

## **Proposal for preparing a South Warwickshire Plan involving Stratford-on-Avon District Council and Warwick District Council**

---

### **Introduction**

This paper has been prepared jointly by officers from Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SDC) and Warwick District Council (WDC) for consideration and agreement by both Councils.

Both SDC and WDC have agreed to prepare a Local Plan for both Council areas, given the economic and geographic functional synergies between the two Districts and the fact that both Districts are keen to commence early reviews of their adopted Local Plan/Core Strategy.

The purpose of this paper is to consider a number of key issues that need to be addressed before the two councils commence preparation of a South Warwickshire Plan (SWP), and then to make recommendations based on these. The key issues and recommendations can be summarised around a number of key questions:-

1. What is the case for preparing a joint Local Plan?
2. What might a Joint Local Plan look like?
3. What organisational / staffing structure is required to deliver a SWP?
4. What governance arrangements should we put in place to support and manage the delivery of the SWP?
5. What might be an indicative work programme?
6. What might be the financial implications?
7. What are the next steps for taking this work forward?

It is worth noting here that the current government White Paper ("Planning for the future" August 2020) proposes some significant changes to the scope of Local Plans. This will impact on both Councils regardless of how each decides to progress its Local Plan review. These changes will also require new primary legislation and, even once enacted, there will be transitional arrangements put in place as all local authorities update their plans to follow the new format and scope. There will therefore be a considerable time before both Councils know when and how these proposed changes will impact on our Local Plan review. There are good reasons for each Council to make progress now on Local Plan review, and therefore the advent of the White Paper is not a reason to delay this work. Having said that, it would be prudent to seek to ensure as far as possible, that the SWP is future proofed and anticipates expected changes. It is worth remembering, that irrespective of the system for preparing Local Plans, the evidence sitting behind them will remain the same. Indeed, the Government's Chief Planner has advised that the proposed reforms should not be seen as an opportunity to pause the preparation of plans and address the development challenges facing local areas.

It should also be noted that both Councils have been involved in discussions about joint plan-making for the Coventry and Warwickshire sub-region. Those discussions are ongoing. There is no conflict between these discussions and the Proposal for a single SWP. Indeed, it represents a continuation of existing practices of joint preparation for the evidence base to underpin Local Plans.

By way of background, the preparation of Local Plans is led by a Service Manager. Whilst there are similarities between the planning policy service structures of both Councils, there are some important differences:

	SDC	WDC
<b>Head of Service</b>	Deputy Chief Executive	Head of Development Services
<b>Service Manager</b>	Policy Manager (Enterprise, Housing & Planning)	Policy & Projects Manager
<b>Teams</b>	Local Plans Housing Policy & Development "Enterprise & Planning Projects"*	Policy & Delivery (i.e. Local Plans) Enterprise Projects & Economic Development
* Not a defined team as such but staff led by a Senior Policy Planner reporting directly to the Policy Manager		

WDC has a much larger economic development function than SDC. Reflecting the holistic approach to plan-preparation, the SDC Policy Service also includes Housing Policy and Development, which leads on housing enabling and the provision of affordable housing. These activities sit within the Housing Service at WDC. All aspects of CIL also sit within the Policy Service at WDC, whereas CIL administration at SDC is within the Central Administration Service. The WDC Projects & Economic Development function also includes the Business Support & Events team.

Whilst the focus of this proposal at the current time is the preparation of a Local Plan for the two Council areas, this collaborative approach is a natural precursor to closer integration and working in the context of Local Government Review.

## 1. What is the case for preparing a Joint Local Plan for South Warwickshire (SWP)?

The geography of south Warwickshire means that Stratford on Avon and Warwick Districts have a strong relationship in relation to infrastructure (M40/A46/rail links/etc) the economy (JLR; Tourism; commuting); population migration; social and cultural offer, and environmental assets (such as the River Avon and canal network). On this basis alone, there is a strong planning case for closer working for strategic planning issues. This is particularly with respect to the following:-

- accommodating housing growth: the two authorities face housing pressures from two housing market areas: the Coventry & Warwickshire HMA (WDC & SDC) and the Birmingham HMA (SDC). It will also enable a comprehensive approach to be taken to strategic cross-boundary issues such as Green Belt. The SWP will include a Green Belt Review which would ideally be carried out as part of a wider review of the West Midlands Green Belt across the Coventry & Warwickshire sub-region.
- infrastructure planning: similarly, infrastructure cross local authority boundaries and key road (e.g. M40, M42 and A46) and rail infrastructure link the two districts with the wider sub-region and beyond, offering opportunities as well as challenges for how these can best be supported. A joint approach to strategic planning would help shape a case for where additional infrastructure investment should be directed and how it should be funded and provided.

- allocation of employment land: there is a strong link between the economies of the two districts that would benefit from a shared understanding and policy framework. This includes where employment should be located (including with respect to major transport corridors), how major local employers working in both districts (e.g. JLR) can best be supported and tackling pressing common local issues such as the availability of affordable employment land.
- adapting and mitigating climate change: the environment has no boundaries and there is greater scope for a more environmentally-focused approach across a wider geography including to take account of environmental opportunities

Importantly, this approach enables a South Warwickshire approach to the development challenges facing both Districts and in doing so the SWP will be 'local authority boundary blind'.

There is therefore a logic to the two councils working more closely together to address these strategic planning matters. The two councils have agreed in principle to consider conducting a joint review of the council's respective Core Strategy / Local Plan. A joint SWP would be a logical way for strategic planning decisions affecting both districts to be made. There is provision in section 28 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 for two or more planning authorities to agree to prepare a single development plan document for both their areas. It furthermore follows that both authorities should undertake a Joint Local Plan on the basis that the whole of South Warwickshire (SDC and WDC geographical areas) can be treated as a single entity for the purpose of the Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION: both councils, working together, commit to preparing a Local Plan for South Warwickshire pursuant to section 28 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and that this commitment guides consideration of all the following recommendations set out in this report.**

#### Duty to Cooperate

As part of any plan preparation, all local authorities are required to cooperate with one another on cross-boundary issues. Failure to do so can lead to plans being found unsound by inspectors, leading to considerable delays in bringing forward a plan if the duty is not complied with. Part of this cooperation involves liaising with wider outside bodies as appropriate. As part of preparing a SWP, and given that the whole of south Warwickshire is being treated as a single geographic entity for the purposes of plan making, it is a fundamental principle that the two authorities speak with one voice as part of the Duty to Cooperate requirement. This will normally be as part of officer-to-officer meetings and engagement, but may also include Member engagement. This will include, as necessary, on matters which previously would only have impacted on one of the authorities. For example, both councils are in the Coventry & Warwickshire Housing Market Area (HMA) and would be involved in discussions over housing numbers and distribution within this area. SDC, however, is also in the Greater Birmingham HMA and is involved in these discussions also. In future, both councils will share information on, and involvement in, the Greater Birmingham HMA as part of Duty to Cooperate. The Planning White Paper proposes that the statutory duty be repealed but, even if this comes to pass, effective co-operation between authorities and the ability to speak with one voice will remain vital.

On a day to day basis, this requirement will be managed by the SWP Team under the guidance of the SWP Management Team (see section 6 below).

**RECOMMENDATION:** both SDC and WDC agree to share information and to work together as a single team in all respects in the preparation of the SWP including for the purposes of the “Duty to Cooperate” requirements.

## 2. What might a South Warwickshire Plan look like?

It is recognised that the scope of this may – to an extent – evolve as work progresses, and so any scope should not be too rigidly prescribed at this stage. Also notwithstanding the above comments on the Government White Paper, the following is suggested as a likely scope for any Local Plan review.

Definitely in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development strategy including spatial strategy</li> <li>- Place shaping and visions for towns</li> <li>- Levels of housing and employment growth</li> <li>- Directions of growth</li> <li>- Strategic infrastructure</li> <li>- Major green belt revisions</li> <li>- Climate change policies</li> <li>- Strategic employment and housing allocations</li> <li>- Strategic Green and Blue Infrastructure</li> </ul>
Possibly in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Major allocations</li> <li>- Strategic town centre policies</li> <li>- Employment land policies</li> <li>- Affordable housing</li> </ul>
Probably not in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Non strategic town centre policies (retail frontages, etc)</li> <li>- Non strategic allocations (including small allocations in villages)</li> <li>- Local development management policies</li> <li>- Open space policies</li> </ul>
Definitely not in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed local policies, eg: parking,</li> <li>- Policies for specific sites except where these relate to strategic allocations or revisions to the Green Belt</li> </ul>

The rationale for this suggested scope is not because those matters that may “probably” or “definitely” not be in the SWP are not important, nor that they would not necessarily be appropriate for joint working across the two authorities. The scope is being suggested so that the SWP can focus on the key strategic priorities that any Local Plan review needs to focus on and speed up the timetable for preparing the SWP. Other matters can be dealt with outside of the SWP, either as separate Development Plan Documents or Supplementary Planning Documents as appropriate. There could well be a good case for these being prepared jointly, and this should be kept under active review.

The details of the precise scope of the SWP will be agreed as work progresses, including through joint member involvement in the governance of the SWP (see below).

Importantly, the preparation of the SWP will be informed by the lessons learnt from both Councils from preparing their current plans.

**RECOMMENDATION:** the scope set out above forms the basis for starting work on the SWP and that this will be kept under review as the work progresses. This would include preparation of a joint evidence base as well as a call for strategic sites.

### 3. What organisational/staffing structure is required to deliver the South Warwickshire Plan?

There are potentially four options to deliver a SWP:-

- a. The two Services remain wholly separate but work collaboratively to prepare the SWP
- b. A shared project team, drawn from officers across both councils, is created to prepare the SWP lead by a dedicated project lead officer. Team members would work on the SWP on as required. Non-SWP functions would remain with respective Councils.
- c. A dedicated SWP team is created staffed by officers on secondment from both Councils. Non-SWP functions remain with respective Councils.
- d. The two services merge completely to create a single Policy Unit to deliver all policy services for both Councils.

In determining the most appropriate option, consideration also needs to be given to the other work streams currently undertaken by the planning teams in each respective Policy Service, and these are summarised below. A particular issue is the preparation of the Gypsy and Traveller Plan. Depending on its scope, this topic could be included within the SWP. Alternatively, the two Councils could also agree to preparing a separate SWP specifically for Gypsies and Travellers. Unsurprisingly, many are duplicated because each LPA is obliged to prepare its own version of planning-related documents and data. However, there could be scope, depending on the option, for efficiencies to be achieved by removing some duplication of effort.

- G&T Plan
- Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS)
- CIL Spend
- Monitoring & 5YHLSC
- Self-build Register
- Brownfield Land Register
- Conservation Area Assessments
- SHLAA / Urban Capacity
- Neighbourhood Plans<sup>1</sup>

SDC Only:

- Site Allocations Plan
- G&T SPD
- Parish Plans
- Cotswolds AONB

WDC Only:

- Climate Change Plan
- Canalside Plan

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a significant work stream for SDC

In addition, each Council has to produce a Local Development Scheme (LDS) or plan timetable and a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) setting out how they will engage stakeholders and communities in plan preparation. Both will require co-ordination in respect of the SWP.

As a wider consideration, thought also needs to be given as to where CIL would sit in each respective Council. SDC is keen to review its CIL regime alongside its plan review but doing so could have resource implications. A SWP would, at the very least, require co-ordination in terms of infrastructure provision. Retaining separate CIL regimes could pose practical difficulties. At the very least, agreement would be required for a certain percentage to be spent on South Warwickshire-wide infrastructure to deliver the SWP.

#### Option A - Collaboration

It is unlikely that this option would work on a practical level. In particular, there would be no single officer taking responsibility and ownership for the preparation of the plan. Allocating work responsibilities could prove difficult with junior officers unclear about a 'chain of command'.

#### Option B - Shared Project Team

This option would resolve the ownership issue and enable a chain of command for SWP work. Officers from both Councils would be brought in, as appropriate, for SWP work. Tension may arise however in terms of prioritisation of workloads between SWP and non-SWP work. The SWP Lead would report to both existing Policy Managers but also directly to a SWP Member Working Group (see below).

The Councils would have to agree how the dedicated project lead officer post was to be funded and delivered. Would this be through the creation of a new post (jointly funded by both councils) or would it be created through a secondment opportunity? If through a secondment opportunity, then it is likely that one council would provide the secondee and the other would need to provide a financial contribution to fund 50% of this post. Other posts in the team would remain with their respective Councils.

#### Option C - Dedicated SWP Team

This is an extension of option B above, but with the creation of a dedicated core "SWP Team". It would be staffed by both authorities putting staff at the disposal of each other under section 113 of the Local Government Act 2972, which would not constitute a formal secondment or alter their employment status. The two Council's would jointly recruit staff from the two existing Policy Services, in the first instance.

The major benefit of this approach is that it provides a dedicated resource to prepare the SWP with officers focused solely on this task without being 'distracted' by other priorities. Those planning policy officers that are not assigned to the SWP Team would remain within their authority to progress other planning policy work outside of the SWP. There would need to be an expectation, however, that all officers would be available to support the work of the SWP Team at key times or to provide specific skills. This would include, for example, at key points when commissioning elements of the evidence base, during public consultation exercises and during the Public Examination. In this way, the effective capacity of the team could flex to meet operational requirements.

This Team could comprise, as a minimum, a Manager, Senior Planning Policy Officer and Planning Assistant. In addition, the potential for a dedicated project manager role to lead on the successful delivery of this major project will be explored. A smaller core team would have less impact on the

wider service but may not be as effective in terms of delivery (depending on other priorities) although it could be established on the proviso that the team would expect to call on both individual authority's teams for additional help where required. A significantly larger team could negatively impact upon the residual functions of both Councils.

Both Councils would fund 50% of the staffing costs. It is expected that the team will be staffed from existing staff resources, although there may need to be some financial contribution (in lieu of personnel) depending on salary grading.

The exact role and grading of the Team Manager post is still to be determined. It is acknowledged that there could be a lack of clarity for this post-holder in terms of line management. However, this post would 'report' to the South Warwickshire Plan Advisory Group (see Section 4 below) to ensure consistent oversight from both Councils. In establishing the post, both Councils could commit to reviewing the scope and remit of the role after 6 months to see how effective the new arrangements were. This approach is considered to be a pragmatic first step to the preparation of the SWP.

#### Option D - Shared Service / Joint Policy Unit

This option would see both planning policy services combined and restructured into a single Joint Policy Unit. A SWP Team would be set up within this unit, but there would be a wider merging of the functions of each authority including, importantly at Senior Management level. This would create a clear framework within which resources across the two authorities could be combined and work that could be reasonably carried out on a cross-authority basis could be undertaken.

A JPU would be more challenging to set up, with potential greater impacts on existing staff. As set out above, whilst there are synergies between the two Council's Policy Services there are some important differences. The Council's would need to resolve what service functions are included in any JPU and any consequential structural implications. The fact that both Council's already operate Policy Services that encompass functions outside of the land-use planning system suggests that they both appreciate and understand the benefits of a holistic approach to plan-making and better outputs that can be achieved when the teams responsible for planning strategy are combined with those for economic and housing strategy, for example.

One further benefit of a JPU could be in terms of the ICT support packages, e.g. GIS, consultation databases, monitoring systems etc especially where existing systems are not fit for purpose. Whilst licensing arrangements would need to be considered, migrating to shared systems would have the benefit of some staff being familiar with their use.

There are clear benefits in moving towards creating a Joint Policy Unit, however to do so now would be time consuming, would impact upon existing staff and, in the short term, divert resources away from the immediate priority of progressing the SWP. Whilst a Joint Policy Unit may be a long term aspiration for both Councils many of its objectives, including – but not limited to – making progress with the SWP, can be achieved more quickly by other options. Creating a more focussed SWP Team (as proposed in option C above) creates a springboard for wider discussions about different models of closer joint working in the future.

**RECOMMENDATION: option C (a dedicated core "SWP Team") is created to manage the work of the SWP. It is also recommended that this be funded on 50/50 basis by each authority. Each council's contribution would be made up by either assigning staff or making a financial contribution to the**

other. The precise size of the SWP Team will be an operational matter, however the model set out above of a 3 FTE officer team with consideration given to a dedicated project management support, would seem an appropriate first step.

#### 4. What governance and management arrangements should we put in place to support the delivery of the SWP?

Creating a governance structure that is operationally effective, ensures good stakeholder engagement and has the confidence of councillors for both councils will be fundamentally important to the success of the SWP.

A possible governance framework – and some options within this - is set out below in the diagram below.

	Purpose (see below for further details)		
1	Formal approval of Local Plan at key stages as required by constitution	SDC Council	WDC Council
2	Formal approval of Local Plan at key stages where Full Council approval is not required by constitution	SWP Executive Committee	
3	Formal scrutiny by each Council prior to (2) above.	SDC Overview & Scrutiny Committee	WDC Scrutiny Committee
4	Focal point for stakeholder engagement	South Warwickshire Place Board	
5	Further informal stakeholder engagement with existing groups	Coventry & Warwickshire Infrastructure Partnership	Existing Stakeholder Forums (Business, Citizens, Developer, Parish)
6	A joint member working group to provide informal scrutiny of Local Plan proposals as advised by SWP Management Team (7).	South Warwickshire Plan Advisory Group	
7	Management support for officer team.	SWP Management Team	
8	Officer team delivering SWP	SWP officer team	

	Decision making
	Scrutiny
	Operational
	Advisory

Within this framework there are a few key elements that need particular consideration.

##### Formal decision making on the SWP

There are some key stages of Local Plan preparation that require formal approval by Full Council. It would mean that both Councils would need to separately approve the SWP at these key stages. At the very least, these stages are Proposed Submission consultation, the submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State, considering the Inspector’s Proposed Modifications and its final adoption. Consideration would need to be given to where authority for approval to consult on the earlier stages

of the SWP sat and whether in the circumstances of a single plan, it should also sit with the respective Councils. It would be possible to create a statutory joint committee (under section 29 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) able to make these decisions but that would require an order made by the Secretary of State establishing a new planning authority. This is thought to be an option that exceeds the pooling of responsibilities presently envisaged.

Approval of all other stages of any Local Plan/Core Strategy are currently delegated to Executive/Cabinet. There are two options available for how these decisions could be made for a SWP.

- Firstly, each council could separately and formally approve all key stages of the SWP (much as happens at the moment) through Executive/Cabinet. The main limitation here would be that one council could not progress to the next stage of plan production without the approval of the other. This option would retain sovereignty of decision making within each Council but runs the risk that if one Council refused to support the SWP, the other could not progress it.
- Secondly, both councils could agree to cede authority for agreeing the SWP to a separate Joint Executive Committee made up of Councillors from both councils. The decision of this committee would be binding on both councils.

In practice, in most places where joint strategic plans are prepared (e.g. the Black Country) authorities opt for the first option, and rely on the close joint working that has been fostered throughout the process to identify and therefore help manage the political risks inherent in such an option. However, most joint strategic plans are not prepared in the context of two councils that are actively exploring much closer working in the way that SDC and WDC currently is doing. Creating a single decision-making body for key decisions relating to the SWP would be a strong expression of the desire of both councils to work closely together to address key development challenges across both districts.

As such, it is recommended that a single Executive Committee with decision-making powers is established which then prepares a single report to the two respective Councils.

#### SWP Management Team

On a day to day level, management support for the SWP Team would be provided by a nominated Head of Service/Senior Manager from both councils. This in turn would be supported by a wider SWP Management Team. It is suggested that this is made up of the following from each authority: relevant Portfolio Holder, a member of Corporate Management Team and the HoS/Senior Manager responsible for the SWP. This Management team would meet on a regular basis (to be agreed but suggest this is on a fortnightly or monthly basis). The purpose of the Management Team is to:

- provide a regular strategic steer including when and how wider political and stakeholder engagement (the SWP Member Working Group – see below) is needed.
- give support and enabling wider resource allocation and advice where needed
- ensure key milestones are being met.

#### South Warwickshire Plan Advisory Board (SWPAB)

The SWPAB is a vital element of the wider governance structure for developing the SWP. It would not have any formal decision making role but would be a wider working and reference group of councillors for the SWP with a wide and deep informal scrutiny role. Its main purposes are as follows:

- provide an informal conduit for wider political involvement from both councils on the SWP to build knowledge of the SWP and confidence in the work that is being done

- provide a place where key issues for the SWP and key decisions could be informally discussed in a confidential setting.

The SWPAB would be a key place where (hopefully) understanding and consensus can be established built around key policy issues, including those that impact on cross-boundary issues. It would allow a greater level of Member involvement than is available through normal scrutiny committees. Meetings of the SWPAB would be private and confidential, and allow a “safe space” where councillors could discuss sometimes challenging issues and help officers to shape policy options for wider public discussion including with stakeholders.

Membership would be agreed but there would be equal representation from both councils. The SWPAG would be jointly chaired by the two relevant portfolio holders. The officer lead for this group would be the SWP Team Leader supported by the officers from within the SWP Management Team.

#### South Warwickshire Place Board

The creation of the ‘Place Board’ (akin to the former Local Strategic Partnerships) is considered integral to the success of the plan, allowing a wider group of key stakeholders to ‘buy-in’ to the plan and the process. Membership could include SDC, WDC, town councils, Warwickshire Association of Local Councils (WALC), Warwickshire County Council, CWLEP, Chambers of Commerce, Shakespeare’s England, BIDs, Universities and key businesses.

SDC has put together a model for a Place Board and it is considered that this offers a good model which could easily be expanded to incorporate key stakeholders in Warwick District. A draft of the Place Board (as it relates to SDC) is shown in appendix A. In addition to the main Place Board it includes a number of sub groups. The exact composition of the Place Board can be agreed by the SWP Management Team in consultation with the SWPAB.

There are also a number of existing stakeholder networks operating across the two districts. In addition to the Place Board, these groups will need to be engaged and consulted with in developing the SWP.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

- **the above governance model is used as the basis for delivering the SWP.**
- **In respect of any decisions and recommendations currently made by the Cabinet at SDC and Executive at WDC, the Executives will explore more detailed proposals for their replacement by a single Joint Executive Committee made up of Councillors from both councils. Where a decision is made by this committee, this will be binding on both councils.**

**Councillor composition of the SWP committees/groups will agreed by the Leaders of SDC and WDC, on the basis of parity between the two councils**

## **5. Indicative work programme**

Both Authorities Local Development Schemes show the Plan Review submission stage public consultation taking place in quarter 4 of 2022. In order to get to this stage an indicative work programme is set out below:

Date	Stage
Autumn 2020	Initial stakeholder engagement and Housing & Economic Development Needs Assessments (HEDNA) commissioned
2021	Prepare all other evidence base, compare extant policies with revised NPPF, drafting of new policies
Jan/Feb 2021	Initial spatial options consultation and call for strategic sites
Mar 2021	Deadline for south of Coventry limited Review (will require WDC Exec paper deferring)
Winter 2021	Deliverability and viability work on strategic sites
Jan/Feb 2022	Preferred options consultation
Spring 2022	Second call for sites if required
Summer 2022	Finalise draft SWP (inc. allocations)
Oct 2022	Public consultation (Submission Stage)
Spring 2023	Public Examination
Autumn 2023	Proposed Modifications
Spring 2024	Adoption of SWP

It is recognised that this timetable is ambitious, and indeed the first task is being carried out jointly by authorities across Coventry and Warwickshire so it is reliant on wider cross boundary cooperation.

Once the SWP Team is in place, an initial priority will be to review this timetable. Once this is done, both SDC and WDC will need to review their respective Local Development Schemes. The timetable will also need to be kept under review to take account of any changes to the planning system itself as a result of the Government's proposed reforms of the planning system.

## 6. Financial Implications

The funding of the officer team (the SWP Team) will be on a 50/50 basis as set out in the recommendation in section 5 above. Whilst it is proposed that the Place Board and stakeholder groups would be serviced by Policy staff, consideration needs to be given to how any joint committees are serviced and resourced.

Other costs of preparing a revised Local Plan are recognised to be significant. Officers are currently working to establish an estimate which will include the cost of the evidence base, public consultation and the Public Examination. As a guide, the cost of preparing each current Local Plan/Core Strategy (not including officer costs) was approximately £1 million.

Approvals will need to be sought from within each Council (as appropriate) to make these funds available, however it is recommended that both councils commit, in principle, that all costs will be shared equally except where, by agreement, there is a particular strategic issue that is only relevant to one council. In this case, that Council would bear the additional costs. This could be, for example, where a specific piece of evidence needs to be procured. Given the suggested scope of the SWP suggested in section 4 above, it is considered that there will be few cases where this will be the case.

**RECOMMENDATION: the above approaches to Finance are adopted as founding principles underpinning the work on the SWP.**

## **7. Next steps**

This paper is being considered by Warwick District Council at its Executive on 1<sup>st</sup> October and Stratford District Council at its Cabinet on 5<sup>th</sup> October.

**Subject to both councils agreeing to the recommendations contained in this report at these meetings, the following next steps are RECOMMENDED.**

- 1. Officers work together to engage with staff, draft job descriptions and to appoint officers to the SWP Team.**
- 2. Officers agree any detailed financial arrangements relating to funding the SWP Team within the framework set out in this report.**
- 3. Officers and members agree a shared approach to managing the SWP Team within the framework set out in this report.**
- 4. The two Council Leaders agree an approach to creating the Joint Local Plan Advisory Board and appoint councillors to this group.**

FINAL VERSION: 21/9/20

## Appendix: Suggested model of Stratford on Avon Place Board

Underlined text refers to multiple organisations

### Stratford District Place Board

SDC, WCC, CWLEP, WMCA, CW Chamber of Commerce, Shakespeare's England, WRCC, WALC, VASA, Stratford-upon-Avon TC, Alcester TC, Shipston-on-Stour TC, Southam TC, Cotswolds AONB Conservation Board, CPRE, Stratford, SuA Town Trust

### Advisory Groups and Forums

#### CW Travel Infrastructure Group

Highways England  
Network Rail  
Midlands Connect  
WCC Highways  
WCC Public Transport  
WCC Transport Planning  
CCC Highways  
CCC Public Transport  
CCC Transport Planning  
Chiltern Railways  
West Midlands Trains  
London Northwestern Railway  
Great Western Railway  
Heart of England Community Rail Partnership  
Campaign for Better Transport  
Bus Operators

#### CW Green & Blue Infrastructure Group

Natural England  
Environment Agency  
WCC Lead Local Flood Authority  
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust  
WCC Ecology  
CCC Ecology  
Severn Trent  
Cotswolds AONB Conservation Board  
Thames Water  
Canal & River Trust  
Sport England  
WCC Archaeology  
CCC Archaeology  
Historic England  
Friends of the Earth

#### CW Resilience Infrastructure Group

Western Power  
National Grid Gas  
National Grid  
BT Open Reach  
BDUK  
Cadent Gas  
Severn Trent  
Environment Agency  
Warwickshire Police  
Warwickshire Fire & Rescue  
West Midlands Police  
West Midlands Fire & Rescue  
West Midlands Ambulance Trust  
Biffa  
Act on Energy

#### CW Community Infrastructure Group

Colleges  
CCC Education  
WCC Education  
University of Warwick  
University of Birmingham  
Sport England  
SDC Leisure  
WDC Leisure  
NBBC Leisure  
NWBC Leisure  
RBC Leisure  
WALC  
WCC Communities  
CCC Communities  
ThinkActive

#### CW Wellbeing Infrastructure Group

CW NHS Trust  
South Warks NHS Trust  
South Warks CCG  
CW CCG  
Oxford CCG  
CCC Public Health  
WCC Public Health  
SDC Housing  
WDC Housing  
NBBC Housing  
NWBC Housing  
RBC Housing  
WCC Communities  
CCC Communities  
Diocese of Gloucester  
Diocese of Coventry  
P3  
Age UK  
Citizens Advice

#### CW Developer Forum

Housebuilders  
Housing Associations  
Homes England  
National Housing Federation  
Home Builders Federation  
Land Promoters Group  
Civic Voice  
MADE

#### CW Business Forum

Businesses  
BIDs  
Federation of Small Businesses  
CW Chamber of Commerce  
WCC Economic Development  
CCC Economic Development  
CW Growth Hub  
CWLEP  
WM Growth Company  
NFU  
Country Land & Business Association

#### SDC Citizens Forum

Citizens Panel  
Youth parliament

#### SDC Parish Forums

Avon  
Arden  
Feldon  
Stour