

Appendix 4: Duty to Cooperate (DtC) responses summary

Statutory body	Summary points
Environmental Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lists topics EA expect any Local Plan should cover. • Regarding any further LP update, advice to focus on updating evidence base i.e., SFRA level 1 and 2 and the Water Cycle Study.
Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not consider (other than National Policy and Guidance) that there are any strategic issues or changes in circumstance that fall within their purview of historic policy advice that should be taken into account at this time.
National Highways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments other than providing several links to documentation to take account of in review. [These are likely more relevant to any update process].
Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes in circumstance / strategic issues that should be taken into account as part of the reviewing process.
County / Neighbouring Councils	Summary points
Mole Valley DC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MVDC's stage in the plan-making cycle precludes it from being able to take unmet housing 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. • Continue to engage on cross boundary matters.
Rushmoor BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider that the following cross-boundary duty-to-cooperate matters may require further engagement going forward: Housing need and housing supply; Employments needs and economic development; Infrastructure; The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area; Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople; Major sites of more than local significance.
Surrey County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Policy H1 does not include any mechanism to ensure that specialist forms of accommodation come forward. Review [Update] should address how the sufficiency of specialist housing delivery will be assessed and what remedial action will be taken if required.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once the revised Surrey Hills AONB boundary is established, consideration will be needed as to whether there should be continued protection of AGLV land not designated AONB, for example through local landscape designation. • Updates to PPG on Flood Risk and Coastal Change (e.g. change in definition of functional floodplain) and the Environment Agency’s Climate Change Allowances Guidance should be considered. • Regarding the economy, much of the evidence base is older and prior to the COVID pandemic, which has resulted in changing work patterns for many with more hybrid working and increased online shopping. National policy has also seen the creation of new use classes and further changes to permitted development rights. Local impacts will need to be understood as part of plan-making. • Any update process to consider evidence on net zero and SCC Healthy Streets for Surrey Design Code as supporting document. • Consideration if need for additional early years provision [in any update]. • [Any update to] consider SCC’s Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) and Local Nature Recovery Strategy (to be developed). • LPSS only makes mention of the old Surrey Waste Plan 2008, and the review should consider the need to update reference to the SWP at the first available opportunity. • Request new and updated local plans be subject to HIA and to include policies requiring certain developments to be informed/accompanied by an HIA.
Surrey Heath BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Borough will continue to be constrained and face challenges regarding meeting housing needs in the Borough. • No significant cross boundary issues arising from focus of spatial strategy regarding transport or infrastructure improvements.
Waverley BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertaking comprehensive update to Local Plan covering both strategic and non-strategic policies.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Waverley unlikely to be able to meet any unmet needs from neighbouring authorities. May need to work together to assess the impact of higher housing numbers.• Necessary for Waverley and Guildford to work together, with Surrey County Council and National Highways, to manage any potential impact of development on the A3.
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None received at time of writing.