



Duty to Co-Operate responses to the draft local plan Core Strategy Review 2024

Duty to Co-operate for Local Plan Core Strategy Review 2024

The Council's advice from Counsel on the issue of local plan reviews advises that the Duty to Cooperate is not a legal requirement for local plan reviews, but for the plan-making process, which a local plan review is not part of. A local plan Review may, or may not, result in the need to update a local plan.

However, the national web based PPG has been revised since the core strategy was last reviewed in 2019, and it now includes the guidance that "*Local planning authorities need to comply with the Duty to Co-operate when revising their development plan documents and reviewing whether they remain up to date.*" It refers to Section 33A(3d) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as it says plan reviews prepare the way for the preparation of preparation of development plan document as they involve an assessment of whether policies in a plan need updating. Whilst our own legal advice does not reflect with this interpretation, we have nonetheless engaged with the relevant duty to cop-operate bodies and specific consultees in finalising the local plan core strategy review.

The draft Local Plan Core Strategy Review was sent to 'Prescribed Bodies' for the Duty to Co-operate and 'Specific Consultees' including nearby local authorities, inviting them to submit any relevant comments on the draft which they wished us to consider in finalising the local plan core strategy Review to put to the Council for approval and adoption. Comments were invited over a three week period in January and February 2024.

A summary of those comments received, and an officer response is provided in Table 1 below. No fundamental issues were raised which officers consider indicted challenge the conclusion that the local plan core policies remain up to date and effective.

Table 1: Comments received on Duty to Co-operate consultation of the draft local plan Core Strategy Review 2024

Organisation	Summary of comments received	Officer 's response
---------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------

<p>Surrey County Council</p>	<p>This is an officer response, and we have the following comments to make.</p> <p>Ecology</p> <p>We recommend editing paragraph 2.15 as biodiversity net gain was delayed and will now become a 'legal requirement to most 'major' developments from January 2024 12th February 2024, and is due to come into force for other smaller developments from <u>2nd</u> April 2024.'</p> <p>A requirement of the Environment Act 2021 is the production of a LNRS in a collaborative and evidence-based manner and the engagement process for this commenced in 2023, with the aim to complete the strategy by 2024.</p> <p>We would welcome Reigate and Banstead's involvement in this process to ensure local opportunities for nature recovery are identified and linked into a network for greater ecological resilience.</p> <p>As responsible authority for the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) we would like to see acknowledgement of the LNRS in this draft review document and expect to see the LNRS referenced in policy in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>Flood Risk</p> <p>Paragraph 1.23 mentions flooding and coastal change, but we would also like to see specific reference to Sustainable Drainage systems that should be included in major developments - particularly given the significant surface water flood risk that exists within Reigate and Banstead and the opportunities that could be created to better manage and reduce this risk.</p> <p>We acknowledge that Policy CS10 refers to Sustainable Drainage</p>	<p>Paragraph amended accordingly</p> <p>LNRS policy is considered in the review of Policy CS2 and has been noted for work to produce our new Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council's Climate Change and Sustainable Construction SPD 2021</p>
------------------------------	--	--

	<p>systems (SuDs) as a way to manage flood risk and the DMP includes a detailed policy on flood risk that includes SuDs.</p> <p>We would like to see the new Local Plan consider retrofitting and the inclusion of SuDs into existing developed areas which will offer multi-functional benefits.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste</p> <p>No issues are identified with the existing policies of the Core Strategy, but we would expect the new Local Plan to address sustainable waste management issues, including the provision of Site Waste Management Plans for major development.</p> <p>SCC has published a <u>Sustainable Construction and Waste Management in New Development Guidance Note</u>, that provides details for national and local policy for sustainable waste management.</p> <p>We would also welcome consideration of the following matters in the new plan: safeguarding existing waste management facilities, Waste Consultation Areas, Mineral Safeguarding Areas, existing mineral sites, and resources in the county.</p> <p>We have recently updated and published our <u>Mineral Safeguarding Note</u>, outlining the importance of mineral resources and mineral safeguarding policies.</p>	<p>includes further detail on provision of SuDS.</p> <p>Request noted, and retrofitting of SuDS will be considered through the evidence and preparation of a new local plan</p> <p>Request noted, and will be considered through the evidence and preparation of a new local plan, including safeguarding existing waste management facilities and Minerals Safeguarding Areas</p>
--	--	---

<p>Mole Valley District Council</p>	<p>The RBBC Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted in 2014) Review 2024 concludes that all of the Core Strategy policies are generally consistent with national policy and remain up-to-date and effective. This Core Strategy Review is subsequent to a previous review carried out in 2019.</p> <p>Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) does not have any comment to make on the robustness of this assessment of the performance and efficacy of a 10-year-old Core Strategy. However, MVDC would like to make a few observations with respect to the potential consequences of RBBC's conclusion.</p> <p>RBBC's current Core Strategy housing target is a minimum of 6,900 homes between 2012 and 2027 under Policy CS13, or 460 homes per annum. Under the national standard method, the housing need figure for RBBC is 156% higher, at 1,123 homes per annum. RBBC notes that if the Core Strategy's policies were found to require updating, 1,123 would be the applicable figure. RBBC's housing delivery performance over the plan period to date is 573 new homes per year, exceeding the minimum plan requirement, but roughly half the standard method figure.</p> <p>For the RBBC 2014 Core Strategy, the Inspector concluded: "the full, objectively assessed need for housing over the plan period is an annual average of between about 600 and 640 dwellings."</p> <p>RBBC appears to consider that the national standard annual local housing need for the Borough (1,123) does not represent a significant change from the housing need identified by the Inspector. The Planning Practice Guidance does not indicate whether a 75 % to 87 % uplift would be a significant change. However, given the extent of the discrepancy in the figures 10 years from the adoption of the Core Strategy, it is imperative that RBBC's assessments of housing land availability and analysis of constraints are rigorous and up-to-date.</p>	<p>This is a mis-reading of the draft local plan CS Review, which at paragraph 2.289 of the draft document clearly stated that the standard method to be applied to R&B at this time would be capped.</p> <p>As noted in the local plan Core Strategy Review, the local housing need number calculated using the standard method currently produces a local housing need number of 644 homes per annum (capped at 40% above the plan figure because the Core Strategy has been reviewed and found not to need updating within the last 5 years). This figure is clearly very close to the "annual average of between about 600 and 640" identified by the CS Inspector. The CS Review (paragraph 2.295) has been amended to make the Council's point clearer that the local</p>
-------------------------------------	--	---

	<p>RBBC is currently at an early stage in the preparation of its new local plan. However, even at this stage, it is important RBBC has an appreciation of the potential for MVDC to accommodate any unmet housing need. MVDC's stage in the plan-making cycle precludes it from being able to take unmet need. Even if MVDC were at an earlier stage in the plan preparation cycle, it would be unable to meet unmet housing need from other authorities. 77% of MVDC's area is designated as either Green Belt or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The built-up area only comprises 11% of the area and the two principal towns, Leatherhead and Dorking, are historic market towns with significant and extensive heritage constraints limiting development to little more than very gentle densification.</p> <p>As a result of these constraints, MVDC's emerging local plan would meet only approximately 75% of its own need. Given this state of affairs, MVDC would not be able to consider meeting need from outside its borders.</p> <p>Gypsies and Travellers</p> <p>RBBC's last traveller accommodation needs survey was undertaken in 2016 and it is understood that RBBC is preparing a brief to commission consultants to complete a needs assessment.</p> <p>Policy GTT1 of the RBBC Development Management Plan identifies a need for 32 additional pitches for gypsies and travellers over the period from 2016 to 2031. This equates to 28 pitches over the Core Strategy plan period to 2027.</p> <p>As set out in the latest Housing Monitor (2023), planning permission has been granted for an additional 35 permanent pitches of gypsy accommodation since the 2016 survey base-date of the GTAA 2017, with a further allocated site having capacity for approximately four</p>	<p>housing need number has not changed significantly.</p> <p>As an edge-of London authority with considerable constraints to development, including 70% of the Borough designated as Green Belt, we appreciate the difficulties in meeting local housing needs in full, and note that MVDC will not be able to accommodate any unmet housing need from R&B Borough.</p> <p>This is the current position</p>
--	--	---

	<p>pitches. As of 31 March 2023, the RBBC demonstrated a 16.36-year supply of deliverable permanent traveller pitches against its local plan target.</p> <p>MVDC's stage in the plan-making cycle precludes it from being able to take unmet need.</p> <p>Furthermore, even if MVDC were at an earlier stage in the plan preparation cycle, it would be unable to accommodate unmet Gypsy and Traveller need from other authorities.</p> <p>MVDC's has an identified need of 52 Gypsy and Traveller pitches over its draft Local Plan period (encompassing both planning and housing definitions of Gypsies and Travellers).</p> <p>MVDC's strategy for meeting this need is through allocating new pitches on strategic development sites, most of which would be released from the Green Belt, and the intensifying of specific existing Gypsy and Traveller sites.</p> <p>Based on the 2021 NPPF definition, the five-year target from adoption and the need over the plan period should both be met. However, MVDC is reliant on (albeit robust) windfall provision to meet the Lisa Smith/2023 NPPF definition. The margin for manoeuvre is therefore tight, especially if one or more sites fails to be developed.</p> <p>Consequently, MVDC would not be able to accommodate unmet need Gypsy and Traveller from RBBC should a more up-to-date GTAA demonstrate a greater need.</p> <p>Travelling Showpeople</p> <p>Policy GTT1 of the RBBC Development Plan identifies a need for seven plots for travelling</p>	<p>We note that MVDC will not be able to accommodate any unmet G&T pitch need from R&B Borough</p>
--	---	--

Elmbridge Borough Council	The Borough has no comments to make at this time. We look forward to continuing to engage with you	Response noted
---------------------------	--	----------------

<p>Waverley Borough Council</p>	<p>Housing Need</p> <p>Waverley notes that Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy seeks to deliver at least 6,900 homes from 2012 to 2027 which equates to 460 homes per annum. However, it is also noted that this is short of the figure that would be produced using the standard method for assessing housing needs. Whilst Waverley acknowledges that Reigate and Banstead consider that they are unable to accommodate any more housing beyond the level which the adopted Core Strategy Inspector found to be capable of being sustainably delivered, it is unclear how any shortfall in housing need will be delivered going forward.</p> <p>I am of the view that Waverley is unlikely to be able to meet any unmet needs from neighbouring authorities and therefore any unmet needs in Reigate and Banstead must be met within the Housing Market Area that the Borough lies in.</p> <p>It is currently challenging for Waverley to meet the housing requirement set out in its adopted Local Plan Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) (adopted February 2018) given the significant planning constraints that cover our Borough, including the Green Belt, National Landscapes and the proximity of Habitats sites in the form of Special Protection Areas. Waverley is also preparing a new Local Plan following a review of LPP1. The standard method for calculating local housing need currently shows that the difference between the strategic housing requirement in the Waverley LPP1 is significantly higher which presents an even greater challenge.</p>	<p>We note that there is no legal nor national policy requirement for an area's local housing needs to be met in full.</p> <p>Whilst NPPF paragraph 60 provides in relation to local plans, that "<i>The overall aim should be to meet as much of an area's identified housing need as possible</i>", NPPF paragraph 11 relating to sustainable development confirms that strategic policies for housing and other uses should provide for objectively assessed needs (as well as any needs that cannot be met in neighbouring areas) UNLESS national planning policies in NPPF footnote 7 protecting Green Belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, areas at risk of flooding, irreplaceable habitats, heritage assets, etc, provide a strong reason to restrict the scale of development, or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.</p> <p>This was the position on conclusion of the CS Examination.</p> <p>We appreciate the position that Waverley is in, although R&B has exceeded its minimum local plan</p>
---------------------------------	---	--

	<p>Gatwick Airport</p> <p>It is noted that Policy CS9 sets out the Council's strategic position on Gatwick Airport and supports its development within the existing airport boundary and legal limits. Waverley Borough Council declared a Climate Change Emergency in September 2019 and supports the reduction in carbon emissions including through the aviation industry. Waverley therefore continues to submit representations on proposed Airport development.</p>	<p>housing requirement over the plan period to date.</p> <p>Noted. – The Council is also working with other authorities in the area on responses to Gatwick's DCO application.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council</p>	<p>1 Paragraph 1.18</p> <p><i>says “It will be up to local authorities, working with their communities, to determine how many homes can actually be built, taking into account what should be protected in each area - be that our precious Green Belt or national parks, the character or an area, or heritage assets.”</i></p> <p>Question 1 Does “<i>It will be up to local authorities . . . to determine how many homes can . . . be built</i>” mean the Borough can now specify the number of new homes they need to make provision for rather than be told the number it has to meet?</p> <p>Question 2 If not, what does it mean?</p> <p>Question 3 Does “<i>It will be up to local authorities . . . to determine how many homes can . . . be built, taking into account what should be protected in each area - be that our precious Green Belt etc</i>” mean protection of the Green Belt boundaries will be stronger?</p> <p>Question 4 If not, what does it mean?</p> <p>Question 5 If either is correct what policy shows how the Borough will achieve this?</p> <p>Question 6 How will Policy CS13: Housing delivery reflect this?</p> <p>2 POLICY CS3 GREEN BELT</p> <p>Paragraph 2.19 says “<i>The Policy also requires green spaces, green corridors and site important site-specific green features to be retained and enhanced as far as practicable.</i>”</p>	<p>Question 1 - Yes.</p> <p>The Council’s new local plan housing requirement for the area will be informed by local evidence (including of constraints under NPPF paragraph 11 and footnote 7) and communities, with the standard method for assessing local housing needs being “an advisory starting point”. (NPPF paragraph 61)</p> <p>Question 3 – National planning policy is not explicit that there is no requirement for local authorities to assess their Green Belt for development nor to release Green Belt land for development by altering its boundaries.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.19 of the Draft LP CS Review relates to Policy CS2, which protects the hierarchy of designated habitat sites in the Borough</p>
---	--	---

	<p>2.48 says <i>“The Council’s evidence demonstrates that the Green Belt in the borough continues to serve an important strategic purpose, and that its boundaries remain relevant and robust.”</i></p> <p>2.62 says <i>“No modification or update to Policy CS3 is required. This Policy is consistent with national policy as far as parts 1 and 2 are concerned and has run its course as far as parts 3 to 6 are concerned, as a green belt review was undertaken to inform the DMP with sustainable urban extension sites allocated.”</i></p> <p>Question 7 Is there any need for new alterations to the Green Belt boundaries?</p> <p>Question 8 If so, where are these likely to be?</p> <p>2.62 The conclusion says <i>“No modification or update to Policy CS3 is required. This Policy is consistent with national policy as far as parts 1 and 2 are concerned and has run its course as far as parts 3 to 6 are concerned, as a green belt review was undertaken to inform the DMP with sustainable urban extension sites allocated.”</i></p> <p>The Sustainable Urban Extensions report refers to two areas of possible housing development in Salfords, one east of Salfords and one west of Salfords. Neither is clearly named or specified in this review. There are three possible areas east of Salfords. Land north of Honeycrook Lane, Land south of Whitebushes Estate and land west of Pickets Lane.</p> <p>Comment 1 To avoid doubt site titles and designations should be clear, consistent and unique.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.19 of the draft Local Plan Core Strategy Review relates to Policy CS2 ‘<i>Valued landscapes and the natural environment</i>’, whilst paragraphs 2.48 and 2.62 relate to Policy CS3 Green Belt.</p> <p>Question 7 - As has been made clear in the revised NPPF (through wording emphasis rather than change in policy), it is a local authority’s choice whether to alter Green Belt boundaries. The Council is not currently intending to assess the Green Belt in the area. We draw to your attention NPPF paragraph 145 <i>“Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, ... Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries, having regard to their intended permanence in the long</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p>3. POLICY CS9: GATWICK AIRPORT</p> <p>The conclusion in 2.237 says <i>“No modification or update to Policy CS9 is required.”</i></p> <p>This seems to ignore concern raised in the Borough’s Gatwick Northern Runway DCO Application Representation dated 26 October 2023.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS9 says <i>‘The Council will support the development of Gatwick Airport, within the existing airport boundary and existing legal limits, including the development of facilities that contribute to the safe and efficient operation of the airport.’</i></p> <p>2.229 says <i>‘The UK’s Sixth Carbon Budget’ 2021, introduced a statutory cap on aviation emissions for the first time through the DfT’s ‘Jet Zero Strategy: Delivering net zero aviation by 2050’ (July 2022), which sets ambitious targets for achieving zero emissions from the aviation sector by 2040 for internal flights and 2050 for external flights.</i></p> <p>2.236 Policy CS9 does not preclude additional capacity within Gatwick Airport, and whilst the outcome of the DCO submission is still</p>	<p><i>term, so they can endure beyond the plan period.”</i></p> <p>The Sustainable Urban Extensions reports that refer to these areas informed the Core Strategy’s assessment of Green Belt land, and Policy CS6(3).</p> <p>We note this issue of clarity of site referencing for our new Local Plan evidence.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>unknown, a clearer picture of the growth impacts is emerging. Continued monitoring of the progress of the Gatwick Northern Runway DCO will continue, but it is not considered to require Policy CS9 to be modified at this time. It is unlikely that a decision will be reached on the submitted DCO by the Examining Authority until late 2024 at the earliest.</p> <p>Note policy CS1 : Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, which says . . . <i>the Council. . . will work proactively with applicants to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area</i></p> <p>Comment 2 In order to avoid the Borough’s Gatwick Northern Runway DCO Application Representation (GNRDAR) being dismissed as contrary to the Core Strategy Policy CS9 should include <i>“The council will oppose any growth at Gatwick Airport, including any increase in runway capacity, which would have an adverse effect on any of the following; landscape and townscape, ecology, water, traffic, and transport, air quality, noise, climate change, socio-economic concerns, the Code of Construction Practice, the Design and Access Statement, health and wellbeing, agriculture and recreation and the Council’s additional concerns. [from paragraph 3 of the (GNRDAR)]</i></p> <p>4. POLICY CS16: GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE</p> <p>The Conclusion at 2.398 says <i>“No modification or update to Policy CS16 is required.”</i></p> <p>Question 9 Does the Core Strategy identify sufficient land for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople to mean the Borough can successfully prevent these people from setting up their own sites?</p>	<p>There is no conflict between Policy CS9 and the Borough Council’s submitted representation to Gatwick’s DCO.</p> <p>The Borough Council is challenging the DCO application on a number of environmental grounds including air quality and noise. Policy CS9 does not therefore currently need to be updated.</p> <p>Policy CS16 and DMP Policy GTT1 together provide for policy criteria and site allocations to meet the needs identified in the latest Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2017) Individuals and families sometimes do still purchase land and set up unauthorised sites, and sometimes</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Question 10 If not what more is required and will it be done?</p> <p>We hope these comments and questions are useful and will be seriously considered in the Local Plan core strategy review.</p>	<p>these are permitted either by the Council or at appeal because of a variety of factors, that may include personal circumstances and best interests of children.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>We understand you are reviewing your existing Core Strategy (adopted July 2014) as part of the requirement outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to conduct a review every 5 years.</p> <p>We have reviewed the policies related to matters within our remit and respond as follows:</p> <p>Policy CS2: Valued landscapes and the natural environment</p> <p>With reference to the above policy, our role and focus is on protecting and enhancing the water environment including watercourses and wetland habitats.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.14 states that the requirement for measurable biodiversity net gain (BNG) on most development sites will come into effect in January 2024. This has subsequently been delayed until 12 February 2024.</p> <p>Whilst we agree that there is no requirement for the existing core strategy to be modified to reflect the statutory BNG instruments, we would strongly recommend that you develop a local BNG policy in a future local plan.</p> <p>A locally specific biodiversity net gain policy would allow you to identify specific priorities and strategies you require developers to consider delivering BNG, e.g., Local Nature Recovery Strategies, important habitats, Biodiversity Action Plans, and Green and Blue Infrastructure strategies.</p> <p>We have no further comments to add on this policy and no objections to the wording of this policy being kept the same.</p> <p>Policy CS10: Sustainable Development</p>	<p>Dates noted changed.</p> <p>The Council is currently considering how it will secure BNG and we are agreed that this issue will be considered in preparing our new Local Plan (a single local plan consisting of Vision, strategy, site allocations, and detailed local DM policies).</p>
---------------------------	---	---

<p>National Highways</p>	<p>National Highways was appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN).</p> <p>The SRN is a critical national asset and as such National Highways works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the M25, M23 and part of the A23.</p> <p>Following review of the Core Strategy Review document, we note the Core Strategy is on target and remains consistent with national policy. There were no particular issues raised previously that impacted on the SRN in relation to the adopted Core Strategy, and therefore we have no comments to make on this review.</p> <p>Moving forward with the new Department for Transport Circular 01/2022 ‘Strategic road network and the delivery of sustainable development’, we will be looking more closely at adherence to national policy, and in particular, in relation to our net zero strategy and sustainable measures requirements. We look forward to continuing to participate in future consultations and discussions.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
--------------------------	---	------------------------

<p>Historic England</p>	<p>As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages of the planning process. This includes formulation of local development policy and plans, supplementary planning documents, area and site proposals, and the on-going review of policies and plans.</p> <p>There are many issues and matters in the consultation document that are beyond the remit and concern of Historic England and our comments are, as required, limited to matters relating to the historic environment and heritage assets.</p> <p>Historic England wishes to highlight the objective of the Paragraph 196 of National Planning Policy Framework to set out in the local plan <i>"a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats.</i></p> <p><i>This strategy should take into account</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;</i> <i>b) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;</i> <i>c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and</i> <i>d) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place."</i> <p>A strategic strategy for the historic environment as required by paragraph 20 d) of NPPF, in our view, is not a passive exercise but requires a plan for the maintenance and use of heritage assets and for the delivery of development including within their setting that will afford appropriate protection for the</p>	<p>The current Local Plan is in two parts, the Core Strategy 2014 and the subsequent Development Management Plan 2019 (DMP), which provides detailed policies for assessing planning applications and site allocations.</p> <p>DMP 'Policy NHE9: Heritage Assets' and its Explanation provide a positive strategy that we consider accords with NPPF paragraph 196, as it was required by PINS Local Plan Inspector to be amended in order to be fully consistent with the NPPF (see Main modification MM21).</p> <p>Local Plan Policies CS4 and NHE9 are amplified by guidance provided in</p>
-------------------------	--	---

	<p>asset(s) and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>You should satisfy yourself that the Review of extant policies reflects the requirements of both paragraphs 196 and 20 d) of the NPPF. In our view, the Review is an opportunity to start the process of updating the historic environment policies of the local plan, and the assessment of Core Strategy Policy CS4: Valued townscapes and the historic environment does not fully address this.</p> <p>We trust that as the new local plan evolves, the Council will revisit the policies relating to the historic environment of the Borough and ensure that the new plan is robust and sound, and well evidenced.</p> <p>We should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation.</p> <p>To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.</p> <p>We hope that these comments are useful.</p>	<p>the 2021 Local Distinctiveness and Design Guide SPD.</p> <p>As noted in the LP CS Review, Policy CS4 is supplemented by detailed design requirements in Development Management Plan Policy NHE9. We are satisfied that together, the two parts of our Local Plan reflect the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 20d and 196.</p> <p>The new Local Plan, which is currently at the very early stages in its preparation, will be a single local plan, and so will address both strategic and local details development, design and heritage issues.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Thames Water</p>	<p>Thames Water are the statutory sewerage undertaker for the whole of the Borough and the statutory water undertaker for a small area of the north west corner of the Borough and are hence a “specific consultation body” in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>Policy CS10: Sustainable Development - Water Efficiency</p> <p>Policy CS10 is supported in principle but needs strengthening to ensure water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day is met (105 litres per head per day plus an allowance of 5 litres per head per day for gardens) as set out in the NPPG (Reference ID: 56-014-20150327) and support the inclusion of this requirement in Policy.</p> <p>We understand that the water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day is only applied through the building regulations where there is a planning condition requiring this standard (as set out at paragraph 2.8 of Part G2 of the Building Regulations).</p> <p>Given that the Environment Agency has designated the Thames Water region to be an area of “serious water stress”, reflecting the extent to which available water resources are used, this planning condition should be attached as standard to all planning approvals for new residential development in order to help ensure that the standard is effectively delivered through the building regulations.</p> <p>We therefore support Policy DM7 in referring the use of planning conditions. However, clarification should be provided in relation to the preferred ‘Fittings Approach’.</p> <p>We therefore consider that additional text (provided) should be included in Core Policy 1:</p> <p>Policy CS12: Infrastructure Delivery - Water Resources and Waste</p>	<p>This level of detail is more suited to a DM policy or to Supplementary Planning Document guidance rather than to a strategic policy such as CS10. .</p> <p>Noted, but not relevant to the CS Review</p> <p>It is unclear what Policy DM7 and Core Policy 1 are.</p>
---------------------	--	--

	<p>Water Infrastructure</p> <p>We generally support the reference to water and wastewater infrastructure, but it is such an important issue that it should be covered in a separate ‘Water Resources and Wastewater Infrastructure’ policy in the new Local Plan and that it should be improved in line with the following detailed comments:</p> <p>Water and wastewater infrastructure is essential to any development. Failure to ensure that any required upgrades to the infrastructure network are delivered alongside development could result in adverse impacts in the form of internal and external sewer flooding and pollution of land and water courses and/or low water pressure.’</p> <p>A key sustainability objective for the preparation of Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 20 of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2021, states: “<i>Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for... infrastructure for waste management, water supply, wastewater...</i>”</p> <p>Paragraph 28 relates to non-strategic policies and states: “<i>Non-strategic policies should be used by local planning authorities and communities to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development. This can include allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure...</i>”</p> <p>A summary of the requirements of various parts of the web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) on ‘water supply, wastewater and water quality’ is provided.</p> <p>The new Local Plan should therefore seek to ensure that there is</p>	<p>Development Management Plan (DMP) 2019 Policy INF1 includes more detailed requirements relating to proposed developments and impacts on local utilities networks.</p> <p>Key infrastructure to support the development planned by the Core Strategy is included for each area in Policy CS8</p> <p>As the Core Strategy is the strategic part of the Borough’s Local Plan, this is not relevant to the CS Review. The Development Management Plan (DMP) allocated sites for development and includes detailed policies for development management, including consideration of adequate suitable supporting infrastructure.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. We consider that the New Local Plan should include a specific policy on the key issue of the provision of 'Water Resources/Supply and Sewerage/Wastewater Infrastructure' to service development.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that Core Policy 9 is amended to cover both 'Water Resources & Wastewater Infrastructure'.</p> <p>Q12 - Policy EN18: Flooding and Sustainable Drainage</p> <p>In relation to flood risk, the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states that a sequential approach should be used by local planning authorities in areas known to be at risk from forms of flooding other than from river and sea, which includes "Flooding from Sewers". We therefore support the reference to sewer flooding in Core Policy 7.</p> <p>Detailed requirements for flood risk policies are highlighted.</p> <p>Limiting the opportunity for surface water entering the foul and combined sewer networks is of critical importance to Thames Water. Thames Water have advocated an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system. By doing this, SuDS have the potential to play an important role in helping to ensure the sewerage network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the effects of climate change.</p> <p>SuDS help to mitigate flooding and can also help to improve water quality; provide opportunities for water efficiency; provide enhanced landscape and visual features; support wildlife; and provide amenity and recreational benefits.</p> <p>With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included in Policy wording or supporting text: <i>"It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for</i></p>	<p>Policy CS7 concerns town and local centres rather than flooding and drainage.</p> <p>Guidance on SuDS is provided in the adopted Climate Change and Sustainable Construction SPD 2021 to amplify CS and DMP policies</p> <p>This is a detailed development management issues, rather than a</p>
--	--	--

	<p><i>surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.”</i></p> <p>Policy CS13: Housing Delivery - Growth Options Comments</p> <p>The level of information contained in the current consultation does not enable Thames Water to make an assessment of the impact the proposed development will have on the waste water/sewerage network infrastructure and sewage treatment works. To enable us to provide more specific comments we require details of the type and scale of development together with the anticipated phasing.</p> <p>Where developers do not engage with Thames Water prior to submitting their application, this will more likely lead to the recommendation that a Grampian condition is attached to any planning permission to resolve any infrastructure issues.</p>	<p>strategic plan issue, and is currently set out at paragraphs 3.4.11 and 3.4.12 of the Explanation to DMP Policy INF1 Infrastructure</p> <p>Thames Water was consulted and its comments informed the site allocation policies in the DMP.</p>
Transport for London (TfL)	We have reviewed the draft Core Strategy Local Plan Review 2024 and do not have any comments.	