

**Examination of the Spelthorne Core Strategy
and Policies DPD**

**Background Paper
on
Infrastructure**

July 2008

**Planning Services
Strategic Directorate (Community)
Borough of Spelthorne
Council Offices
Knowle Green
Staines
Middlesex
TW18 1XB**



Infrastructure

The purpose of this Background Paper is to set out the latest information in relation to infrastructure issues. It draws together in one place evidence gathered in the early stages of preparing the Core Strategy and Policies DPD. Some of the information is already referred to briefly within the DPD itself.

Introduction

1. Infrastructure provision forms part of the strategy of the LDF for meeting community needs, which is summarised in para 9.1 of the DPD. Strategic policy SP5 ensures provision is made for services and facilities to meet the needs of the community and adds that new developments that individually or cumulatively add to the requirements for infrastructure and services will be expected to contribute to the provision of necessary improvements. Policy CO2 requires developers to contribute in a timely way to the cost of infrastructure required as a result of any development they bring forward.
2. The approach to infrastructure in the Core Strategy needs to be consistent with the South East Plan. Policy CC5 of the draft South East Plan (CD REG 300) (page 45) links infrastructure with development provision and requires infrastructure providers to align their investment programmes to help deliver the plan's proposals. That policy also requires contributions from development to help deliver necessary infrastructure and adds that local authorities should include policies and guidance in their local development documents. The Panel Report (CD/REG/301) recommends the deletion of the part of the policy that effectively makes development conditional on necessary infrastructure being available. (see para 5.75-5.83 and Recommendation 5.5 – pages 53-57). Whilst it is accepted that the needs of individual development can be secured at the time of development and delivered through Section 106 agreements across larger areas it was unrealistic to expect all infrastructure to be in place ahead of development and to attempt to do so might slow the pace of economic development and housing delivery.
3. Infrastructure requirements are summarized in paras 2.17-2.20 of the DPD. This statement provides background information by setting out the proposals of infrastructure providers for improvements to infrastructure serving Spelthorne, including both improvements to serve the current population and any specific improvements to cater for changes due to the proposals of the Spelthorne LDF.
4. This background paper covers the following services:
 - Education
 - Adult and Community Care services
 - County Community Services
 - Health services
 - Highways
 - Emergency services
 - Water services
 - Sewerage
 - Energy supply
5. A list of organisations responding and dates of responses is contained in Appendix A.

Education

6. The document Spelthorne Population Projections April 2007 (CD.SBC 009) shows there will be a decline in school age population over the plan period. Surrey County Council has not produced any evidence to show any additional educational needs in the Borough over the plan period other than for the new Spelthorne (Brooklands) College.
7. Discussions are taking place between the County and Borough Councils to review assets available and particularly the future of learning for the 14-19 and 19+ age groups.
8. Spelthorne College in Ashford merged with Brooklands College in Weybridge in August 2007. The new Brooklands College intends to develop a widened range of courses for young people and adults with improved facilities. A planning application for the comprehensive redevelopment of the existing site for a new college was submitted in April 2008. (See also para 2.20 of the DPD).

Adult and Community Care Services

9. Surrey County Council has worked with the Borough, other authorities and PCT to develop a long term strategy and commissioning plan for the development of extra care sheltered housing over the next ten years. The North Surrey Extra Care Housing Strategy 2005 (CS/SCC/206) identifies a need for 200 units of extra care accommodation in Spelthorne by 2016. Projecting this forward to 2026 would require 400 in total. Future provision will need to meet the growth in small households including supported accommodation for the elderly (see para 2.10 of the DPD). The priority for further provision is firstly Ashford, followed by Stanwell, Sunbury and Staines.

County Community Services

10. The County library network is to be re-configured with improvements and modernisation. There are currently libraries at Ashford, Shepperton, Staines, Stanwell and Sunbury. The Stanwell library is to be encompassed within a new Health Centre in Hadrian Way/Vibia Close. There are no other proposals for relocation/extension.
11. Youth and other community service are similarly due to be reconfigured. No specific development requirements have been identified, but through the readvertising of the Core Strategy SCC has proposed the identification of the Sports Centre at Leacroft, Staines, Shepperton Youth Centre, and Fairways Day Centre Staines for redevelopment.

Health Services

12. The Surrey NHS Primary Care Trust has produced its Strategic Commissioning Plan 2007-2012 for North Surrey (CD/OTH/600), which sets out investment priorities. It identifies four Health Centres as prime candidates for significant investment, of which two, Shepperton and Stanwell, are in Spelthorne (the others are Chertsey and Walton).
13. A redevelopment scheme has been agreed for the Council's former Day Centre site in Vibia Close, Stanwell to provide a new Health Centre and Information

Centre. The existing St Davids Health Centre site in Hadrian Way will then be vacated and redeveloped for residential.

14. The redevelopment of the Shepperton Health Centre with replacement facilities on site is being considered by the PCT.
15. The other two health centres, at Staines and Sunbury, are also in need of improvement. On-site solutions are currently contemplated for both facilities by the PCT (see para 2.19 of the DPD).

Highways

16. The Highways Agency is responsible for the strategic road network, which, in Spelthorne, comprises the M3, M25, A30 and A3113 (Airport Way) The HA comments that these roads, except for the M3, J1 to J2, are generally operating at relatively high levels of stress throughout the day and are particularly congested at peak times. The Transport Statement (CD/SBC/022) shows (at para 8.2) that only the M25 and A3113 will be operating above their design capacity in 2026.
17. The HA is satisfied that the level of transport assessment in the Transport Statement is sufficient evaluation of the impact of development proposals in the LDF on the strategic road network and adds that there are no “showstoppers”.
18. The Transport Statement (CD/SBC/022) prepared by the Council has considered the impact of greater levels of housing coming forward. Paras 5.14-5.15 concludes that, because of the proportion of housing on former commercial sites and the fact commercial development has much higher am peak trip rates, the building of housing overall may lead to less am peak-hour movements. As housing increases the same benefits occur. This means that the likelihood of the South East Plan housing requirements being exceeded would not of itself add to peak-hour traffic movements and congestion but rather lead to a very small drop overall. This conclusion ignores the further beneficial impact of policies in the DPD to encourage modal shift.
19. Surrey County Council is the Highways Authority for the non trunk road network. It supports Spelthorne’s Transport Statement (CD/SBC/022). It has no objection to the scale of development proposed in the Core Strategy and Policies DPD, or to any of the Allocations subject to detailed comments that primarily relate to detailed access arrangements and sightlines. It comments that developers should be obliged to fund/provide appropriate mitigation measures to accommodate the movement impact of developments they propose.
20. At peak times there is congestion at various locations in the Borough, including the four main centres. Congestion is a feature of much of this part of the South East Region and to an even greater degree within London. Travel pattern across the Borough are complex and reflect the travel to work pattern set out in the Transport Statement. Much of the congestion is not related solely to local traffic but movements from a wide area. Irrespective of whether the Borough had more development these patterns of movement and congestion points would remain. The DPD does provide the opportunity to ensure development is located at sustainable locations and this is supported by Policy SP1. Development which is close to public transport facilities, particularly where several services exist, provide greater opportunity for non-car based travel and for the traffic impact of new development to be less than in the case of accessible locations.

21. Many objectors have cited existing traffic congestion as a reason to halt all further development, or for it to be halted in particular areas. To a large extent this is outside the Borough Council's control because decisions on the amount of development have already largely been taken in the context of the emerging South East Plan. The Panel specifically considered the issue of congestion at para 20.43 (page 295) of their report. They agreed with the analysis that existing congestion levels are high throughout the London Fringe sub-region and that the development strategy had not been led by the availability of capacity in transport infrastructure. They noted that additional travel demand related to the increment of new growth would, by definition, be marginal in relation to existing flows. They did not recommend development be halted until congestion was resolved and neither did they advocate massive road building to overcome the issue. At paras 20.92 – 20.96 of their report they endorse investment to support measures to assist modal shift generally and only to improve roads or relieve congestion in regional hubs. This is why the movement policies in this DPD focus on modal shift.

Emergency Services

22. The Fire and Rescue service operates from premises near Ashford Hospital and at Sunbury Cross. Sites are under review as the service is looking to provide modern stations in the best locations to cover current risk. They have no specific proposals at this stage, or sought for new locations to be identified by the Borough Council in the LDF.

23. Surrey Police comment that their main concerns are funding and their capacity to deliver a quality policing service, policing an elderly and more vulnerable population and policing and managing the strategic road network. Surrey Police have not identified any specific development requirements for their service for inclusion in the LDF.

24. Surrey Ambulance NHS Trust did not respond to the consultation.

Water Supply

25. Most of the Borough is served by Three Valleys Water, although Sunbury is served by Thames Water. Water companies are under a statutory duty to supply services to domestic housing on request.

26. The future plans of both companies take account of the level of growth in regional planning guidance. Three Valleys comment that in the longer term provision would need to include a new regional water resource to serve the south east, a reference to the proposed facility in the Abingdon area referred to in the draft South East Plan. Three Valleys also comment that a large amount of development in existing urban areas would require significant distribution system upgrades and expansion for which the water industry would normally recover much of the cost from developers, although where development is piecemeal it is more difficult to apportion costs between developments. While Three Valleys responded to the infrastructure consultation the company made no formal representations on the LDF.

Sewerage

27. Thames Water is responsible for sewerage services across the Borough. Spelthorne's sewage goes to the Mogden Treatment Works in West London, which has sufficient capacity to cater for current development provision and the specific proposals in the Allocations DPD.
28. No major network capacity problems have been identified with the proposals in the Allocations DPD. Thames Water comments that the onus is on the developer to demonstrate that adequate capacity exists both on and off site to serve the development. If upgrades are required the lead in time is 18 months for minor and three years for major upgrades. Unplanned upgrades necessary to accommodate development would need to be funded by the developer.

Energy Supply

29. Scottish and Southern Energy responded to say it has no comments.
30. EDF Energy registered an interest in the LDF at the issues and options stage but has not responded since.
31. National Grid responded to confirm its responsibility for the electricity transmission network and for gas pipelines. It raised the issue of development close to overhead lines but had no comment on any specific proposal. The company is not responsible for supply to domestic properties and commented that it is for local suppliers to meet any increase in demand from more housing.

Flood Risk

32. Flood related issues are dealt with in the Council's SFRA (CD/SBC/010).

List of Organisations

EDF Energy (email dated 4 October 2004)

Highways Agency (letters dated 5 May 2005 and 31 July 2007)

National Grid (letter dated 19 April 2005)

North Surrey NHS Primary Care Trust (emails dated 13 May 2005 and 20 April 2007)

Scottish and Southern Energy (email dated 3 May 2006)

Surrey County Council (Adult and Community Care Services, County Community Services, Education, Fire and Rescue Services, Transportation) (letters dated 27 April 2005 and 1 August 2007)

Surrey Police (letter dated 7 April 2005)

Thames Water (Water Supply and Sewerage) (letter dated 13 July 2005 and email dated 28 November 2006)

Three Valleys Water (Water Supply) (letter dated 24 August 2005)