**EXAMPLES OF DUTY TO CO-OPERATE IN DIFFERENT LOCATIONS**

A brief search of *Planning* the RTPI’s journal in June 2012, on how the new ‘duty to co-operate’ was working out produced the following results, which you might want to investigate and update:

* An existing 15 year old waste strategy drawn up between 7 London boroughs, must now be rewritten to comply with the duty to co-operate (waste was a county planning function under the previous system)
* 3 Lancashire authorities have produced a joint core strategy which has been ruled as sound covering Preston, South Ribble, and Chorley, based on previously agreed RSS regional strategy residential development figures
* Oxford City council is having a row with South Oxfordshire district in relation to the city wanting to export housing into this adjacent rural authority which wants to protect its part of the greenbelt, so not much hope for the duty of co-operation at present!
* BAINES (Bath and North East Somerset district council) is objected to by a developer arguing it is ‘unsound’ because it was not based on co-operation with its neighbouring authorities (Bath and Bristol), but BAINES argues this is irrelevant as its strategy is covered by the interim rule’ as it was passed in the ‘period of grace’ between when the 2011 Localism Act was passed and when the new requirements came into force.
* On the other hand there are reports of other adjacent authorities getting on well together, such as 6 local planning authorities working together in the Greater Nottingham region.
* Meanwhile some local authorities have already gone ahead and converted their previous policies to the new system and gained approval such as Plymouth.