

Duty to Co-operate Position Statement in Relation to the emerging Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan

November 2017

Introduction

1. This document is an interim Duty to Co-operate Report prepared in advance of the Regulation 19 plan and sets out;
 - a) Chiltern and South Bucks Councils' understanding of relevant Duty issues that have been raised
 - b) how these issues have been or are being considered
 - c) to document agreed outcomes to-date;
 - d) provide the opportunity for the Chiltern and South Bucks understanding to be checked out with each Duty to Co-operate organisation
 - e) to share issues across all duty organisations; and
 - f) for Duty to co-operate organisations to raise any additional issues they consider necessary.
2. This document is a summary record at this point in time and does not seek to demonstrate that the Councils' have met the Duty (something to be set out in the final Duty to Co-operate Report in due course) however Chiltern and South Bucks District Councils' consider they have met the Duty requirements to-date through proactive and on-going engagement with all duty to co-operate organisations on strategic planning and cross border issues.

In responding to this interim report the Councils' request the view of each Duty to Co-operate organisation as to whether from their perspective the Duty has been met to-date and if not how in their opinion this could be corrected.

3. South Bucks District Council is also a member of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group (HSPG) - a group of local authorities, LEPs and the Colne Valley Regional Park working with Heathrow Airport Ltd to influence the potential expansion of Heathrow Airport (either 2 runway or 3 runway scenarios). If the decision is made to expand the airport (decision expected in spring 2018) with a new runway a Development Consent Order will be submitted in due course and the Council will become a Host Authority. The HSPG is hoping to bring forward a sub-regional planning framework to influence the location of new and displaced land uses, surface access improvements, biodiversity enhancements, replacement recreational opportunities, flood mitigation and other environmental investment. Due to the timing for decisions on Heathrow and likely timing for implementation,

Heathrow expansion is not considered to be a matter for consideration in this current local plan. However the implications of Heathrow expansion, HSPG work and any related matters will need to be considered in appropriate alterations to or a review of the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan. Heathrow expansion itself could well become a trigger or reason for a local plan review.

4. Where relevant on-going Duty to Co-operation engagement and evidence base work as part of this local plan will contribute to the work of the HSPG and inform subsequent plan alterations/reviews.

5. Slough Borough Council is promoting a Northern Extension of Slough in conjunction with anticipated expansion of Heathrow and (subject to a full options appraisal and other relevant evidence base work) to assist in meeting Sloughs unmet objectively assessed housing needs. It is understood for these reasons, plus delivery of opportunities within Slough and the likely Slough Local Plan timetable that Slough Borough Council are not looking for their northern extension to Slough proposal to be considered as part of the current emerging Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan. The Councils' are seeking clarity on this matter under the Duty to co-operate but in undertaking the current Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan have tested a number of options for a northern extension of Slough. This is expected to be an on-going Duty to Co-operate matter between the Councils', Slough Borough Council and other relevant local planning authorities where there is a functional housing market relationship with Slough.

Abbreviations Used in the Table Below	
AONB	Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
AVDC	Aylesbury Vale District Council
BCC	Buckinghamshire County Council
BTVLEP	Bucks Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership
CCG	Chiltern Clinical Commissioning Group
CDC	Chiltern District Council
FEMA	Functional Economic Market Area
HE	Highways England
HEDNA	Buckinghamshire Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment
HELAA	Chiltern and South Bucks Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
HMA	Housing Market Area
LEP	Local Enterprise Partnership
NEP	Natural Environment Partnership
OAHN	Objectively Assessed Housing Need
RBWM	Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SBC	Slough Borough Council
SBDC	South Bucks District Council
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
Aylesbury Vale District Council	<p>Support joint HEDNA and need for continued engagement to assess capacity for growth (particularly in relation to the Green Belt review) and transport modelling.</p> <p>Support options to maximise capacity for development in Chiltern/South Bucks.</p> <p>Want to see a commitment to meet Gypsy a Traveller needs in full in Chiltern and South Bucks</p>	<p>AVDC recognise the growth challenge, particularly with the AONB and Green Belt and so important that Chiltern and South Bucks follow national policy and guidance and rigorously examines how best to meet needs within its own area and clearly demonstrate all options have been fully examined prior to reaching a conclusion on the level of unmet need.</p> <p>Keen to see as much housing provision being made in Chiltern and South bucks as is reasonable and sustainable.</p> <p>G L Hearn has been</p>	<p>Regular updates and on-going dialogue on evidence base work.</p> <p>Number of jointly commissioned evidence base work including Green Belt Assessment Part 1, HENDA and Housing Delivery.</p> <p>Shared, consulted and where relevant agreement on technical work methodology.</p> <p>Parties to a Bucks Memorandum of Understanding and Positon Statement on the Slough Local Plan and Northern Extension of Slough proposal.</p>	<p>Meeting housing needs across Bucks HMA and deliver Chiltern and South Bucks unmet needs.</p> <p>Housing capacity scrutiny within Chiltern/South Bucks (HELAA and Green Belt options) including officer workshops, scrutiny through G L Hearn and via AVDC Local Plan Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>Approach to ensuring Chiltern and South Bucks access to affordable housing needs provided in Aylesbury Vale as part of Chiltern and South Bucks general housing unmet</p>	<p>Agreed joint evidence base in relation to: Defining HMA and FEMA, HEDNA, Housing Delivery Study, Green Belt Assessment Part 1, Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Needs Assessment and Bucks wide Strategic Transport Modelling.</p> <p>Joint working on methodologies for: Green Belt Assessment Part 2 and HELAA.</p> <p>HELAA critical friend or peer review and agreement of draft HELAA.</p> <p>Agreed Chiltern and South Bucks unmet housing needs assessment through AVDC commission with G L Hearn and AVDC Local Plan Overview and Scrutiny Committee questioning.</p>	<p>Agree specific Memorandum of Understanding with AVDC on meeting unmet needs to 2033 and appropriate triggers for review.</p> <p>Continued input to Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p>

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
		<p>commissioned to independently review work undertaken so far.</p> <p>Support approach being taken to Green Belt Preferred Options (including identified densities) and housing need provides exceptional circumstances for a Green Belt review.</p>	<p>Agreement for the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan to accommodate 5,725 dwellings to 2033 of Chiltern and South Bucks objectively assessed housing need, including a proportion of Chiltern and South Bucks affordable housing need and a proportionate amount of employment need.</p> <p>Agreement to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding between the Councils on the above and context for future Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan review.</p>	<p>needs.</p> <p>Meeting employment needs across the FEMA.</p> <p>Matters in relation to the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan.</p>	<p>Bucks Memorandum of Understandings (February 2016 and July 2017).</p> <p>Agreed joint Position Statement on Slough Emerging Local Plan (July 2017).</p>	

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
Wycombe District Council	<p>For potential unmet needs will want to explore strategic options in Chiltern and South Bucks.</p> <p>Unlikely to be any scope for Chiltern/South Bucks unmet needs to be met in Wycombe District.</p> <p>Will want to explore potential loss of employment sites implications across the wider FEMA.</p> <p>Green Belt safeguarding should only occur where there is no prospect of delivery in the plan period given the expected unmet housing needs position.</p>	<p>Welcome progress making on addressing strategic issues.</p> <p>Welcome identification of strategic Green Belt preferred options including provision for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. Looking for Gypsy and Traveller needs to be met in full in the plan.</p> <p>Support Green Belt Preferred Option 2 and confirm need for joint working including a joint development brief.</p> <p>Confirm not taking the Wycombe part of Option 3 forward.</p>	<p>Regular updates and on-going dialogue on evidence base work particularly but not limited to cross border development opportunities and matters.</p> <p>Number of jointly commissioned evidence base work including Green Belt Assessment Part 1, HENDA and Housing Delivery.</p> <p>Shared, consulted and where relevant agreement on technical work methodology.</p> <p>Parties to a Bucks Memorandum of Understanding and Position Statement on the Slough Local Plan and Northern Extension of Slough</p>	<p>Meeting housing needs across Bucks HMA.</p> <p>Meeting employment needs across the FEMA.</p> <p>Joint working on Habitat Regulation and policy implications for development proposals that could affect Burnham Beeches SAC.</p> <p>Joint approach to addressing development issues in relation with the Chilterns AONB and joint discussions with the AONB Board.</p> <p>Matters in relation to the emerging Wycombe Local Plan.</p>	<p>Agreed joint evidence base in relation to: Defining HMA and FEMA, HEDNA, Housing Delivery Study, Green Belt Assessment Part 1, Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Needs Assessment and Bucks wide Strategic Transport Modelling.</p> <p>Joint working on methodologies for: Green Belt Assessment Part 2 and HELAA.</p> <p>HELAA critical friend or peer review and agreement of draft HELAA.</p> <p>Bucks Memorandum of Understandings (February 2016 and July 2017)</p> <p>Agreed joint Position Statement on Slough Emerging Local Plan (July 2017).</p>	<p>On-going joint evidence base updates and co-operation.</p> <p>Continued input to Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p>

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
			<p>proposal.</p> <p>Co-ordination of evidence for cross boarder housing proposal options/sites (specifically Green Belt Preferred Options 2 and 3) e.g. landscape assessment and infrastructure implications.</p> <p>Co-ordination of evidence in relation to cross border water implications.</p> <p>Memorandum of Understanding.</p>		<p>Joint working and agreed outcome on the Green Belt Preferred Option 2 at Holmer Green and 3 Land at Hazelmere.</p> <p>Wycombe and Chiltern/South Bucks Memorandum of Understanding (August 2017)</p>	

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
Bucks County Council	<p>Need for well-planned sustainable infrastructure to support development.</p> <p>Need to improve strategic connectivity.</p> <p>The unique character of residential areas and AONB are important influences for the spatial strategy.</p> <p>Want to participate in discussions on unmet needs for potential infrastructure implications.</p> <p>Preservation and maintenance of the Green Belt is a strategic County Council objective and a robust,</p>	<p><u>Note:</u> Response received outside the consultation period but considered under the Duty to Co-operate.</p> <p>Spatial strategy focus on enabling development within existing settlement boundaries. Need for a County perspective on growth to enable sustainable growth supported by appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>Not convinced some preferred options have the critical mass to generate infrastructure needed and whether some could be better planned elsewhere within the County.</p> <p>National infrastructure</p>	<p>Regular updates and on-going dialogue on evidence base work, infrastructure needs and delivery options.</p> <p>Detailed consultation and discussion on infrastructure requirements (e.g. education, flooding) and delivery options for the emerging Local Plan and feeding into the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. Also to feed in to key evidence base work such as the Viability Assessment.</p> <p>Joint commissioned the Green Belt Assessment Part 1, transport modelling and SFRA Levels 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Co-ordination with the emerging Bucks Minerals and Waste Local Plan and Local Transport Plans.</p> <p>Joint working and discussions with Slough Council in relation to the emerging Slough Local Plan and Sloughs proposed Northern Extension proposal. Seeking clarification on County concerns for the some Green Belt Preferred Options raised in the consultation (including member meetings).</p> <p>Joint working as part of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group.</p> <p>Joint discussions</p>	<p>Agreed joint evidence base in relation to: Strategic and specific Chiltern/South Bucks Transport Modelling, SFRA level 1 and level 2. On-going commissions.</p> <p>Refined Green Belt options and HELAA sites taking account of other BCC service implications where known (e.g. education, flooding)..</p> <p>Joint commissioners for the Green Belt Assessment Part 1.</p> <p>Bucks Memorandum of Understandings (February 2016).</p> <p>Joint response to the Housing Infrastructure Bid 2017 opportunity in relation to Beaconsfield and Iver relief road proposals.</p>	<p>On-going joint evidence base updates and co-operation between service areas and for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and Transport Plans.</p> <p>Clarification on Bucks County Council planning concerns in relation to specific Green Belt Preferred Options in the context of an updated evidence base, possible inconsistency in approach, discussions and (in due course) the County response to the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan Reg 19</p>

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
	<p>independent and objective assessment to inform potential areas for release is welcomed.</p> <p>Likely no conflict between consultation options and known minerals and waste proposals but need to protect existing waste facilities.</p>	<p>projects and resultant construction impacts - consider phasing and deliverability to mitigate cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Welcomes removal of the proposed Green Belt options adjacent to Slough Borough.</p> <p>There is sufficient land outside the Green Belt suitable for development within the HMA to meet need and so no exceptional circumstance for Green Belt change.</p> <p>Green Belt Preferred Options 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8 should remain in the Green Belt and development proposed planned elsewhere within the HMA. Also details on</p>	<p>Joint working on the preferred route for the Iver Relief Road and inputs to the Iver Topic Paper.</p> <p>Comments sought on the Heritage Strategy.</p> <p>Comments sought on Green Infrastructure Topic Paper.</p> <p>Comments sought on the Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>Joint working on Habitat Regulation and policy implications for development proposals that could affect Burnham Beeches SAC.</p>	<p>with Highways England and Slough Borough Council to co-ordinate transport model inputs and consistency of approach.</p> <p>Matters in relation to the emerging Bucks Minerals and Waste Local Plan.</p>		<p>consultation.</p> <p>Continued joined up working on matters relating to the Slough Local Plan.</p> <p>Seek agreement to Green Infrastructure Topic Paper.</p> <p>Seek agreement for updated Heritage Strategy</p> <p>Seek to agree transport modelling with HE and BCC as the two duty to co-operate highway authorities.</p>

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
		<p>transport implications and County services.</p> <p>The implications of preferred options on mineral sites are limited to options 7 to 15 located within the Minerals Safeguarding Area with particular consideration for Option 13.</p>				
Bucks Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership	Did not submit a representation as part of the consultation.	<p>Comments on options suitable for employment in context of demand for land for new employment opportunities in the Chiltern and South Bucks area is likely to remain buoyant for the foreseeable future and would like to see an over allocation of potential employment locations (above the figures stated in the</p>	<p>Inputs to HEDNA particularly assisting in providing an economic market perspective.</p> <p>Inputs to infrastructure needs and delivery options.</p> <p>Considering BTVLEP evidence as part of the emerging Employment Topic Paper and seeking input on the Topic</p>	Joint working as part of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group.	<p>Agreed joint evidence base in relation to: Defining HMA and FEMA and HEDNA update.</p> <p>Inclusion of key LEP documents as part of the evidence base.</p> <p>Joint response to the Housing Infrastructure Bid 2017 opportunity in relation to Beaconsfield and Iver relief road proposals.</p> <p>Agreed joint Position Statement on Slough</p>	On-going joint evidence base updates and co-operation.

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
		<p>recent HEDNA Report) to ensure that businesses are given the appropriate flexibility to react to market demand, to support significant opportunities such as the recently announced expansion of Heathrow airport and to ensure that the effect of the loss of employment land through the permitted rights legislation is mitigated against. Also seeking to balance out the net outflow of workers from the Chiltern and South Bucks area and to provide a greater mix of employment opportunities for residents to work closer to home.</p>	<p>Paper. Parties to a Bucks Memorandum of Understanding and Position Statement on the Slough Local Plan and Northern Extension of Slough proposal.</p>		<p>Emerging Local Plan (July 2017). Bucks Memorandum of Understandings (July 2017).</p>	

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
Bucks Natural Environment Partnership	Did not submit a representation as part of the consultation.	Did not submit a representation as part of the consultation.	Wildlife Surveys of Biological Notification Areas and other areas of potential wildlife value Comments sought on Green Infrastructure Topic Paper.	Biodiversity off-setting approach across Bucks Attendance at NEP meetings and keeping informed on local plan.	Inclusion of key NEP documents as part of the evidence base. Agreement to include a biodiversity off-setting policy.	On-going co-operation. Seek agreement to Green Infrastructure Topic Paper
Dacorum Borough Council	Did not submit a representation as part of the consultation.	<u>Note:</u> Response received outside the consultation period but considered under the Duty to Co-operate. Dacorum confirmed that it would not be able to accommodate any of CDC/SBDCs unmet need. This is due to this Borough having its own challenging OAHN figure, whilst also being heavily constrained in terms of Green Belt, Special	Liaison on evidence work as appropriate. Joint working on a Water Cycle Study. Infrastructure needs to be most critical in terms of cross-boundary issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water – waste and potable • Road network – including impact of new development on the B4505 and A41. 	Matters in relation to the emerging Dacorum Local Plan.	Understanding that Dacorum has no scope to accommodate any of Chiltern/South Bucks unmet development needs to 2036 but will need to be monitored as evidence base work proceed.	Ongoing engagement / co-operation. Continued input to Strategic Green Belt Assessment.

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
		<p>Area of Conservation, AONB and other designations. The Councils do not share a Housing Market Area (HMA), or Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA).</p> <p>For the Preferred Options site at Chesham DBC did not wish to raise any issues with regard to the principle of bringing forward this site: only to flag up the need for continuing liaison on cross-boundary infrastructure issues, especially in the Chesham / Bovington area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools – primary and secondary Crematoria <p>Comments sought on the Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p>			
Three Rivers	TRDC encourages	Did not submit a	Liaison on evidence	Matters in relation to	It is understood that the	Ongoing

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
District Council	<p>CDC/SBDC to meet their need in the plan area or within the wider Bucks HMA. It is very unlikely TRDC will be able to accommodate any unmet need.</p> <p>TRDC does not object to reviewing the Green Belt - there is clearly a need.</p> <p>For any Green Belt options close to the TRDC boundary, need to work closely with CDC/SBDC to ensure any strategic issues are identified and addressed. TRDC would expect CDC/SBDC to accommodate any need for Gypsy and Traveller sites within the Plan Area or</p>	<p>representation as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>work as appropriate, in particular concerning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water infrastructure – waste and potable Transport modelling Monitoring of provision for gypsies and travellers <p>Joint working on a Water Cycle Study.</p> <p>Comments sought on the Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p>	<p>the emerging Three Rivers Local Plan.</p> <p>Matters in relation to HS2 Colne Valley issues.</p>	<p>LPAs in the south west Herts HMA are aiming to meet their own needs and will not be able to meet unmet needs arising from outside the HMA. This will be subject of on-going discussion as the TRDC evidence base for the new Local Plan emerges but as at this point Three Rivers has no scope to accommodate any of Chiltern/South Bucks unmet development needs to 2036.</p>	<p>engagement / co-operation.</p> <p>Continued input to Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p>

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
	<p>CDC/SBDC HMA.</p> <p>There is no need arising from the migration of Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople into Three Rivers from adjoining authorities</p> <p>Although there is no longer any need for additional transit sites, there may well be a need for alternative transit provision (such as stopping places and visitor spaces) within the Bucks HMA – to be reviewed in the updated evidence.</p>					
Hertfordshire County Council	HCC - education infrastructure, i.e. relationship between	HCC Childrens services – Potential school places impact	Herts Water Study for the water – related infrastructure		Education response shared with Bucks CC school places planning team.	On-going joint evidence base updates and co-

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
	towns such as Berkhamsted, Chorleywood, Rickmansworth and Tring and neighbouring population centres. As pupils move between areas any increase in population may put pressure on school places. Further work would need to be undertaken once more details are known on housing growth.	in Herts related to Chesham, Little Chalfont, National Epilepsy Center, Chalfont St Peter. It is important to have the demand on cross boundary school places monitored as it is likely that children in Chiltern District attend school in Herts and vice versa. This will be most significant between Little Chalfont and Chorleywood/Rickmansworth. Schools in Rickmansworth already at capacity.	capacity implications of the Local Plan led by HCC Environment		Response from HCC property services (education) on refined options sought.	operation. Need for the education authorities to liaise further on potential cross - boundary education issues related to the refined green belt options. Complete the Herts Water Study
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Unable to support the definition of South Bucks District	Recommend that a full draft plan be made available for	Consulted on key evidence base documents e.g.	Matters in relation to the emerging Windsor and	Agreement to prepare a Statement of Common Ground	On-going joint evidence base updates and co-

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
	<p>Council (SBDC) being within the Central Buckinghamshire Housing Market Area (HMA) and Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) which are only very recent redefinitions.</p> <p>The RBWM is endeavouring to meet its own OAN, and is highly unlikely that it will be able to meet the additional housing needs of adjoining authorities.</p>	<p>consultation to allow comprehensive options to be tested against an updated Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>RBWM, in common with neighbouring Berkshire authorities, is committed to supporting the existing jointly prepared evidence base for housing and economic development needs.</p> <p>It is surprising that only 15 preferred options have been included in the consultation document, considering the scope and scale of the assessment.</p> <p>There may be opportunities within</p>	<p>Definition of Housing and Functional Economic Market Areas, Green Belt Assessment, HELAA, HEDNA and Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>On-going engagement on definition of best fit HMA and FEMA.</p> <p>Comments sought on a Position Statement on the Slough Local Plan and Northern Extension of Slough proposal and relationship with the emerging RBWM Local Plan.</p> <p>Comments sought on the Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p>	<p>Maidenhead Local Plan and Slough Local Plan..</p>		<p>operation.</p> <p>Agree Statement of Common Ground</p> <p>Continued input to Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p>

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
		the two councils' areas for meeting a greater amount of the unmet objectively assessed need, rather than relying on provision in the more distant Aylesbury Vale. Other options may include additional assessment on sites in close proximity to sustainable transport nodes, particularly as higher density in such locations would be more appropriate. In addition, the possibility of a northern expansion of Slough into the local plan area could be considered to meet a higher proportion of housing need.				
Slough Borough Council	Request scope to consider an urban extension of Slough in the form of a new	Concerned about the overall decision making process and shortcomings in the	Consulted on key evidence base documents e.g. Definition of Housing	Joint working as part of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group.	Agreement for CDC/SBDC to test a Northern Extension of Slough as part of the Chiltern and South	On-going joint evidence base updates and co-operation.

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
	<p>'Garden Suburb' to meet the housing help needs within the area. If the Joint Plan produces a strategy which can provide for these needs without having a northern expansion of Slough it is considered that this option should still be considered to meet Slough's needs.</p> <p>Should develop a comprehensive strategic planning option which would consider a major urban expansion of Slough combined with selective growth around Taplow and Iver stations.</p> <p>The fact that South Bucks has now been added to the</p>	<p>methodology for selecting sites for development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Concerned that our previous reps to the Issues and Options consultation that there should be an urban expansion of Slough in the form of a new 'Garden Suburb' which will help to meet the housing needs in the area have not been properly considered.</p> <p>Objects to the amount and distribution of housing in the Green Belt Preferred Options which will fail to meet housing needs where they arise and increase pressures on the housing market in an area that is already one of the least</p>	<p>and Functional Economic Market Areas, Green Belt Assessment, HELAA, HEDNA and Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>On-going engagement on definition of best fit HMA and FEMA.</p> <p>Comments sought on the Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>Published evidence base documents relating to SBC proposal for a Northern Extension of Slough.</p> <p>Provided SBC with a Bucks Position Statement to set out concerns on how Slough is</p>	<p>On-going engagement on the Northern Extension to Slough option and other matters in relation to the emerging Slough Local Plan and Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan.</p> <p>Matters in relation to M4 smart motorway, Western Rail Link to Heathrow and HS2 Hex Depot.</p>	<p>Bucks Local Plan evidence base (Green Belt Assessment and Green Belt Options Appraisal) based on an agreed area with SBC.</p> <p>Agreed that CDC/SBDC commission a Strategic Green Belt Assessment to inform the above and to consult SBC and others on the methodology and draft findings.</p>	<p>Agree of a Memorandum of Understanding.</p> <p>Continued input to Strategic Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>Continued input to SBCs work on preparing a Northern Extension to Slough Masterplan (despite disagreeing that this is the appropriate was forward).</p>

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
	Buckinghamshire HMA for admin purposes does not change the fact that South Bucks is divided and does not alter the functional geographic relationship between Slough and South Bucks. As a result Slough Borough Council does not agree that there is evidence to show that South Bucks is no longer in the same HMA as Slough.	affordable in the country. Request the proposal for the northern expansion of Slough combined with selective growth around Taplow, Langley and Iver stations as Preferred Options be considered and a memorandum of understanding.	approaching a Northern Extension and related matters. Provided detailed comments on SBC draft Northern Extension to Slough document (prepared by Atkins). Seeking to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding. Joint working on Habitat Regulation and policy implications for development proposals that could affect Burnham Beeches SAC.			
London Borough of Hillingdon	Did not submit a representation as part of the consultation.	Primary concern to ensure overall quantum of development identified in the	Comments to be considered as part of on-going evidence base work particularly potential	Matters in relation to the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan.	No issues identified at this stage that require an outcome.	On-going joint evidence base updates and co-operation.

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
		<p>document does not lead to additional infrastructure pressures in Hillingdon. Particularly to ensure factors such as additional traffic congestion on the A40 and environmental and economic impacts of development are fully considered.</p> <p>Option 10 - Land North of Denham Roundabout In addition to general infrastructure requirements, an issue will be the creation of a suitable access point to the Denham roundabout. It is noted that the proposals include an element of office development. Need to be consistent with evidence on need for</p>	<p>cross border infrastructure matters.</p> <p>CDC/SBDC officers Encourage the Cape Board site to be included as a residential redevelopment proposal in the Hillingdon Local Plan which would contribute to reducing HGV traffic in South Bucks District.</p>	<p>Matters in relation to M4 smart motorway and HS2 Colne Valley issues.</p>		

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
		<p>office space and should demonstrate that this is a sequentially preferable location, in accordance with the NPPF. Hillingdon is particularly keen to ensure that the proposals are not detrimental to wider market for offices, including Uxbridge town centre.</p> <p>Option 11 - Land North of Iver Heath and Option 12 - Area west of Iver Heath are located some distance from the boundary with Hillingdon and has no specific comments to make at this stage.</p> <p>Option 13 -Area North of Iver Station and Option 14 - Area to the East of Ridgeway</p>				

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
		<p>Business Park, Iver It is noted propose a significant amount of office floorspace. The comments made in relation to option 10 also apply. In particular, Hillingdon is keen to see the evidence to justify such a large quantum of office development in South Bucks.</p> <p>Hillingdon welcomes the proposal to delay development at options 11, 12 and 13, in order to limit the traffic impacts from already committed major infrastructure projects.</p>				
Mayor of London	Did not submit a representation as part of the consultation.	Did not submit a representation as part of the consultation.		Engagement from CDC and SBDC on the emerging London Plan.		None identified at this point in time in relation to the emerging Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan.

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
Chiltern Clinical Commissioning Group	Did not submit any representation as part of the consultation	Preferred Option at Beaconsfield could link into the proposal to combine two existing practises. Options at Amersham/Little Chalfont will require (expansion / modification of existing primary care facilities). Also the case for Chesham. These settlements are more preferable broad locations for consideration in the Joint Local Plan. Other areas outside of the above are less preferable. Need to discourage the creation of new developments in small urban areas where there is insufficient scale to support services and transport routes/links.	Detailed consultation and discussion on infrastructure requirements and delivery options for the emerging Local Plan and feeding into the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. Also to feed in to key evidence base work such as the Viability Assessment.		Refined Green Belt options and HELAA sites taking account of health implications where known.	On-going liaison on infrastructure issues and need to specifically understand concerns for the NEC option and whether there are mitigations or other alternatives to meeting specialist housing needs.

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
		<p>Part of the CCG strategy is to develop healthcare hubs providing more patient care in community settings. Existing GP practises are experiencing high levels of demand for their services with four of the preferred options will experience significant pressure on service provision.</p> <p>The majority of GP premises are already deficient of space with little room for expansion therefore health CIL and Section 106 contributions will be required.</p> <p>The National Centre for Epilepsy due to greater demands on GP practises in</p>				

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
		<p>Chalfont St Peter a new healthcare facility would ideally be provided as part of development. Depending on the size of development the Calcott Medical Centre may need to be expanded or relocated.</p> <p>Primary care services will need to expand or relocate in the area around Iver (Iver Heath, Iver and Richings Park).</p> <p>Green Belt sites will add to the pressure over the next 10 – 15 years.</p>				
NHS England	Did not submit any representation as part of the consultation	Did not submit any representation as part of the consultation	Requested detailed consultation and discussion on infrastructure requirements and delivery options for the emerging Local		No NHS England issues identified at this stage that require an outcome.	NHS England role taken over by CCG post April 2017 and so future engagement on health

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
			<p>Plan and feeding into the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule but no response.</p> <p>Other contact made direct with NHS organisations, e.g. NHS Property, Mental Health, Ambulance services, local hospital trusts and public health at BCC.</p>			<p>infrastructure issues will be with CCG and with other NHS organisations. Need to check position with NHS England and whether they need to be engaged further with the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan.</p>
Civil Aviation Authority	Did not submit any representation as part of the consultation	Did not submit any representation as part of the consultation	Requested detailed consultation and discussion on infrastructure requirements and delivery options for the emerging Local Plan and feeding into the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule but no response.		No issues identified at this stage that require an outcome.	On-going checks and engagement.
Historic England	NPPF sets out requirements for the	Options 1, 7, 9, 12 and 15 all have listed	Seeking agreement to the Heritage	Detailed concerns on Green Belt	Comments on initial draft Heritage Strategy agreed.	Seek agreement on the Heritage

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
	<p>historic environment in local plans. Wide ranging definition of “historic environment” and welcome recognition of the wealth of heritage assets in the Districts.</p> <p>Agreed the intention to review the draft Joint Heritage Strategy. Consider it likely that the Councils will have an adequate, up-to-date and relevant historic environment evidence base and we will expect the Councils to demonstrate in the Local Plan how that historic evidence base has informed and influenced the Plan’s policies and site allocations,</p>	<p>buildings or structures. These should be retained and taken into careful consideration when developing around them e.g. the grade II listed buildings at Wilton Park Farm should be retained with sufficient land around the farm complex left undeveloped.</p> <p>Objection to Option 5 (except the south-western half).</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Options to be taken into account as part of detailed work where relevant.</p>		<p>Strategy.</p>

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
	<p>Commented on specific options.</p> <p>Support the commitment to review Conservation Areas. The Plan should also include detailed policies which aim to conserve historic assets.</p>					
Environment Agency	<p>Need for a water cycle study for South Bucks and acknowledged water – cycle related work in progress for Chiltern District.</p> <p>Provided evidence to support detailed policies on water efficiency, water infrastructure and drainage, biodiversity, flood risk, SUDs, land contamination, heritage and water</p>	<p><u>Note:</u> Response received outside the consultation period but considered under the Duty to Co-operate.</p> <p>Commented on specific options in terms of flood risk and biodiversity (water framework directive issues), and suggestions for mitigation / site specific solutions.</p>	<p>Consulted on Habitat Regulation Assessment Screening.</p> <p>Comments sought on Green Infrastructure Topic Paper.</p> <p>Discussions / evidence on flood risk issues raised at Preferred options stage which has informed the work on the SFRA.</p>		<p>Habitat Regulation Screening impacts agreed.</p> <p>agreement for CDC/SBDC to prepare Water Cycle evidence relating to South Bucks District.</p> <p>Matters concerning flood risk and water quality have been subject of on-going engagement as part of the SFRA and water – related evidence work for the Local Plan. Much of this evidence relies on the provision of information from the EA. EA advice has assisted in</p>	<p>Seek agreement to Green Infrastructure Topic Paper, level 2 SFRA and water – related evidence studies.</p>

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
	quality. Provided information on the constraints affecting sites included in the consultation document.				the drafting of detailed policies for the Local Plan.	
Homes and Communities Agency	Did not submit any representation as part of the consultation	Did not submit any representation as part of the consultation	Request information for infrastructure requirements for the new Local Plan and its Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.		No issues identified at this stage that require an outcome.	On-going checks and engagement.
Natural England	Did not submit any representation as part of the consultation	Site visits had been made by Natural England to Option 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 providing detailed comments outlining the constraints and factors to note. Key issue being the need to carry out a Landscape Assessment for each option.	<p>Consulted on Habitat Regulation Assessment Screening and follow up implications in relation to Burnham Beeches SAC.</p> <p>Comments sought on Green Infrastructure Topic Paper.</p> <p>Consulted on Landscape Assessment consultant brief, methodology and</p>	Quarterly meetings with Natural England and City of London re. Burnham Beeches SAC focussing on control of visitor numbers and the need for alternative recreational land.	<p>Habitat Regulation Screening impacts agreed.</p> <p>Agreement on approach to mitigate potential impact on Burnham Beeches generally and specifically for the option east of Beaconsfield.</p>	<p>Need to agree air pollution modelling following the Wealden decision and resultant mitigations / controls.</p> <p>Seek agreement to Green Infrastructure Topic Paper</p>

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
			final draft report. Comments to be considered by the Landscape Architects.			
Highways England	<p>Need to consider if proposals have the potential to impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) - the M25 J15 –J20, M40 J1-3, M4 J4b-J8/9 and A404/A404(M).</p> <p>The following issues need to be addressed: Congestion and journey delay on the SRN. Enhance the provision of intermodal interchanges between rail and SRN, particularly for freight; new capacity requirements at a wide range of</p>	No specific comments about the locations for development although would be concerned about any impacts upon the SRN.	Provided advice on methodology and input on transport modelling. At this point in time HE may require SRN junction modelling and local modelling to evidence traffic use assumptions.		<p>Scope of SRN network and HE comments incorporated into local transport modelling work but subject of on-going discussions.</p> <p>HE involved in major infrastructure projects and related evidence base work with CDC/ SBDC and BCC</p> <p>HE to be consulted on any new proposal for a motorway service area.</p>	Seek to agree transport modelling with HE and BCC as the two duty to co-operate highway authorities.

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
	locations; Impacts on the SRN of a possible third runway at Heathrow; and Motorway services on the M25					
Office of Rail Regulation	Did not submit any representation as part of the consultation	Did not submit any representation as part of the consultation	Request information for infrastructure requirements for the new Local Plan and its Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.		No issues identified at this stage that require an outcome.	On-going checks and engagement.
Transport for London	Research suggests there is a degree of capacity on the rail network particularly following delivery of schemes on Chiltern and Metropolitan line services, as well as the Elizabeth Line. Development should be steered towards existing rail stations and their catchments. Policies should encourage reduced car parking provision, increased	Preferred Option 6: As partial land owner of the site at South East of Little Chalfont, we note that any future release of the site from the Green Belt, if considered to meet the exceptional circumstances needed to justify alterations to the Green Belt boundary, would provide the potential for us to bring forward our landholdings for	Request information for infrastructure requirements for the new Local Plan and its Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. Information provided in relation to the HELAA site at Chesham station, Little Chalfont and Great Missenden supporting the opportunity for new development.	Engagement in relation to Crossrail (Elizabeth Line) and Iver and Taplow stations.	Agreed replacement for Iver Station.	On-going liaison on infrastructure issues

Duty to Co-operate Organisation	Summary Duty Issues Raised in Response to Consultations		Duty Issues in Relation to Chiltern and South Bucks Evidence Base	Duty Issues Raised Outside of Consultations or evidence base work	Outcome from Discussions To-date	Outstanding Matters and Next Steps
	Reg 18/Issues and Options	Green Belt Preferred Options				
	car club availability and provision of/ funding for improvements in alternative transport.	development.				