





## **Declarations of Interest**

Any Member attending the meeting is reminded of the requirement to declare if he/she has a personal interest in any item of business, as defined in the Code of Conduct. If that interest is a prejudicial interest as defined in the Code the Member should also withdraw from the meeting.

## **A G E N D A**

- |   | (Pages)   |
|---|-----------|
| 1. <b>Apologies for absence</b>   |           |
| 2. <b>Minutes</b>   |           |
| To receive the minutes of the meeting of the PAG held on 12 June 2014.  | (1 - 2)   |
| 3. <b>Parking Standards</b>   |           |
| To consider report of Head of Sustainable Development.  | (3 - 6)   |
| 4. <b>The Duty to Co-operate and Planning for Strategic Cross Boundary Matters</b>  |           |
| To consider report of Head of Sustainable Development.  | (7 - 8)   |
| <i>Appendix</i>   | (9 - 14)  |
| 5. <b>Exclusion of Public</b>   |           |
| The Chairman to move the following resolution:-   |           |
| “That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.” |           |
| 6. <b>HS2 Update</b>  |           |
| To consider report of the Director of Services.   | (15 - 18) |
| 7. <b>Any other business</b>  |           |
| Any other business which the Portfolio Holder considers is urgent.  |           |

The next meeting is due to take place on Thursday, 27 November 2014

This page is intentionally left blank

**SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT POLICY ADVISORY GROUP**

**Meeting - 12 June 2014**

Present: Mr Reed (Chairman)  
Mr Bagge and Mr Samson

Also Present: Mrs Sullivan and Mrs Woolveridge

Apologies for absence: Mr D Dhillon, Mr Lidgate and The Earl of Stockton

**1. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the PAG held on 13 March 2014 were received.

**2. DUTY TO CO-OPERATE**

In accordance with the commitment given by the Portfolio Holder at the meeting on 13 March 2014 the PAG received a report setting out the interactions that have taken place in relation to the “duty to cooperate”.

**3. TOWNSCAPE CHARACTER ASSESSMENT**

The PAG considered a report setting out the outcome of an assessment of the townscape settlements in South Bucks carried out by consultancy firm Tibbalds.

The Townscape Character Assessment (TCA) outlines the ways in which each of the eleven main settlements in South Bucks have developed, the main points of their character and an indication of their potential for change. It goes on to identify 12 different character typologies such as “woodland roads”, “open plan suburban” and “park edge”. There are elements of many different typologies in each settlement. Each typology is analysed in detail and comments are set out about townscape, built form, hard and soft landscape and vegetation and boundary treatments. Two of the most important elements of each analysis include identification of threats to character and a series of recommendations. The report went on to show how such an analysis would be carried out in respect of woodland roads.

Although the Townscape Character Assessment (TCA) will not have undergone testing by local plan inspector, the PAG concurred that the quality of the TCA, together with its status as an independently produced report prepared by experts in the field, provided a very good context for making decisions.

The PAG therefore supported the proposal that the TCA should be adopted and used as Interim Planning Guidance (IPG). Whilst the IPG would not constitute a Supplementary Planning Document as part of the Local Development Framework, it would be a material consideration when determining planning applications.

Having received the advice of the PAG the Portfolio Holder **AGREED** to **RECOMMEND** to the Cabinet that the South Bucks Townscape Character Study Part 2, February 2014 prepared by Tibbalds on behalf of the Council be adopted as interim planning guidance

**4. ACCOMMODATING THE NEEDS OF THE TRAVELLING COMMUNITY IN SOUTH BUCKS: FEED BACK ON ISSUES AND OPTIONS AND CALL FOR SITES PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

The PAG considered a report setting out the results of the public consultation on the Issues and Options and Call for Sites Paper which is the first stage in the preparation of the Gypsy and Travellers Plan. The paper set out to provide an understanding of Gypsy and Traveller communities and the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the ten year

period from 2013 to 2023. The paper also explored a series of options of how the Council could accommodate the future growth of the Gypsy and Traveller population.

A total of 32 responses had been received amounting to 177 individual issues and the report identified the key issues raised in relation to the ten questions in the paper and the five sites submitted to the Council through the Call for Sites form.

The report went on to explain how the Council had worked closely with neighbouring authorities in accordance with the duty to cooperate and set out a timetable culminating in the Gypsies and Travellers Plan being adopted by the Council in December 2015.

In response to a question the Portfolio Holder agreed that it would be difficult to avoid providing sites in the Green Belt mindful that it represented 87% of the District and confirmed that discussions would continue with neighbouring authorities to encourage them to provide sites in their areas.

## 5. DEFINITION OF KEY SHOPPING AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PURPOSES

Following changes to permitted development rules which came into effect on 6 April 2014 allowing a change of use to residential from shops provided the shop was not larger than 150 sq. m, the PAG considered a report setting out a proposal that the following District and Local centres as defined in the Core Strategy and Proposals Map be categorised as “Key Shopping Areas” for the purpose of interpreting the new legislation:

- *District centres - Beaconsfield New Town and Gerrards Cross*
- *Local centres - Beaconsfield Old Town, Burnham, Farnham Common, Iver Village and Denham Green*

The report went on to explain why Neighbourhood Centres had been excluded from the interpretation pending the preparation of more guidance in the Development Management Local Plan.

The PAG noted that the change of use to residential through the Prior Approval process would be subject to close scrutiny in terms of the potential impact on the sustainability of the relevant shopping area.

After receiving the advice of the PAG which supported the proposal the Portfolio Holder **AGREED** to **RECOMMEND** to Cabinet that new definition for Shopping Areas be adopted for development management purposes

The meeting terminated at 6.42 pm

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	County wide parking standards		
<b>REPORT OF:</b>	Officer Management Team-	Director of Services	
	Prepared by	-	Head of Sustainable Development

**1. Purpose of Report**

To agree a response to the consultation by County Council on new County wide Parking Guidance.

**2. Links to Council Policy Objectives**

Striving to conserve the environment and promote sustainability

**3. Background**

The County has drawn up County wide parking guidance. This is currently out to consultation which runs from 8th September to 31<sup>st</sup> October. A copy of the consultation is available at

<https://democracy.buckscc.gov.uk/documents/s50399/Parking%20guidance%20final.pdf> .

Members are invited to view the document and advise of their views, which would be taken into account in the District Council's consultation response. It explains that parking at new developments should provide for bicycles, motorcycles, cars and Blue Badge Holders. The parking standards will be 'optimum' and moves away from imposing either maximum or minimum standards. There is also flexibility to provide the right amount of parking where applying the specific standards would not be appropriate. The other Districts have agreed on a zoning approach. Your officers have agreed that this is not appropriate for South Bucks as the small geographical area differences are not as apparent as say Wycombe.

The NPPF states that the following factors should be considered if local authorities choose to set parking standards;

- The accessibility of the development
- The type, mix and use of the development
- The availability of and opportunities for public transport
- Local car ownership level
- An overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles

The government is currently consulting until 26<sup>th</sup> September on parking standards. This is an extract from the consultation document.

***Maximum parking standards***

*2.77 The Government supports the motorist and wants to see adequate parking provision for them. For this reason, we removed the previous administration's restrictions on the number of parking spaces for new developments. And in March this year we published new planning guidance, which encourages local authorities to improve the quality of parking in town centres and, where it is necessary to ensure their vitality, the quantity too. Parking standards are now matters for local authorities.*

*2.78 We are aware that some local authorities appear to have adopted a more flexible approach, and this is to be welcomed, but the Government now wishes to understand whether more action is needed to tackle on-street parking problems. We want to understand whether local authorities are stopping builders from providing sufficient parking space to meet market demand. We also want to ensure that local authorities*

*in their Local Plans have properly reviewed their parking policies and brought them up to date.*

The table below compares the District Council's existing parking standards with the standards proposed by the County Council.

**Comparison Table**

Example uses	SBDC existing policy	Bucks CC proposed policy	Difference
<b>Housing C3</b>		Zone B	
4 + beds	3 spaces	2.5-3	0.5 (for 4 beds)
2 or 3 beds	2 spaces	1.5-2	0.5 (for 2 beds)
1 bed	1 space	1	
<b>Offices B1</b>	1 space for 25 Sq m	1 space for 39 Sq m	7 spaces less for each 500 Sq m (but flexibility offered)
<b>Retail A1 (less than 1000 Sq m)</b>	1 space for 30 Sq m	1 space for 30 Sq m	No difference
<b>Pubs, restaurants A3</b>	1 space for 4 Sq m of public floorspace	1 space for 36 Sq m	34 spaces for 150 Sq m of public floorspace .
<b>Care Home C2</b>	1 space for 4 residents plus 1 space per resident staff	Case by case	

#### 4. Discussion

The proposed standards are optimum numbers but are mostly proposing less parking spaces than we currently require. Accordingly, if these standards were to be adopted your officers consider that they should be applied flexibly in order to ensure that sufficient spaces are provided to reflect local circumstances. However, the problem with having relatively low optimum standards is that where the Council considers that a higher standard than the optimum should be applicable, the applicant may disagree. Accordingly, this might result in an increase in refusals on parking grounds, with the potential for an increase in appeals. It would be better if the optimum standard were more reflective of the more demanding circumstances in the first place, with the flexibility to allow less provision than the optimum standard where local circumstances justify it.

Members will also notice that the whole District, unlike other districts is one zone for both residential and non-residential parking standards as your officers did not agree that



there were sufficient differences in geography within the District to justify a zoned approach.

Development Management officers have been consulted and they are concerned that in this District where car ownership is so high, any decrease in parking standards from the current standards is not desirable. They are also concerned about using ½ spaces such as in the housing standards (see table above).

Of particular concern is the significant drop in the parking standard for offices. The Bucks proposed standards would require 7 spaces less than current standards for each 500 square metres of office floorspace. On a large scheme, in what would almost certainly be a location with relatively poor public transport, this would be likely to result in insufficient parking being provided by most office schemes. After pressure from your officers an additional clause has been inserted into Table 7 of the non-residential standards to include for deviations to reflect local circumstances provided a justification is made. In this District that exception is likely to be the rule. However, again it would be better if the optimum standard were more reflective of the more demanding circumstances in the first place, with the flexibility to allow less provision than the optimum standard where local circumstances justify it.

In response to the consultation it is suggested that we express concern regarding the above issues and other relevant concerns expressed by Members.

The District Council could not adopt the County Council's final document (post consultation) as SPD as the current consultation has not complied with the District Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Accordingly the County Council's final document could only be used by the District Council as part of the evidence base in preparing new parking standards for the District to be set out either in the Development Management Local Plan or in a parking standards SPD produced by the District Council.

## 5. Resources, Risk and Other Implications

The consultation has no direct resource implications (other than responding to the consultation). There is a risk that if the County Council were to adopt the document (either in its current form, or an amended form that did not reflect the District Council's views), that it might be referred to by developers in support of their applications and appeals, and that as it had been prepared more recently than the District Council's current standards, that it might be given more weight at appeal.

## 6. Recommendation(s)

To respond to County expressing concern that the decrease in parking standards from the current standards; the use of ½ spaces and the potential effect on future office development and authorise the Head of Sustainable Development to finalise the wording of the Council's response.

Officer Contact:	Jane Griffin 01895 837315 jane.griffin@southbucks.gov.uk
Background Papers:	<a href="https://democracy.buckscc.gov.uk/mgConsultationDisplay.aspx?ID=925">https://democracy.buckscc.gov.uk/mgConsultationDisplay.aspx?ID=925</a>

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>The Duty to Co-operate and Planning for Strategic Cross Boundary Matters</b>
<b>REPORT OF:</b>	<b>Officer Management Team - Director of Services</b> <b>Prepared by - Head of Sustainable Development</b>

## 1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This report records the activity that has taken place in relation to the statutory duty to co-operate.

## 2. Links to Council Policy Objectives

- 2.1 Effective outcomes as a result of the duty to co-operate are linked to each set of priority action areas set out in the South Bucks Sustainable Community Strategy:

- A sustainable environment
- A thriving economy
- Safe communities
- Health and well-being for all
- Cohesive and strong communities.

## 3. Background

- 3.1 The duty to co-operate was created in the Localism Act 2011, and amends the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It places a legal duty on local planning authorities, county councils and specified public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of local plan preparation relating to strategic cross-boundary matters. The duty to co-operate came into effect in November 2011. A local planning authority must demonstrate how it has complied with the duty at the independent examination of its local plan. If a local authority cannot demonstrate that it has complied with the duty, the local plan will not be able to proceed further through the Examination and the Inspector will recommend that the plan is not adopted. The duty to co-operate is separate from, but related to, the local plan tests of soundness.
- 3.2 The duty to co-operate applies to all local planning authorities who are in the process of preparing and reviewing a local plan. Even if a local planning authority has an adopted local plan (such as South Bucks District), it is still required to co-operate with another local planning authority that is bringing forward a plan.
- 3.3 A report on the duty to co-operate was presented to the meeting of the Sustainable Development PAG held on 13 March 2014. Cabinet subsequently resolved that authority be delegated to the Head of Sustainable Development to respond, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development, to requests from other local planning authorities for input to their local plans/evidence base, and to provide comments to the Mayor of London on the London Plan.
- 3.4 Sustainable Development PAG agreed to receive regular updates on duty to co-operate activities. This report is the latest update.

## 4. Discussion

- 4.1 The attached spreadsheet sets out the Council's most recent duty to co-operate activities in terms of both the Council's own plan-making, and the ways in which we have responded to requests from other Councils.

## 5. Resources, Risk and Other Implications

- 5.1 This report has no direct cost implications. Ensuring the Council meets its duty to co-operate is vital in the plan-making process in order to reduce the chance of plans being found to be unsound at

Examination. Councillors have an important role to play in ensuring effective planning for strategic matters through the duty to co-operate.

**6. Summary**

6.1 This report is for the information of Members.

<b>Officer Contact:</b>	Alison Bailey, Principal Planner - Policy, 01895 837247 <a href="mailto:alison.bailey@southbucks.gov.uk">alison.bailey@southbucks.gov.uk</a>
<b>Background Papers:</b>	None

## Duty to Co-operate: South Bucks District Council Local Plan Preparation, From 1 March 2014

Strategic Cross Boundary Issue	Local Plan Document	Who We Engaged With	Named Officers	SBDC Officer(s)	Date	What We Did	Political Interactions	Key Points Made
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan			Hamah Butterfield	01/01/2013			
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Wycombe District Council	Rosie Brake, Ian Manktelow	Paul Geehan and David Holmes	25/10/2013	Duty to Cooperate Meeting	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	New Local Plan being written which will include site allocations to meet the needs of gypsies and travellers.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Ian Bellinger, Phillip Gill	Paul Geehan and David Holmes	13/11/2013	Duty to Cooperate Meeting	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	GTNAs are being written for both authorities. The forthcoming consultation will not propose any allocations for G&Ts, but will include a criteria based policy to assist in future allocation / development management decisions.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	London Borough of Hillingdon	James Gleave	Hamah Butterfield and David Holmes	05/02/2014	Duty to Cooperate Meeting	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Hillingdon are currently undertaking a GTAA. One of the options for South Bucks is to look towards adjoining authorities to see if they can help in accommodating future need; Hillingdon confirmed that they are unlikely to be in a position to assist in meeting the need for G&T pitches.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Bucks County Council	Darl Sweetland	Hamah Butterfield, Paul Geehan and Peter Beckford	17/03/2014	Meeting regarding the three publicly owned traveller sites in South Bucks	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Bucks CC are looking at their traveller site and how they could be managed, sold or could otherwise reduce the revenue and capital costs of them. Sites being considered are Mansion Lane, Wapseys Wood and Bottoms Walton.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	All statutory consultees		Hamah Butterfield	19/03/2014	Email sent out inviting comments on the Issues and Options and Call for Sites consultation	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Email inviting comments on the Issues and Options and Call for Sites consultation.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Chiltern District Council, Wycombe District Council, Aylesbury Vale District Council and ORS consultants	Chiltern: Graham Winwright, Helen Harding Wycombe: David Dewar Aylesbury Vale: Lyndsey Beveridge, Louise Stevens ORS: Nigel Moore	Hamah Butterfield, Paul Geehan and Peter Beckford	01/04/2014	Meeting with ORS regarding GTNA evidence base and the need for a 2014 review	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	In light of planning decisions from recent appeals and local plan examinations, ORS considered it necessary to update the GTNA report to make it more robust for Bucks districts.

## Appendix

### Duty to Co-operate: South Bucks District Council Local Plan Preparation, From 1 March 2014

Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Wycombe District Council	David Dewar	Hannah Butterfield	04/04/2014	Received response to Issues and Options consultation	Overview of issues raised and consultation responses received reported to SDPAG on 12/06/2014.	Wycombe also has significant land constraints such as Chiltern AONB and Green Belt, therefore will be unlikely to be able to help meet identified need in South Bucks. Other authorities should only be considered to assist where all other options have been fully explored. Also have some concerns over the site selection criteria.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Three Rivers District Council	Claire May, Ben Lawless and David Holmes	Hannah Butterfield and Jane Griffin	14/04/2014	Duty to Cooperate Meeting	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Three Rivers have a very low Gypsy population, with a current need for 7 pitches. They are proposing to allocate existing temporary sites that are currently in use and these sites also have room for expansion should the need arise. Three Rivers are currently preparing documents for future submission, and hopeful for examination in September.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Three Rivers District Council	David Holmes	Hannah Butterfield	16/04/2014	Received response to Issues and Options consultation	Overview of issues raised and consultation responses received reported to SDPAG on 12/06/2014.	Welcome paper and support many of the points made within in. Query the approach towards other authorities in helping meet South Bucks need as an option - Three Rivers will not be able to assist due to the struggle they had in finding enough for just 7 pitches. Also note that you cannot allocate sites within the Green Belt, therefore you should designate areas and make insets into the Green Belt to meet the identified need, as set out in the NPPF.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Chiltern District Council		Hannah Butterfield	17/04/2014	Follow up email sent to authority asking whether they were planning to respond to the Issues and Options consultation	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Queried whether the authority planned to respond to the Issues and Options consultation as a statutory consultee, and whether they needed more time.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	London Borough of Hillingdon		Hannah Butterfield	17/04/2014	Follow up email sent to authority asking whether they were planning to respond to the Issues and Options consultation	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Queried whether the authority planned to respond to the Issues and Options consultation as a statutory consultee, and whether they needed more time.

## Duty to Co-operate: South Bucks District Council Local Plan Preparation, From 1 March 2014

Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Slough Borough Council	Hannah Butterfield	17/04/2014	Follow up email sent to authority asking whether they were planning to respond to the Issues and Options consultation	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Queried whether the authority planned to respond to the Issues and Options consultation as a statutory consultee, and whether they needed more time.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Hannah Butterfield	17/04/2014	Follow up email sent to authority asking whether they were planning to respond to the Issues and Options consultation	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Queried whether the authority planned to respond to the Issues and Options consultation as a statutory consultee, and whether they needed more time.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Bucks County Council	Hannah Butterfield	17/04/2014	Follow up email sent to authority asking whether they were planning to respond to the Issues and Options consultation	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Queried whether the authority planned to respond to the Issues and Options consultation as a statutory consultee, and whether they needed more time.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Chiltern District Council	Graham Winwright	17/04/2014	Received response to Issues and Options consultation	Overview of issues raised and consultation responses received reported to SDPAG on 12/06/2014.	Welcomed the issues and options paper and ongoing engagement, particularly in light of Chiltern not being able to meet their own need for sites in the district. Would request for knowledge/responses to be shared with regards to travelling showpeople as Chiltern has an identified need, and South Bucks do not.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	London Borough of Hillingdon	Brianne Stopler	17/04/2014	Email correspondence took place agreeing to a deadline of 23/04/2014. No response has been received.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Email recognised that no response has been made and requested more time to respond.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Chiltern District Council	Chiltern: Graham Winwright, Helen Harding Wycombe: Ian Manktelow, David Dewar Aylsebury Vale: Lyndsey Beveridge, Louise Stevens Three Rivers: Claire May, David Holmes	24/04/2014	Chiltern Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople meeting in relation to Chiltern DDPD		Chiltern are unable to meet their need for Gypsies and Travellers without encroaching onto the Green Belt. Therefore are asking authorities to share their need.
Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Slough Borough Council	Hannah Butterfield	28/04/2014	An email was received recognising that no response had been sent, but no consultation response has been received.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Recognised that no response had been made to the issues and options consultation.

# Appendix

## Duty to Co-operate: South Bucks District Council Local Plan Preparation, From 1 March 2014

Gypsy & Travellers	Gypsy and Travellers Plan	Slough Borough Council	Paul Stimpson and Neetal Rajput	Jane Griffin	28/04/2014	Duty to Cooperate Meeting	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014	Atkins have a done a Berkshire wide strategy. Slough only have 2 sites in Colnbrook – 8 pitches in total but are aware that they probably need 8 more but would need to release land from the GB. The sites also have flooding issues. They cannot accommodate any of South Bucks needs without also releasing land from the GB.
Housing	SHMA	Hillingdon Borough Council	James Gleave	Jane Griffin	14/05/2014	Email informing of Bucks-wide work to identify SHMA geography and establishing interest in reviewing the consultants brief and any subsequent involvement.		
Housing	SHMA	Spelthorne Borough Council	John Brooks	Jane Griffin	14/05/2014	Email informing of Bucks-wide work to identify SHMA geography and establishing interest in reviewing the consultants brief and any subsequent involvement.		
Housing	SHMA	Runnymede Borough Council	Georgina Pacey	Jane Griffin	14/05/2014	Email informing of Bucks-wide work to identify SHMA geography and establishing interest in reviewing the consultants brief and any subsequent involvement.		Request to review draft brief
Housing	SHMA	Slough Borough Council	Paul Stimpson	Jane Griffin	14/05/2014	Email informing of Bucks-wide work to identify SHMA geography and establishing interest in reviewing the consultants brief and any subsequent involvement.		Request to review draft brief
Housing	SHMA	Stakeholders		Alison Bailey	28/08/2014	ORS/Atkins emailed a range of stakeholders informing them of the study to define housing market and economic market areas and explaining the opportunities that there will be to get involved.		



## Duty to Co-operate: Other Local Authorities' Formal Consultations, From 1 March 2014

Local Authority	Local Plan Document	Strategic Cross Boundary Issue(s)	SBDC Officer(s)	Deadline	Response Date	Comments	Political Interactions
Three Rivers District Council	Gypsy & Travellers Plan	Gypsies & Travellers	HB	07/03/2014	05/03/2014	No objection but drew attention to our G&T needs.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014
Three Rivers District Council	Site Allocations LDD Modifications	None	HB	18/03/2014	18/03/2014	Generally supportive but acknowledged had made difficult decision to use Green Belt.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014
RBWM	Local Plan	Housing need	PG	21/03/2014	05/03/2014	Objections: no consultation on SHMA and no clarity on meeting overall housing need.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014
Bucks County Council	Statement of Community Involvement	None	PG	31/03/2014	26/03/2014	No fundamental problems. Suggested could be shorter with some of the text in the LDS.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014
Wycombe District Council	Local Plan Options Consultation	Gypsies & Travellers	JG	04/04/2014	03/04/2014	Drew attention to our G&T needs.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014
Wycombe District Council	Local Plan Options Consultation	Housing need	JG	04/04/2014	03/04/2014	Raised possibility of joint SHMA.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014
Chiltern District Council	Delivery DPD	Gypsies & Travellers	JG	04/04/2014	03/04/2014	Concerns re. G&T site delivery.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014
Mayor of London	Further Alterations to the London Plan	Housing need	AB	10/04/2014	10/04/2014	Support ambition to achieve a step-change in housing delivery in London, but London needs to do more to meet its own housing needs. Object to policies that plan for 42,000 homes per year.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014
London Boroughs of Brent, Ealing, Harrow, Hillingdon, Hounslow and Richmond-Upon-Thames	West London Waste Plan	Waste	HB	11/04/2014	11/04/2014	Support for waste hierarchy and removal of Tavisstock Road Coal Depot as a potential site. Continued reliance on waste movements out of West London is not sustainable in the long-term.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014
Chiltern District Council	Chalfont St Peter Neighbourhood Plan	None	HB	22/04/2014	22/04/2014	No comment.	
Aylesbury Vale District Council	SHMA	Housing need	PG	25/04/2014	25/04/2014	Welcomed the clear statement that AVDC recognise that AVDC may need to make some provision for other authorities' unmet need and that there is likely to be unmet need in S Bucks. Comments on appropriate geography for a SHMA for Aylesbury Vale.	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014
Aylesbury Vale District Council	Vale of Aylesbury Plan Scoping		PG	28/05/2014	16/05/2014	Need to consider sub-region under Duty to Co-operate; need for more houses in AV than in the previously submitted VALP	Reported to SDPAG 12/06/2014
Aylesbury Vale District Council	Brief for Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA)	Housing need and Employment	PG	26/05/2014	22/05/2014	Response adds to comments made by CDC	
Three Rivers District Council	Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule	CIL	AB	04/08/2014	21/07/2014	No comment.	
Aylesbury Vale District Council	Vale of Aylesbury Plan HEDNA	Housing need and Employment	AB	-	07/08/2014	Confirmed that a full objective assessment of housing need is unlikely to be available by February 2015. SBDC will provide such information as is available in line with the AVDC timetable and will work with AVDC to seek agreement on evidence, assumptions and conclusions.	
Runnymede BC & Spelthorne BC	Runnymede & Spelthorne SHMA	Housing need	AB		20/08/2014	Attended consultant presentation on defining housing market areas.	

# Appendix

## Duty to Co-operate: Other Local Authorities' Formal Consultations, From 1 March 2014

Runnymede BC & Spelthorne BC	Runnymede & Spelthorne SHMA	Housing need	AB	05/08/2014	04/05/2014	Confirmed that the travel to work and migration flows between South Bucks and Runnymede/Spelthorne do not appear to be significant. The extent of any relationship(s) will be confirmed through the current Bucks-wide work on defining HMA & FEMA.	Comments agreed by Portfolio Holder
Chiltern District Council	Sustainable Construction and Renewable Energy Supplementary Planning Document	Sustainability and Energy	HB	08/09/2014	08/09/2014	Welcomed the plan and are supportive of it. Comments made in relation to some references to sustainability sources and out of date policies or documents; but overall the plan seems to be based on good evidence and background.	Comments agreed by Portfolio Holder
Aylesbury Vale District Council	Vale of Aylesbury Plan HEDNA	Housing need and Employment	AB	-	12/09/2014	Attended presentation on defining housing market and economic areas and on initial demographic analysis	
Dacorum Borough Council	SW Herts SHMA	Housing need	AB	19/09/2014	22/09/2014	Accepted invitation to participate in SHMA Project Advisory Group.	Approach agreed by Portfolio Holder

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank