by the development) to give both Councils comfort should they decide to include appropriate statements in planning policy documents to be published in the coming months.

If you would like to meet to discuss the matter, just let me know when might be convenient.

Yours sincerely,

John Jory
Chief Executive

John.jory@reigate-banstead.gov.uk

Town Hall, Castlefield Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0SH Direct Dial 01737 276151 Help Line 01737 276000

www.reigate-banstead.gov.uk Follow the council on twitter.com/reigatbanstead
Leader of the Council

CLLR VICTOR BROAD

Rt Hon Chris Grayling MP
Constituency Office
212 Barnett Wood Lane
Ashtead
Surrey
KT21 2DB

Our ref: VB/ae
Date: 6th July 2017

Dear Chris,

Thank you for taking the time to meet with us last week. It was helpful to discuss with you the proposal for the development of Redhill Aerodrome as a new settlement, which has the potential to help meet housing needs within both Reigate & Banstead Borough Council and Tandridge District Council.

The Aerodrome site lies in the Green Belt and falls within both Reigate & Banstead and Tandridge administrative areas. The site is currently an operational aerodrome used by small scale light aircraft and helicopter operators, and is being promoted for a new ‘garden village’ development of between 4,000 and 6,000 new homes.

Development of the site would be dependent on securing a new junction from the M23, between junctions 8 and 9. I enclose a copy of a letter from Thakeham Homes, confirming that this would be developer funded. As well as acting as the main access for the new development, this junction (and an associated link road) has the potential to provide improved access to East Surrey Hospital (including from Gatwick Airport) and help relieve congestion on the local road network through Redhill and Reigate. The proposed development could also facilitate an expansion of operational capacity at East Surrey Hospital and other new employment-generating development as part of the scheme.

As I mentioned when we met, at Reigate & Banstead we are assessing the Aerodrome site - in terms of its acceptability in planning terms and its development potential – through our local plan-making work. Tandridge District Council is undertaking a similar exercise as it prepares its new Local Plan. In order to help determine whether this site represents a sustainable and developable option for inclusion in our local plan documents, the two authorities are agreed that a level of certainty is required in relation to the new M23 junction: as a key component of the scheme, its deliverability will be central to our consideration of the planning merits of this proposal.

I would therefore be grateful if you are able to confirm your ‘in principle’ support for the junction, subject to the scheme proposals being as outlined above. It would also be helpful if you could encourage your Department and Highways England to assist both authorities to understand the transport options and impacts in relation to this development proposal.

Town Hall, Castlefield Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0SH • Help Line 01737 278000
• www.reigate-banstead.gov.uk • Follow the council on twitter.com/reigatebanstead •
I look forward to hearing from you. If you feel that you require any further information at this stage, please don’t hesitate to get in touch.

Yours sincerely,

Councillor Victor Broad
Leader of the Council
Direct dial: 01737 276021
Email: Ctr.Broad@reigate-banstead.gov.uk

Enc.
Mr J Jory  
Chief Executive & Leader  
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council  
Reigate Town Hall  
Castlefield Road  
Reigate  
Surrey  
RH2 0SH  

4th July 2017  

Dear John,  

Re: Proposed M23 Junction & M23 / A23 Strategic Link Road  

I write to confirm that the proposed junction on M23 will be planned and designed to accommodate projected traffic growth over the Local Plan period using both strategic and local traffic models that accord with the requirements of Highways England. The form of the proposed junction will take account of traffic that would be generated by the Redhill Garden Community and the committed and planned development identified within the emerging Local Plans. The design, layout and specification of the proposed junction will also accord with the strict requirements of the Department of Transport’s Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and will be subject to independent Road Safety Audits from early conceptual ideas, leading through to detailed design and subsequent implementation. We would therefore endeavour to engage directly with Highways England and their consultants to establish how the proposed junction arrangement could be accommodated within their Smarter Motorway programme.

I would also like to take this opportunity to confirm that we do not require any form of government grant, the proposed junction and strategic road scheme will be entirely privately funded by the associated housing development.

Yours sincerely,  

Robert Boughton  
Group Managing Director
Dear Sarah and Cath

**Background**

I refer to the following letters written to Department of Transport Secretary of State, Chris Grayling:

1. Dated 23/6/17 from Reigate & Banstead Council Chief Executive, John Jory, at the House of Commons
2. Dated 6/7/17 from Reigate & Banstead Council Leader, Cllr Victor Broad, at his constituency office (also enclosing a letter to John Jory dated 4 July from Robert Boughton, Group Managing Director of Thakeham: the site promoters)

Sarah has confirmed that while the letters are on RBBC headed paper, they are effectively letters on behalf of both councils; with Officers/Members attending the meetings referred to, and having received presentations form Thakeham.

Both seek “in principle” Ministerial support for a potential new settlement centred on Redhill Aerodrome that straddles the Reigate & Banstead and Tandridge boundary. The latter also seeks Ministerial support from the Department and Highways England to “understand the transport options and impacts in relation to this development proposal”.

I understand that Ministers will be responding to the letters in due course.

However, it has been agreed that in view of Tandridge’s impending Local Plan consultation (commencing 14 August) and at the request of RBBC/Thakeham, Highways England should provide more “nuts and bolts” advice regarding the policies, programmes and practicalities likely to need to be taken into consideration. This email aims to provide that advice, while being mindful that the considerations may change as work progresses on the proposals and other material considerations become apparent.

**24 July Meeting at Reigate & Banstead Council Offices**

On Monday 24 July, Highways England (Spatial Planning Managers: Kevin Bown & Janice Burgess) and Department for Communities & Local Government (Ben Greener) met representatives from Reigate & Banstead Council and Thakeham to discuss their proposals.

A wide ranging discussion took place. Thakeham will provide minutes in due course.

In summary, HEs position is that:
HE welcomes the opportunity to work with all parties at pre-plan/ pre-application stages to help identify matters to be addressed, agree ways of working, methodologies and timetables; and hence make best use of time and resources.

HE has met with the various parties and others (eg Surrey County Highways) separately or jointly in recent months to discuss both general plan-making and these proposals; and commits to continuing to do so.


The primary purpose of HE is to ensure the safety, reliability and operational efficiency of the Strategic Road Network (SRN).

Commensurate with these purposes HE also seeks to improve the network and to facilitate growth and regeneration where possible and appropriate.

We also recognise that our customers do not distinguish between local and strategic networks when making their journeys, so we work with local highway authorities to ensure, where possible, proposals are acceptable from both perspectives.

The M25 and M23 form a vital part of the SRN, with particular functions to carry long distance traffic travelling around London and/or through the South East to the likes of Gatwick Airport, Crawley and Brighton. It is also noted that the M23/A23 corridor has a resilience role in terms of being a strategic emergency evacuation route for London.

With regards development proposals per se, decisions regarding whether they should be in Local Plans or granted permission are for the relevant LPA or planning Inspector/Minister. Therefore HE (like most other statutory consultees) does not express “support” for proposals, rather it starts with a “neutral” stance and then seeks to reach a position whereby any impacts and necessary mitigation are agreed, and hence we have “No Objections”. It is perfectly possible that while HE has no objections from a SRN viewpoint, proposals are refused for other reasons. Equally, but rarely, it is possible that proposals can be acceptable from other viewpoints, but due to their impact on the SRN, and the impossibility for that impact to be mitigated, HE must maintain an objection.

HE normally seeks to agree “Statements of Common Ground” with LPAs and/or site promoters ahead of Local Plan Examinations, setting out the work done, the matters which are agreed and the matters that are still “work in progress” or are not agreed.

In accordance with NPPF and DfT C2/13 *The Strategic Road Network and the delivery of sustainable development* [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/strategic-road-network-and-the-delivery-of-sustainable-development] the promoters of the Redhill Aerodrome site will have to:

a) demonstrate a strategic case for a new junction (para 39)
b) demonstrate that all that can reasonably and appropriately be done will be done to achieve modal shift and sustainable transport choices (eg bus/rail etc); and
c) demonstrate either no impact on the SRN or an ability to mitigate that impact (mitigation to meet required standards, be deliverable etc)
It should also be noted that with regards any new connections the HE licence sets out the following requirement:

“5.36 The Licence holder must, in making decisions under section 175B of the Highways Act about permission for any new connections to its network:

a. Unless otherwise directed by the Secretary of State, consider granting permission in light of the nature of the road in question and the consequences of the new connection, having particular regard to:

i. In the case of sections of the network designed for high-speed traffic, with partially or comprehensively limited access, there should be a presumption against connection, except where it can be provided safely and where there is a demonstrable benefit to the economy;

ii. On all other sections of the network there should be a presumption in favour of connection, except where a clear case can be made to prohibit connection on the basis of safety or economic impacts.

b. Include its section 175B decision in its consultation response to the local planning authority whenever it is consulted about a development which requires consent under that section.”

Re a) we note that the currently envisaged scale of the development (6,000-8,000 homes + 3,000 jobs + all community infrastructure) appears smaller than elsewhere where new development has justified new Motorway junctions (eg M20J10a at Ashford, Kent, M49 at Severnside, M1 at Dunstable), but equally note that there are no set thresholds. Therefore the “business case” that incorporates both planning reasons to justify the location (eg in Green Belt etc) and transport reasons to justify a new motorway junction will be crucial. It was recognised by all parties that DCLG and DfT Ministers may have a role to play in setting the strategic line to take on such matters, mindful of the potential precedents that agreement to the proposals would set.

Re a) we will need to be mindful, at the strategic level, of all other proposed/permitted developments that may impact on the M23/A23 corridor in assessing any case made for any particular site. We are already aware of other new settlements and major employment hubs, either in the public domain or at confidential pre-plan/pre-application stage, that would affect the M23/A23 corridor. Therefore we will need to consider the cumulative impact of all such proposals, as far as they are material, before reaching any conclusions regarding any particular site.
• Re b) we note that the promoters are in early discussions with the likes of the rail operators and bus companies, but will need to see robust commitments before being able to take proposals into account. While we recognise the aspiration for the proposals to demonstrate many facets of sustainability, we would be obliged to consider the "worst case scenario" in terms of impact on the SRN unless and until robust evidence demonstrating the deliverability of the sustainable transport elements is provided.

• Re b) we note that a new junction on to the M23 would provide an alternative access to East Surrey Hospital, but ahead of reviewing the business case and evidence in the round cannot assess the weight to be attached to such a benefit.

• Re c) we note that M23 is already heavily congested between and at the M25 to Gatwick/Crawley junctions. Therefore, ahead of robust modelling evidence, we note that it would seem inevitable that Redhill Aerodrome would have an impact on the SRN. The major question is whether that impact could be acceptably mitigated.

• Re c) we note the promoters believe that a new junction would relieve both the local network and other parts of the SRN, due to vehicles being able to access the SRN sooner and closer to their point of origin. Such evidence will form an important part of both the business case and the modelling evidence; although it should be noted that the SRN should not be used as a means to simply relieve congestion on local networks.

• Re c) we note that the proposed location of the new junction appears to accord with the requirements of DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) regarding junction separation and weaving distances; although all parties agreed this needs to be confirmed in terms of any particular additional requirements for Smart Motorways.

• Re c) we note that the Roads Investment Strategy Period 1 M23 Smart Motorway Project is due to be implemented in 2018. However, it is more about smoothing existing and known future flows than creating large quantities of additional capacity. At this early stage it is unknown what mitigation might be required for any new settlement and hence whether they would be compatible with the proposed Smart works.

• We also note that in order to avoid disrupting our customer’s journeys, HE normally seeks to ensure that either all required works to our network take place in one short timeframe or they are done separately: say 5 years apart. Therefore, ahead of the production of all required evidence and design work, it is currently unknown whether the Smart Project and any Redhill development are compatible from this viewpoint.

• Re c) we note the promoters offer to privately fund any junction/other works (up to around £110m for infrastructure was mentioned), but at this early stage it cannot be known what mitigation is required (eg type of junction/ any other works), when and hence how much it would cost. Also HE, to safeguard Government and taxpayers interests, would require appropriate fiscal and other guarantees to be in place.

• Re c) we note that it will be vital to understand the phasing of any development and/or any new junction to ensure that any new capacity is not used up by other traffic “rat-running” and that it is co-ordinated with any other major works in the M25/M23 corridors or on local networks.
• With regards the production of the required evidence, HE is content for LPAs and/or site promoters to work together to produce robust, relevant, up-to-date, appropriate and proportionate evidence. However, we also noted that it must support the Local Plan as well as the individual sites. Those around the table with modelling experience appreciated the subtle difference between these slightly different requirements.

• We note that we have been involved in discussions about other potential major developments that could affect the M25/M23 corridors, and so our assessment and responses will take account of all circumstances not simply those surrounding any Redhill Aerodrome proposals.

• Re Roads Investment Strategy Period 2 (5 years from 2020). Route Sponsor colleagues (Peter Phillips and Tommy Whittingham) have been working with the central RIS team to gather evidence from stakeholders as to their aspirations and concerns for the various corridors that make up the overall SRN. The evidence is in the process of being collated to establish respectively, corridor, regional and national priorities. Route Strategies were published in March 2017 as part of this process. In due course further rounds of consultation will occur leading to final publication and implementation of RIS2. Further details about the process and its timetable may be found at [https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/road-investment-strategy-post-2020](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/road-investment-strategy-post-2020)

• We note Thakeham have indicated there is support for the proposals from the local C2C LEP. We would be grateful to receive copies of pertinent documents to ensure we are fully aware of all material considerations.

• It is unknown whether and what RIS2 might be able to say about the Redhill proposals. This can only be determined in due course based upon the progress that has been made to work up and assess the proposals.

Next Steps

• Thakeham wish to constitute a working group to take forward various evidence base gathering exercises (eg Transport Assessment including all necessary modelling to cover both the Local Plan per se and Redhill Aerodrome in particular). HE stands ready to participate as appropriate in the group, making available its own information, data and modelling as necessary.

• HE will be attending a Tandridge Local Plan: Garden Villages Consultation (Regulation 18) workshop on 9 August

• HE will participate and respond to any Local Plan consultations

• HE will engage with other site promoters on an equal and proportionate basis.

I hope that this advice and notes assist.

Should any party have any queries about the contents of this email, please contact me.

Regards

Kevin Bown, Spatial (Town) Planning Manager BSc(Hons) MPhil CMS MRTPI
Appendix J – Department of Transport letter (3 August 2017)

From the Secretary of State
The Rt. Hon. Chris Grayling

Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London
SW1P 4DR

Tel: 0300 330 3000
E-Mail: chris.grayling@dft.gsi.gov.uk
Web site: www.gov.uk/df

Our Ref: MC/202728
Your Ref: VB/ae

Councillor Victor Broad
Leader of the Council
Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
Town Hall
Castlefield Road
Reigate
Surrey
RH2 0SH

Thank you for your letter of 6 July 2017, and that from John Jory, Chief Executive, dated 23 June, regarding the proposal for the redevelopment of Redhill Aerodrome for housing and the associated request for a new, developer-funded junction 8A on the M23.

The Housing White Paper “Fixing our broken housing market” recognises transport infrastructure as one of the keys to unlocking housing growth and delivering places people want to live, and the recently published Transport Investment Strategy includes housing growth as a priority. The Department has developed a joint Housing and Transport Programme with the Department for Communities and Local Government, and we are working closely together to deliver it.

In this case I understand your point about the importance of securing a new junction on the M23 to support the proposed development. Given our strategic ambitions for housing and transport, there may well be a strong case for a new junction, assuming that the development itself is acceptable locally, meets planning and environmental requirements, and that the cost of such a junction would be met by the site’s developers.

With this in mind, I have asked Highways England to work with you on the detail of this proposal as it is developed. Highways England will write separately to your planning department and the site promoters setting out some of the more detailed processes and considerations to be taken into account in seeking to progress these proposals.
Naturally, a final decision on whether to proceed depends on engineering and operational advice from Highways England about the potential impact of a new junction on the road network in the surrounding area, in accordance with the framework we have set in DfT Circular 02/2013 (available at: www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/237412/dft-circular-strategic-road.pdf).

We will shortly be entering into decisions about the next Road Investment Strategy (RIS2), covering work on the strategic road network beyond 2020. If appropriate, and subject to this scheme being deemed satisfactory, it would be possible to list it in RIS2, with the caveat that it is subject to securing the developer contribution. This practice has been used for a number of new road proposals in the current RIS, and could be a good way of ensuring that a junction to support the Redhill Aerodrome development achieves similar status and certainty to other schemes in the strategy.

I am copying this letter to Sajid Javid as the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

Rt Hon Chris Grayling MP

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR TRANSPORT