

Initial Consultation October/November 2004

January 2005

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



Contents

List of Abbreviations ii

1 Introduction..... 1

2 How we have Consulted.....2

3 Response to the Consultation4

4 The Next Stage.....5

Appendix A: Index to Responses6

Appendix B: Schedule of comments and the Council’s Response..... 16

Appendix C: Copy of four-page Borough Bulletin insert.....55

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|-----|------------------------------------|
| LDF | Local Development Framework |
| DPD | Development Plan Document |
| SPD | Supplementary Planning Document |
| LDS | Local Development Scheme |
| SCI | Statement of Community Involvement |

1 Introduction

- 1.1 New planning legislation introduced through the Planning and Compensation Act 2004 requires all local planning authorities to produce a new plan for their areas to replace existing Local Plans. These new plans are called Local Development Frameworks (LDF). A number of separate documents make up an LDF. The Council's [Local Development Scheme](#) (LDS) sets out its programme for preparing the various parts of the Spelthorne LDF.
- 1.2 A key feature of the new system is active involvement of communities, stakeholders and commercial interests earlier in the preparation process. The aim is to seek agreement on issues that the 'framework' should consider early on. It also offers people and organisations an opportunity to influence the content of the 'framework' by sharing their knowledge and views.
- 1.3 This report sets out the Council's initial consultation on the Spelthorne Development Plan carried out between the 4 October and 15 November 2004. This early consultation is part of the Council's initial background research into the issues that the new development plan should address.
- 1.4 The following documents are collectively referred to as the 'Spelthorne Development Plan':
 - Spelthorne Development Plan - Strategy and Policies DPD
 - Spelthorne Development Plan - Proposals DPD
 - Spelthorne Development Plan - Proposals Map
- 1.5 The responses from this consultation will be taken into account when preparing the 'Spelthorne Development Plan'.
- 1.6 This consultation also included questions relating to preferred consultation methods for the LDF and major planning applications. These results will be reported in a separate document and feed into the preparation of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

2 How we have Consulted

The Borough Bulletin

- 2.1 The September issue of the Borough Bulletin contained a 4-page insert entitled – ‘Spelthorne, a question of vision, have your say’ (Appendix C). The article contained information on both the Council’s emerging Local Development Framework and Community Plan. The bulletin goes out to every household and business in Spelthorne – circa 44,000 copies.
- 2.2 The ‘have your say’ insert invited individuals to get involved in the preparation of both plans. It included two pages dedicated to the Spelthorne Local Development Framework, which invited people to do three things:
- Join our contacts list
 - Indicate how they would like to be consulted on the LDF and on major planning applications
 - Record the issues that the Spelthorne Development Plan should address

The Council’s website

- 2.3 The four-page insert was made available on the Council’s website. The response form could be accessed from an icon on the home page of the website throughout the consultation period. The form could be downloaded, completed and e-mailed. Links to the form and other information about the Council’s LDF were also available under the sections entitled ‘Local Development Framework’ and ‘Public Consultation’.

Direct mail

- 2.4 A letter and a copy of the four-page insert was sent to:
- All specific consultation bodies identified in Government planning guidance (Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12)) and in legislation (Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004).
 - All general consultation bodies identified in Government guidance (PPS12) and in legislation (Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004).
 - Other organisations or bodies representing the local community.
 - Individuals or organisations that had previously requested information on the LDF

In total 918 letters were sent.

Presentations

- 2.5 In addition to the above the Council gave presentations on the LDF to the following groups:
- Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) (25 October 2004)
 - The Student Council (20 September 2004)
 - Spelthorne Committee for Access Now (SCAN) (22 September 2004)
 - Spelthorne Chamber of Commerce (7 September 2004)
- 2.6 Information about the LDF was also distributed in the SCAN and Voluntary Action In Spelthorne (VAIS) newsletters and via e-mail to all members of the Spelthorne Chamber of Commerce.

3 Response to the Consultation

- 3.1 In total the Council received 177 responses to the consultation of which 99 raised specific issues. Others contacted us simply to be added to or removed from the contact list.
- 3.2 From the 99 responses 210 distinct issues were raised. In many cases several respondents made the same point. All of the issues raised are set out in Appendix B and grouped under 26 topic headings. The Council's response to each issue is set out in the right hand column.
- Each respondent is given a unique personal reference number and each point raised is numbered sequentially e.g. Ms Smith (31/1).
 - Each point raised is recorded under the relevant topic heading and is grouped together with other similar points.
 - Each unique point or group of points raised are contained within one box and given a unique entry reference number. This number enables points raised by particular individuals/groups to be found via the index of respondents in Appendix A.
- 3.3 Some of the issues raised were beyond the scope of the LDF. All comments received are important to the Council and have been addressed or re-directed to those who can deal with them. Where issues related to the day-to-day management of facilities or services they have been passed to the relevant section in the Council or organisation dealing with the issue. Some comments were more relevant to the preparation of the County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) and again have been forwarded.

4 The Next Stage

- 4.1 The Council will take account of all the relevant comments made in preparing the new Spelthorne Development Plan.
- 4.2 The next stage is publishing a Scoping Report which forms part of the Sustainability Appraisal process. The Scoping Report will include an initial list of issues, objectives and broad options for the new development plan.
- 4.3 Once the Scoping Report has been consulted on and the comments assessed the Council will compile a more detailed list of issues and options that the development plan could consider and a sustainability appraisal of each. The issues and options will take account of the issues raised at this stage together with background research and will be in accordance with national guidance and other policies and plans. Consultation will then take place on these issues and options.
- 4.4 Further details of the programme for the preparation of the LDF are available on the Council's website. Alternatively, please contact Sarah Oliver at s.oliver@spelthorne.gov.uk or telephone 01784 446449.

Appendix A: Index to Responses

| Last Name | Title | Initial | Organisation | Personal Ref Number | Entry Reference Number |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | Shepperton & Sunbury Scout Fellowship | 066 | 56, 132 |
| Allan | Mr | I | | 005 | 42, 152 |
| Allen | Mr | R | Surrey Education & Business Partnership | 098 | 168 |
| Anon | | | | 001 | 81 |
| Anon | | | | 025 | 129 |
| Anson | Mr | M | Sport England | 074 | 58, 59, 60 |
| Auster | Ms | V | Laleham Residents Association | 085 | 71, 75, 101, 110, 111, 118, 197 |
| Barnes | Ms | J | White Lodge Centre | 031 | 56, 160 |
| Barrett | Mr | M | | 009 | |
| Batten | Mr | N | | 046 | 23 |
| Bayliss | Ms | S | | 023 | 56,68 |
| Beecham | Mr | H | | 043 | 22, 194, 195 |

| Last Name | Title | Initial | Organisation | Personal Ref Number | Entry Reference Number |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Begeman | Mr | C | Whitgift Homes Ltd | 051 | 1 |
| Bentall | Mr | A M | The Burgoyne Road Charitable Trust | 032 | 184 |
| Blatchford | Mr | C | Blue Sky Planning | 069 | 163, 35 |
| Bond | Mrs | J | | 011 | 36, 57, 61, 70, 109, 124 |
| Bristow | Ms | P | St David's School | 048 | 81 |
| Bulford | Mrs | M | | 016 | 67, 120, 179 |
| Burrell | Mr | P | Strategic Rail Authority | 086 | 123, 136, 137, 142, 143, 144 |
| Burton | Mr & Mrs | R S | | 028 | 9 |
| Calder | Mr | R J | Ashford & District Smallholders | 075 | 63 |
| Capner | Mr | G | Barton Willmore Planning Partnership on behalf of Kempton Park Racecourse | 070 | 183 |
| Carr | Ms | C | | 017 | 5, 21, 26, 42 |
| Champion | Mr | E | Riverside Arts Centre | 039 | 93 |

| Last Name | Title | Initial | Organisation | Personal Ref Number | Entry Reference Number |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Coldman | Rev | G | Ashford Baptist Church | 035 | 56, 122 |
| Coleman | Mrs | C | | 099 | 43, 45, 49, 56, 81, 88, 90, 114, 120, 191, 204 |
| Cook | Ms | G | Thames Water | 064 | 78 |
| Cool | Ms | G | | 020 | 21 |
| Coombs | Ms | S | | 053 | 45 |
| Cotterell | Mr & Mrs | | | 041 | 43, 49, 74, 146, 153 |
| Court | Mr | P | Persimmon Home (South East) Ltd | 034 | 1, 174 |
| Cunningham | Mr | D | Humberts | 082 | 181 |
| Damerell | Ms | A | Staines Town Society | 026 | 90, 155, 164, 207 |
| Dixon | Ms | L | Bishop Duppas Bowls Club | 054 | 65 |
| Dowsett | Mr | M | | 049 | 89, 128, 80 |
| Dunkley | Mr | N | The Bishop Wand C of E School | 095 | 64, 156 |

| Last Name | Title | Initial | Organisation | Personal Ref Number | Entry Reference Number |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Edwards | Mr | J | | 012 | 24 |
| Fattal | Mr | W S | Tidegrove Ltd | 033 | 178 |
| Fellman | Mr & Mrs | | Staines Synagogue | 076 | 81, 112, 125 |
| Findlay | Mr | R W | | 084 | 153 |
| Fleckney | Mrs | D | The Matthew Arnold School | 056 | 44, 112, 196 |
| Freebody | Mrs | S | | 024 | 190 |
| Frost | Mr | I | BAA Heathrow | 079 | 100, 102, 123, 170 |
| Fuller | Ms | L | | 077 | 66 |
| Godfrey | Mr | T | Arlington | 027 | 1, 38, 41, 72, 113, 167, 209 |
| Gwilliam | Mr | M | South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) | 097 | 206 |
| Haden | Ms | T | Asperger Support Group | 036 | 56, 159 |
| Harris | Ms | V | | 015 | 113, 126, 127, 130 |

| Last Name | Title | Initial | Organisation | Personal Ref Number | Entry Reference Number |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|--|----------------------------|--|
| Harrold | Mr | T | Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) | 092 | 49, 85, 91, 99, 107, 113 |
| Hayes | Ms | S | MENCAP | 062 | 123 |
| Heath | Mr | J P | | 060 | 4, 145 |
| Houghton | Miss | D | Spelthorne Ramblers | 058 | 66 |
| Hunt | Mrs | B | | 030 | 59, 92, 98, 131, 182, 208 |
| Hurrell | Mr | S | Ability Housing Association | 038 | 3, 161 |
| Hyatt | Mr | A R | | 073 | 31 |
| Jackson | Mr | R | | 013 | 14, 86, 88, 119, 120, 205 |
| James | Mr | N | | 037 | 28, 32 |
| Janota | Miss | S | Surrey County Council | 087 | 12, 15, 19, 20, 25, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 73, 77, 94, 95, 96, 116, 138, 139, 148, 149, 154, 158, 165, 180, 181, 193, 198 |
| Jenkins | Mr | M | Malcolm Jenkins Associates | 057 | 148 |

| Last Name | Title | Initial | Organisation | Personal Ref Number | Entry Reference Number |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Johns | Ms | M | | 090 | 7, 10, 18, 56, 79, 85, 199 |
| Johnson | Mrs | S J | | 029 | 59, 108 |
| Macvicar | Mr | S | Zodiac Musical Society | 059 | 188 |
| Malhotra | Mr | A | RPS on behalf of BT plc | 068 | 1, 45 |
| Marshall | Mr & Mrs | P | | 007 | 34 |
| Marshall | Mr | M | Gleeson Management | 065 | 34, 112, 141 |
| Martin | Mr | N | Environment Agency | 045 | 76 |
| McDonald | Mr | J | Tetlow King Planning | 088 | 16, 29, 33, 58, 97, 172 |
| McQueen | Mr | M | | 006 | 119, 203 |
| Moore | Mr | H | Highways Agency | 018 | 133, 135 |
| Nair | Ms | L | | 010 | 62, 82, 84 |
| Nappin | Mr | R J | | 008 | 36, 37, 68, 69, 119, 121 |

| Last Name | Title | Initial | Organisation | Personal Ref Number | Entry Reference Number |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Nixey | Ms | | | 002 | 39, 2, 108, 56, 87 |
| O'Hanlon | Mrs | D | | 004 | 114 |
| Palmer | Mrs | S | Staines Bowls Club | 052 | 137 |
| Park | Mr | J | EDF Energy | 096 | 1, 38, 167 |
| Pembrooke | Mr | R | | 055 | 187 |
| Pereira | Mrs | E | Surrey Family Mediation Service | 050 | 186 |
| Priddy | Mr | D | Ashford Common Baptist Church | 019 | 192 |
| Ross | Mrs | J | British Heart Foundation | 094 | 200 |
| Rowley | Ms | A | Two Rivers | 061 | 68 |
| Rushbrook | Mr | G | Green Street Action Group | 091 | 150 |
| Rushe | Mr | K | Lichfield Planning | 083 | 40, 51, 103, 104, 105, 106, 115, 123, 166 |
| Salsbury | Mr | V | | 022 | 147 |

| Last Name | Title | Initial | Organisation | Personal Ref Number | Entry Reference Number |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Shelley | Mrs | J | Oxfam | 044 | 34, 112, 121 |
| Stephens | Ms | J | | 063 | 14 |
| Sullivan | Mr | R | Stanwell Village Hall | 072 | 175 |
| Taylor | Mr | N P | Nicholas P Taylor on behalf of client | 081 | 173 |
| Thompson | Mr | J | Biscoe Craig Hall on behalf of the London Diocesan Fund | 089 | 17, 177, 201 |
| Thompson | Mr | P | The Planning Bureau Ltd on behalf of McCarthy and Stone | 093 | 11 |
| Tisdall | Ms | E | Surrey Care Trust | 071 | 56, 169 |
| Tonkin | Mr | J | Speakability | 047 | 162 |
| Treloar | Mr | D | | 014 | 117 |
| Tucker | Mr | M J | | 021 | 123, 157 |
| Vermeulen | Mr | P E | | 003 | 13, 56, 171, 176, 202 |
| Wallin | Mr | F J | | 040 | 6, 8, 83 |

| Last Name | Title | Initial | Organisation | Personal Ref Number | Entry Reference Number |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Wiggins | Mr | A | Halliford Colts | 042 | 185 |
| Windle | Mr | D M | | 067 | 158 |
| Wood-Dow | Mr | N | | 080 | 27, 50, 151 |
| Wright | Mr | H | | 078 | 140 |

Appendix B: Schedule of comments and the Council's Response

Housing General

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|--|
| 1 | EDF Energy (096/1) – housing. RPS on behalf of BT plc (068/1) – housing allocations. Persimmon Homes (South East) Ltd (034/2) – housing provision. Whitgift Homes Ltd (051/1) – provision of housing. Arlington (027/05) – Housing development. | Interest noted. This issue will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 2 | Ms Nixey (002/2) - conversion of un-used office space to residential to help alleviate the housing shortage. | These issues will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 3 | Ability Housing Association (038/1) – housing for people with special needs. Ability Housing Association (038/2) – analysis of the supply of housing for those with special needs in relation to actual demand. Ability Housing Association (038/3) – Integration of special needs units into larger mixed-use developments to produce more diverse communities. | |
| 4 | Mr Heath (060/2) – stop converting garages to residential use. | |
| 5 | Ms Carr (017/1) – any new housing in the area to be considered as a whole | |
| 6 | Mr Wallin (040/2) – not to approve new housing unless there is provision for at least one parking space for every two bedrooms. | |
| 7 | Ms Johns (090/3) – garages should be built underground. | The Council will consider this issue when reviewing its parking standards as part of the LDF. |
| 8 | Mr Wallin (040/3) – housing for the elderly should include secure storage for electric scooters/wheelchairs/bicycles etc and fitted with a charging point and sufficient lighting. | |
| 9 | Mr & Mrs Burton (028/1) – question the need for extra housing. The importance of not sacrificing the quality of the borough for political correctness. | The Council has already established that there is a significant need for extra housing in a Housing Needs Survey published in 2001. The Council is now required to provide 2580 dwellings to meet the requirement in the Surrey Structure Plan. The issue of protecting the quality of the Borough will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |

Housing General

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|---|
| 10 | Ms Johns (090/4) – reduce the demand for housing. Ensure that only those in true housing need are allocated with houses. | The Council has no control over the occupation or demand for private housing. The Council has criteria for allocating social housing prioritising those with the greatest need. |
| 11 | The Planning Bureau Ltd on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Ltd (093/1) – willing to advise and discuss any policies relating to housing for the elderly. | Added to contact list for further consultation. |
| 12 | Surrey County Council (087/1) – meeting the Surrey Structure Plan housing requirement to 2016. | The housing figure will be taken into account when preparing the new development plan. |

Affordable Housing

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|--|
| 13 | Mr Vermeulen (003/3) - areas of affordable housing with easy access to Heathrow. | Affordable housing is an issue that will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 14 | Mr Jackson (013/6) – more affordable homes. Mrs Stephens (063/1) – more affordable housing | |
| 15 | Surrey County Council (087/4) – provide for a significant increase in affordable housing, to meet the overall 40% target set out in the Structure Plan. Revise thresholds downwards to ensure affordable provision on a wider range of sites. | |
| 16 | Tetlow King Planning (088/1) – housing needs are high in Spelthorne and therefore the demand for affordable housing is an issue that needs to be fully addressed. Important that sufficient land resources are made available to meet need. | Agreed. Affordable housing is an issue that will need to be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 17 | Biscoe Craig Hall on behalf of the London Diocesan Fund (089/3) – any residential development on church owned sites should not be subject to any policy on affordable housing. Affordable housing is often provided by the Fund in conjunction with their own housing association. | National guidance does not exclude particular groups or organisations from affordable housing provision. |

Housing Density

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|---|
| 18 | Ms Johns (090/2) – encourage high-rise apartments to prevent the spread of urban development and waste of land. Money saved on the ground should be channelled to provide more spacious apartments with balconies and sound-proofing. | The form and density of new housing development is an issue that will be considered in the new development plan. The new development plan must also take account of national guidance which seeks to encourage housing which makes more efficient use of land (between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare net) and seek greater intensity of development at places with good public transport accessibility. |
| 19 | Surrey County Council (087/25) – promote higher density residential development and mixed use developments. Important to ensure that any further residential development is properly serviced through the provision of social and community facilities and open space and recreation. | |
| 20 | Surrey County Council (087/8) – seek increased residential density, particularly in and around town centres, with high quality design and layout. | |
| 21 | Ms Carr (017/3) – housing density should be kept low. High-density developments threaten quality of life. Ms Cool (020/1) – developments are being planned too close together and impinge on individuals privacy. | |
| 22 | Mr Beecham (043/1) – concerns about high density housing developments replacing existing properties leading to increased congestion and is detrimental to the environment. | |
| 23 | Mr Batten (046/1) – discourage the demolition of existing sound houses to make way for high-density re-developments. | |
| 24 | Mr Edwards (012/1) – housing density to take account of implications for traffic and local services, especially full provision for off-road parking. Also must take into account improvements to public transport, expansion of refuse collection and recycling facilities. | |

Housing size, type and mix

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|--|
| 25 | Surrey County Council (087/5) – set out desired type, size and mix of housing, including identification of priority housing groups, on individual sites. Assess likely scale of need and specific housing requirements of the aging population especially extra-care housing to enable people to remain in their own homes in the local community. | The issue of housing size, type and mix will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 26 | Ms Carr (017/2) – balance of houses, flats and bungalows to fit in with the existing environment. | In preparing the new development plan the Council will consider how the requirement for different types of dwellings can be met without harm to the local environment. |

Location of new housing

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|---|
| 27 | Mr Wood-Dow (080/1) – consider where to site new homes that will be required in the future. Suggests previously developed land if any exists. | National guidance encourages the protection of the Green Belt and the focus of any new development within urban areas and on previously developed land. The Council's Housing Capacity Study shows that it can meet the Structure Plan requirements for new housing within the existing urban area. |
| 28 | Mr James (037/2) – identification of brownfield sites for new residential development to facilitate the increasing need for new housing. | |
| 29 | Tetlow King Planning (088/2) – concern that housing requirements will not be met solely on previously developed sites. Many sites that are identified for development within the built up area will not be genuinely available within the plan period. | |
| 30 | Surrey Council Council (087/9) – seeking mixed-use development in town centres that includes residential. | This will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 31 | Mr Hyatt (073/1) – limit the use of back gardens for housing provision. There is a knock on effect on the environment and quality of life. | The location of new housing development and its likely effect on the local community and environment is an issue that the new development plan will consider. |
| 32 | Mr James (037/1) – protection of the existing communities amenity and living space in light of the need for new housing. | |
| 33 | Tetlow King Planning (088/7) – the plan should explore and exploit development opportunities which can address a range of planning issues in a proactive way e.g. enable mixed and sustainable communities. Request that plan should be flexible towards the implementation of a sequential approach in order that suitable sites can be brought forward. | The new plan-making process encourages the identification of sites early on. This will help to explore and exploit development opportunities as appropriate. |

Retail

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|------------|---|---|
| 34 | Mr & Mrs Marshall (007/1) – provision of low rent retail and workshop units to bring greater diversity to business and employment opportunities in the Borough. Oxfam (044/1) – provision for smaller shops outside the large shopping mall units and pedestrian access to them. Gleeson Management Ltd (065/3) – requests smaller shops in Staines rather than PC World, Curries etc. Gleeson Management Ltd (065/4) – requests more food shops in Staines i.e. fish and meat shops rather than just Waitrose. | The provision of smaller retail/workshop units and the type of shops that locate in Staines town centre and associated infrastructure are issues that the new development plan will consider. |
| 35 | Blue Sky Planning Ltd (069/2) – consider the need for and appropriate location of bulky goods retail warehousing. | This is an issue that the new development plan will consider. |
| 36 | Mr Nappin (008/2) – there are only expensive supermarkets in Staines e.g. Marks & Spencer and Waitrose. Mrs Bond (011/1) – lack of affordable supermarkets in Staines, Marks and Spencers and Waitrose are expensive. Very difficult for people who do not drive to get to Tesco at Sunbury or Ashford. Questions why Iceland and Safeway closed. | Concern noted. The Council does not have any control over the prices that shops offer. The location of shops in general is an issue for the new development plan to consider. |
| 37 | Mr Nappin (008/3) – 10 empty units in town centre. Are retailers discouraged because of business tax or rent? | Concern noted. The Council does not have any control over the levels of business tax or rent. This is an issue that is beyond the scope of the new development plan. |
| 38 | EDF Energy (096/2) – retail, Arlington (027/8) – retail. | Interest noted. This issue will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |

Commercial

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|------------|--|--|
| 39 | Ms Nixey (002/1) - unnecessary building of office space which then remains empty and un-let. | The Council publishes annually a survey of 'Available Commercial Premises' and monitors permissions for any new commercial development. This will inform the new development plan and help to identify the requirements for future commercial floorspace in the borough. |
| 40 | Lichfield Planning (083/6) – policies to reflect the need to provide suitable premises or land for commercial development, particularly in light of airport development. | |
| 41 | Arlington (027/7) - commercial development | Interest noted. This issue will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |

General Development

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|--|
| 42 | Mr Allan (005/1) - concerned about the spread of urban development. Ms Carr (017/4) – expand sensitively. | Concern noted. National guidance encourages the protection of the Green belt and development within urban areas and on previously developed land. This will be reflected in the new development plan. |
| 43 | Mr & Mrs Cotterell (041/2) – do not allow over-development on any site to the detriment of the local people and facilities. Mrs Coleman (099/7) – no intensive development. | The location and density of new development and the effect on local communities and facilities will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 44 | The Matthew Arnold School (056/2) – development for areas other than Staines. | |
| 45 | Surrey County Council (087/3) – development requirements should be met within existing urban areas. Resistance of Greenfield development within or beyond urban areas. Ms Coombs (053/1) – more brownfield development. RPS on behalf of BT plc (068/2) – re-use of existing sites. Mrs Coleman (099/9) – development of brownfield sites. | National guidance encourages the protection of the Green Belt and the focus of any new development within urban areas and on previously developed land. The Council's Housing Capacity Study shows that it can meet requirements for new housing within the existing urban area. This will be addressed in the new development plan. |
| 46 | Surrey County Council (087/18) – Structure Plan policy SE2 requires at least 10% of the energy requirements of new development to come from renewable resources. | These issues will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 47 | Surrey County Council (087/17) – new development should embrace the principles of sustainable construction and to deliver higher levels of energy efficiency and resource minimisation. | |
| 48 | Surrey County Council (087/24) – recognise Structure Plan designation of Staines as major commercial, retail and leisure centre. Set out detailed vision for town centre that looks to support its economic, retail and leisure base and to develop its existing role having regard to the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy and the relationship with other nearby metropolitan centres and its identification as a regional interchange in the Regional Transport Strategy. | |

Green Belt

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|--|
| 49 | Surrey County Council (087/11) – resist further urbanisation and maintain the Green Belt boundary. Mr & Mrs Cotterell (041/3) – respect, without exception, all Green Belt land. CPRE (092/5) – Green Belt erosion. Mrs Coleman (099/8) – protection of Green Belt land. | The Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) explains that policy GB1 of the Local Plan, relating to the Green Belt, will be 'saved' and not reviewed during the next three years. The policy states that the Green Belt boundary shown on the Proposals Map will be permanent and within it development will not be permitted which would conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt. |
| 50 | Mr Wood-Dow (080/2) – how to evaluate the quality of land currently designated as Green Belt. How green is the Green Belt? | The main purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent the spread of urban development and its quality does not determine the inclusion of land. |
| 51 | Lichfield Planning (083/1) – considers that some of the policies that are identified in the LDS as being 'saved' should be included within the LDF as it is believed that there are wider implications. The review of the Green Belt boundary and the housing capacity study do not take into account the potential need for development in the northern part of the borough that might arise from the Heathrow Airport master plan. Consider release of Green Belt land surrounding the airport to accommodate additional growth requirements. Argument that some areas of Green Belt are not serving the purpose of including land in the Green Belt and that it would be more sustainable to release such sites. | The Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) explains that policy GB1 of the Local Plan, relating to the Green Belt, will be 'saved' and not reviewed during the next three years. The LDS was approved by the First Secretary of State on 22 October 2004. The decision on Heathrow Terminal 5 creates no requirement to release Green Belt land in Spelthorne. The T5 Inspector concluded that the development would not create a need to review Green Belt boundaries and the Secretary of State re-affirmed his commitment to the Green Belt around Heathrow. Any further expansion beyond T5 is subject to further study and may not prove to be acceptable. There is therefore no reason at this time to review Green Belt boundaries in Spelthorne to accommodate Heathrow related pressures. |
| 52 | Surrey County Council (087/13) – need to address land management issues in the rural/urban fringe. | These issues will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 53 | Surrey County Council (087/14) – Thames Valley Reservoirs and Waterbodies pSPA is a local feature that need to be both protected and celebrated. | |

Green Belt

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|------------|---|--|
| 54 | Surrey County Council (087/12) – encourage the enhancement of the landscape, nature conservation and the need for more positive use of land in the Green Belt for access and recreation | These issues will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 55 | Surrey County Council (087/15) – would welcome the opportunity to discuss developing an approach to deal with sites in the Green Belt that have development/redevelopment needs e.g. schools. | Added to contact list for further consultation. This issue will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |

Open Space, Sports and Recreation

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|--|
| 56 | Ms Nixey (002/4) - recreation areas for teenagers, designed, decorated and maintained by them. Mr Vermeulen (003/4) - more leisure facilities. Ms Bayliss (023/1) – activities and safe recreation for children aged 7-11 and young teenagers. Ms Johns (090/1) – need for leisure facilities, particularly somewhere for outdoor swimming and relaxing during the summer. Suggests possible use of river, reservoir or lake. Sunbury and Shepperton Scout Fellowship (066/1) – more support and activities for young people in the borough. Ashford Baptist Church (35/1) – provision of a 'safe space' for young people and others that hang around in Ashford Town Centre in the evening, particularly in the railway station area. Asperger Support Group (036/1) – develop more facilities for children like the skate park at Lammas Park, Staines. White Lodge Centre (031/2) – open spaces and parkland for children. Surrey Care Trust (071/1) – provision for disadvantaged young people. Mrs Coleman (099/6) – more parks and open spaces for all people to use. | The Council is carrying out a study of open space and recreation in the borough to be published early 2005. This will form part of the evidence base that will inform the preparation of the new development plan and consideration of these issues. |
| 57 | Mrs Bond (011/5) – suggests community garden on Royal Estate, Laleham. | |
| 58 | Tetlow King Planning (088/3) – assess the need for open space and recreation and address any deficiencies. Sport England (074/2) – the need to plan for future needs of current and future population for sport and recreation as set out in PPG17 and companion guide. | |
| 59 | Sport England (074/1) – the need to protect existing sport and recreation facilities including playing fields. Mrs Johnson (029/1) – protect green spaces as they are continually being eroded. Mrs Hunt (030/2) – concern that the Lammas Park, Staines which is situated in the Green Belt is being urbanised. The park has a skate ramp, intrusive lighting, recycling bins and a café is proposed. Insists that this riverside space is protected. | National guidance recognises that open space, sports and recreational facilities should be recognised and given protection by local authorities. This will be addressed in the new development plan. |
| 60 | Sport England (074/3) – Playing pitch and sport strategies need updating and policies to secure new provision through planning obligations. | National guidance encourages the use of planning obligations as a means to remedy deficiencies in open space, sports and recreational provision. This will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |

Open Space, Sports and Recreation

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|---|
| 61 | Mrs Bond (011/4) – many trees on the Royal Estate, Laleham have become old and dangerous and many have disappeared completely. Requests that some new trees are planted. | The maintenance and planting of trees on the estate would be the responsibility of the landowners. Any trees on Highway land would be the responsibility of Surrey County Council. Any trees on Spelthorne Council land would be the responsibility of the Direct Services department. This specific request is beyond the scope of the new development plan. |
| 62 | Ms Nair (010/3) – preservation of Staines Moor. Its value for wildlife in the Borough. | The new development plan will need to take account of national guidance, which requires the protection of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). |
| 63 | Ashford and District Smallholders (075/1) – preservation of open space for horticultural purposes. This will provide a source of recreation for all ages, will contribute to the well being of the community and help create a sustainable, healthy environment. | The need for allotments and their protection will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 64 | Bishop Wand Church of England School (095/2) – the school will continue its role as a sports college (specialist school status). Importance of creating and maintaining links with sports clubs. | The recreational contribution of the facilities to the wider community will be taken into account in the open space study being undertaken. |
| 65 | Bishop Duppas Bowls Club (054/1) – maintain and provide facilities for retired and middle-aged residents who represent a high proportion of the local population e.g. bowls club. | This will be considered in the open space study being undertaken which will form part of the evidence base that will inform the new development plan. |
| 66 | Ms Fuller (077/1) – provision for off-road horse riding through providing links to bridle paths in the Staines area. Spelthorne Ramblers (058/1) – maintenance and security of footpaths and rights-of-way. | Maintenance of footpaths is a County Council responsibility and not an issue that would be dealt with in the new development plan. Bridleway provision will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 67 | Mrs Bulford (016/3) – ensure that elderly and disabled people have comprehensive information about the services available to them in the Borough i.e. reprinting the A-Z guide. | The ninth edition of the A-Z guide of 'Services for Retired People in Spelthorne' has recently been published and is available on the Council's website or to purchase. This is not an issue that the new development plan will consider. |

Community Safety

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|---|
| 68 | Mr Nappin (008/6) – community wardens should patrol side streets as well as main streets. Ms Bayliss (023/2) – wardens to patrol recreation areas to deter thugs and drug users. Two Rivers (061/1) – policing and safety in the borough particularly in Staines. | Policing and security are matters that are dealt with by Surrey Police and are beyond the scope of the new development plan. These comments will be passed onto them. Scope for good design to improve safety will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 69 | Mr Nappin (008/4) – feels that Staines Town Centre is unsafe on a Friday and Saturday night due to drunken behaviour. | |
| 70 | Mrs Bond (011/2) – Request regular police patrol on Royal Estate to control gangs of youths and anti-social behaviour. | |
| 71 | Laleham Residents Association (085/6) – tackle the use of hard drugs. Law enforcement should make it impossible for suppliers to trade within the borough and effective action should be taken against known suppliers living in the borough. | |
| 72 | Arlington (027/4) – policing/ security | |
| 73 | Surrey County Council (087/29) – Surrey Fire and Rescue Services would like to discuss community safety considerations and how they might be incorporated into the plan to achieve holistic improvements in casualty and death rates. Also how provisions in the plan might shape local SF & RS priorities and the implications for levels of service to meet future demand. Possible relocation of current services to improve service delivery. | |

Flooding

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|------------|---|---|
| 74 | Mr & Mrs Cotterell (041/4) – reject any development on the designated flood plain. Considers this to be extremely important in view of recent flooding events. | The new development plan must take account of national guidance on development in areas liable to flood. Flooding is an issue that the new development plan will consider. |
| 75 | Laleham Residents Association (084/4) – tackle flooding issues. Prevent flooding rather than try to alleviate the after effects. | |
| 76 | Environment Agency (045/1) – building within floodplains (especially flood zone 3); building within 8 metres of rivers/watercourses; development within groundwater protection zones (especially soakaways/drainage impacting on groundwater); reduction of run-off from major sites and building on or near contaminated and landfill sites. | These issues will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 77 | Surrey County Council (087/20) – manage development to ensure that future flood risk is properly assessed and measures taken to avoid adding to problems elsewhere. Appropriate infrastructure in all new developments to deal with the impact of localised flooding. | |
| 78 | Thames Water (064/1) – water supply and wastewater treatment infrastructure (existing and future in relation to growth proposals). | Thames Water will continue to be consulted on planning applications for new developments. The Council will take advice on how to deal with issues relating to water supply and wastewater treatment infrastructure. |

Maintenance

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|---|
| 79 | Ms Johns (090/6) – refuse collection. Council should provide a better service in particular collection of bulky items. Make it easier to dispose of rubbish. New ways of disposing of rubbish to address the issue that we are running out of space. | Issues relating to refuse collection are dealt with by the Council's Direct Services Department and are beyond the scope of the new development plan. Issues relating to developing new ways of disposing of refuse are dealt with by Surrey County Council in the 'Minerals and Waste Development Framework'. This comment will be passed onto them. |
| 80 | Mr Dowsett (049/2) – criticism regarding the attitudes of the staff at the Charlton Lane refuse tip. | This issue is something that must be dealt with by Surrey County Council who manage the Charlton Lane refuse tip. This comment will be forwarded to them. |
| 81 | Staines Synagogue (076/3) – more road sweepers to clear roads and pavements, particularly in the vicinity of takeaways. Mrs Coleman (099/5) – clean streets clear of litter, dog foul, gum through bans and enforcing penalties and more regular cleaning. Anon (001/1) - poor standard of ladies toilets in Elmsleigh Centre. Important to provide clean, well managed facilities as part of new shopping centre. St David's School (048/1) – improving the environment around and appearance of Ashford Station. | Issues regarding the general maintenance of the environment are dealt with by the Council's Direct Services Department and are beyond the scope of the new development plan. These comments will be passed onto them. |

Pollution

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|------------|--|--|
| 82 | Ms Nair (010/1) – screening Staines from M25/A30 air pollution. The use of trees as a screen and their value as a carbon sink. | Specific landscape enhancement projects are not a level of detail that the new development plan will consider. However, the Council's Environment Service can consider this as part of the implementation of the Environment Strategy. This comment will be forwarded to them. |
| 83 | Mr Wallin (040/1) – important for vehicles to maintain a steady speed to minimise pollution caused by starting, stopping and using a lower gear. | This is not an issue that the new development plan can influence. |
| 84 | Ms Nair (010/2) – noise reduction from M25/A30 and any rail developments. The possible use of trees as a sound buffer or tunnelling. | Scope for noise mitigation can be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 85 | Ms Johns (090/5) – clean air. CPRE (092/4) – air, light and noise pollution and disturbance, mineral/waste and water. | These issues will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |

Recycling and Renewable Energy

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|--|
| 86 | Mr Jackson (013/4) – promotion of energy efficiency and renewables including the purchasing of Green Energy by the Council. | Planning Policy Statement 22 on renewable energy provides national guidance on planning and renewable energy. This will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 87 | Ms Nixey (002/5) - provision of plastic recycling facilities. | The provision and promotion of recycling facilities is dealt with by the Council's Direct Services department and for which there are existing strategies. These comments will be passed onto them. This is not a matter for the new development plan. |
| 88 | Mr Jackson (013/1) – greater efforts to recycle household and business waste including comprehensive roadside collection, better promotion of recycling and recyclable materials and incentives for businesses. Mrs Coleman (099/11) – recycling and the need to reduce landfill and incineration. | |
| 89 | Mr Dowsett (049/1) – poor performance of Spelthorne compared to other authorities. Requests multi-collection vans. | |

Environment

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|---|
| 90 | Staines Town Society (026/2) – more emphasis on environmental and quality of life issues. Mrs Coleman (099/1) – better environment, safe, clean, spacious. | This will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 91 | CPRE (092/6) – significant environmental and biodiversity impacts. | Interest noted. This will be considered as part of the Sustainability Appraisal of the new development plan. |
| 92 | Mrs Hunt (030/3) – environment better protected. | These issues will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 93 | Riverside Arts Centre (039/1) – preservation of the character of the local area. | |
| 94 | Surrey County Council (087/16) – the issue of sustainability should be integral to the development plan covering social, economic and environmental issues. | |
| 95 | Surrey County Council (087/19) – climate change should be taken into account in light of recent ODPM advice 'The Planning Response to Climate Change'. | |
| 96 | Surrey County Council (087/31) – issues in relation to waste created by development, archaeology, ecology, conservation and rights of way. | |
| 97 | Tetlow King Planning (088/5) – review policies relating to Areas of Degraded Landscape and should introduce policies and proposals that can lead towards the improvement of such areas. | |
| 98 | Mrs Hunt (030/4) – suggests the Council should employ a well-qualified Conservation Officer on a full-time basis. There is a great lack of knowledge and experience in dealing with development affecting the historic built environment. | This is a staffing matter which is beyond the scope of the new development plan. However, the need for specialist resources is kept under review. |
| 99 | CPRE (092/7) – CPRE Surrey is more concerned with County and Regional Planning development but rely on District Chairman to advise of any major issues. | Noted. |

Aviation

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|--|
| 100 | BAA (079/1) – revise the current Local Plan chapter on aviation in acknowledgement of both recent government policy concerning aviation growth (i.e. Aviation White Paper) and the Government's decision to permit Terminal 5). | These comments will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 101 | Laleham Residents Association (084/5) – nuisance caused to residents of the borough by increased aircraft movements at Heathrow. | |
| 102 | BAA (079/2) – to review the aviation policy in respect of airport related development in order to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Clarify the definition of airport related development. – Adopt a realistic approach in so far as the Council are able to control the location of such development. – Where possible and appropriate, seek to exploit the economic and regeneration benefits such development can bring to local areas – Seek to secure wider community benefits (e.g. public transportation, cycle routes etc) through the development of new sites (off airport) for specific airport related development or for more general commercial and industrial uses. | The extent to which it will be necessary or relevant for these comments to be reflected in the new development plan will be considered in its preparation. |
| 103 | Lichfield Planning (083/2) – take account of the Heathrow Airport Masterplan. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The availability of airport related sites – Given the finite supply of airport land, LDF should consider the implications of airport related development in the area (cargo, warehousing, offices, hotels etc). – Sustainability issues associated with the provision of necessary facilities in proximity to the airport. – Surface access and parking from the south of the airport. | |
| 104 | Lichfield Planning (083/3) – consider that the functioning of Heathrow Airport with T5 will have significant impacts on the surrounding boroughs. Intensification in use of airport will bring with it increased demand for associated facilities. | |

Aviation

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|------------|--|--|
| 105 | Lichfield Planning (084/5) – the impacts associated with the DfT White Paper should also be considered in the LDF including the implications of available sites within the airport being developed and any additional land needs that may arise. There should be provision within the policies for the release of land based on sustainability criteria. | The extent to which it will be necessary or relevant for these comments to be reflected in the new development plan will be considered in its preparation. |
| 106 | Lichfield Planning (084/4) – consideration of the possible third runway at Heathrow Airport because of its potential implications for the labour market and supply of employment land. | The Aviation White Paper indicates that further study should be carried out in relation to a third runway at Heathrow. A decision on a third runway at Heathrow has not yet been made and therefore it cannot be planned for in the LDF. |
| 107 | CPRE (092/1) – Heathrow expansion. | Interest noted. |

Transport

Note: All comments relating to transport will be forwarded to Surrey County Council as the Highways Authority so it can consider them in preparing the Local Transport Plan (LTP).

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|---|
| 108 | Ms Nixey (002/3) - provision of sensible car park and one-way system layouts – particularly in Staines. Mrs Johnson (029/2) – look at suggestions for roads, car parking etc especially from the public who use them. For example, traffic light sequences and efficient means of getting in and out of car parks i.e. Elmsleigh Centre, Staines. | The extent to which these issues will need to be addressed in the new development plan as against LTP will be considered during the preparation of the new development plan and in discussion with Surrey County Council. |
| 109 | Mrs Bond (011/3) – traffic calming measures on Charles Road and Elizabeth Avenue, Laleham to ensure safety for young children who play on the greens on the estate. Many roads on the estate are used as a “rat-run”. | |
| 110 | Laleham Residents Association (084/2) – prior to provision of a bypass around the Village they request an immediate and effective traffic calming scheme that prevents through traffic travelling at more than 20 mph through the village. | |
| 111 | Laleham Residents Association (084/3) – supports other plans to reduce traffic nuisance in the borough. | |
| 112 | Oxfam (044/2) – improvement of traffic flow into and out of Staines from the Crooked Billet and also from river bridge via Two Rivers. Staines Synagogue (076/1) – re-phase traffic lights between the Crooked Billet roundabout and Staines Bridge to ease congestion. The Matthew Arnold School (056/1) – congestion and traffic light phasing in Staines. Gleeson Management Ltd (065/2) – resolve traffic issues along Kingston Road, High Street and Staines Bridge. | |
| 113 | CPRE (092/2) – M25 widening and surface access to the airport. CPRE (092/3) – Air Track proposals. Mrs Harris (015/1) – all things transport related: cars; buses; trains and planes. Mrs Harris (015/5) – traffic congestion. Arlington – (027/1,2,3) roads, transport and car parking. | |

Transport

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|--|
| 114 | Mrs D O'Hanlon (004/1) - the improvement and maintenance of pavements on Ashford Railway Bridge, particularly on the Church Road side. She raises concerns about safety and suggests that the Church Road pavement is widened and a safety barrier is installed. It needs to be safe for children to walk to school. Mrs Coleman (099/4) – suggests barriers around pavements near schools and keeping pavements free from obstacles to create safe footpaths in particular Clockhouse Lane Railway Bridge. | Issues relating to the general maintenance and improvement of roads and pavements is a Highways matter that is dealt with by Surrey County Council and is beyond the scope of the new development plan. |
| 115 | Lichfield Planning (083/9) – when reviewing the Airtrack Corridor Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) take into account the impact it will have on the development of town centres to the south and west and the benefits and wider regeneration goals and aspirations. | The Council's LDS shows that the Air Track SPG will be reviewed after July 2007 as it has only recently been adopted. It may be brought forward if promoters make progress in implementing the scheme. When the Council reviews this SPG these comments will be addressed. |
| 116 | Surrey County Council (087/28) – consider that the Structure Plan and LTP refer to the Airtrack Scheme and the need for land to be safeguarded for a new station and associated rail track in Staines Town Centre and further rail track across Staines Moor. This is an issue the new plan should address. | This is an issue that will be addressed in the new development plan. |
| 117 | Mr Treloar (014/1) – rail link between Staines station and Heathrow Airport making use of existing infrastructure across Staines Moor towards Stanwell. Many people who work at Heathrow which to live close to public transport but not under the flight path. | |
| 118 | Laleham Residents Association (084/1) – a bypass around Laleham Village by 2015. | Transport proposals of this nature must first be supported by the County Council and included within the LTP. If the Laleham Bypass is included in the LTP then the new development plan will need to reflect the proposal. |

Transport

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|---|
| 119 | Mr McQueen (006/1) – exclusion of bicycles in Staines town centre. Mr Nappin (008/5) – bikes should not be ridden on pavements. Mr Jackson (013/2) – improve the network of cycle routes and tracks. | The new plan will need to reflect specific proposals in the LTP. The management of footways and speed limits are beyond the scope of the new development plan and are dealt with by Surrey County Council. |
| 120 | Mr Jackson (013/3) – safe walking routes/schemes to schools such as “walking bus”. Mrs Bulford (016/1) – safer environment for pedestrians through the imposition of stricter speed limits. Mrs Coleman (099/2) – safe roads for children to walk to school, without large lorries and traffic going through towns causing pollution and congestion. Suggests narrowing of roads and speed restrictions to deter traffic. | |
| 121 | Mr Nappin (008/1) – more parking wardens to enforce existing parking restrictions. Oxfam (044/3) – dealing with unauthorised parking and oversize vehicles. | The enforcement of parking controls is an issue that is dealt with by the Council's Environment Service and is beyond the scope of the new development plan. These comments will be passed onto them. |
| 122 | Ashford Baptist Church (035/2) – Church Road multi-storey car park, Ashford is free but appears 'dark and unsafe'. Possible improvement? | The appearance of car parks is an issue that is dealt with by the Council's Environment Service and is beyond the scope of the new development plan. These comments will be passed onto them for consideration. |
| 123 | BAA (079/3) – improving public transport provision and quality. Lichfield Planning (083/8) – policies that promote sustainable development and encourage better public transport facilities. Strategic Rail Authority (086/1) – promote sustainable transport choices. MENCAP (062/1) – promoting public and community transport that is accessible to all. Mr Tucker (021/1) – suggests that the money spent to produce the Borough Bulletin would be better used improving public transport. | Encouraging public transport provision and sustainable travel are issues that will be considered in preparing the new development plan. The Council will need to ensure that all policies support the LTP. |
| 124 | Mrs Bond (011/6) – praises the provision of the 438 bus which provides a service from the Royal Estate, Laleham to Staines, Laleham Village and Shepperton. | Support noted. |

Transport

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|--|
| 125 | Staines Synagogue (076/2) – ensure that buses follow the correct route, complete their journey and do not curtail if late. | These comments relate to matters that are dealt with by Surrey County Council and will be forwarded to them for consideration. |
| 126 | Mrs Harris (015/4) – consideration of the use of Sunbury as a bus terminus and whether this benefits local residents. | |
| 127 | Mrs Harris (015/3) – provision of better links to Richmond. | |
| 128 | Mr Dowsett (049/3) – concerned about the right hand turn at the end of Charlton Lane by the refuse tip. Suggests a roundabout would be safer. | These comments relate to matters that are dealt with by Surrey County Council and will be forwarded to them for consideration. |
| 129 | Stanwell resident (Anon) (025/1) – requests that something should be done about the traffic in Clyde Road, Stanwell. Cars travel too fast and buses and coaches use it. | |
| 130 | Mrs Harris (015/2) – does transport presently take people to where they want to go for work, leisure etc | This is a Highways matter that is dealt with by Surrey County Council and is beyond the scope of the new development plan. |
| 131 | Mrs Hunt (030/6) – damage is being caused by insensitive highway proposals with a plethora of signs, railings etc. | This is primarily an issue for Surrey County Council to address not the new development plan. |
| 132 | Sunbury and Shepperton Scout Fellowship (066/2) – more consideration for access for disabled people in particular pavement drops. | Access for disabled people generally is an issue that the LDF will consider. Drop kerbs are a matter dealt with by Surrey County Council. This comment will be passed to them. |

Transport

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|--|
| 133 | Highways Agency (018/2) – initial meeting to consider any issues relating to existing infrastructure followed by further a meeting to consider any additional infrastructure requirements. Future engagement will depend on the outcome of the second meeting. | Added to contact list for future consultation. Consider the need for an initial meeting. |
| 134 | Strategic Rail Authority (086/2) – integrate land-use planning and transport policies. Planning system needs to contain policies that enable rail infrastructure/services to be enhanced. | These issues will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 135 | Highways Agency (018/1) – suggest that all infrastructure requirements associated with development proposals are resolved early in the process so as to avoid delays at later stages | |
| 136 | Strategic Rail Authority (086/5) – refer to any new station proposals being discussed with SRA. Plan should make reference to SRA new stations policy and guidance and may need for new stations to meet the rail industry's requirements for technical, commercial and operational feasibility. | |
| 137 | Strategic Rail Authority (086/6) – adequate car parking for rail users is important if use of public transport is to be encouraged. Request acknowledgment that car parking levels at stations should be determined by the train operating companies, Network Rail and the SRA in discussion with local planning authorities. Staines Bowls Club (52/1) – sufficient parking provision in areas other than shopping centres. For example, for railway stations to relief side-street congestion and in the area around the Councils Offices, Knowle Green. | |
| 138 | Surrey County Council (087/27) – any transport policies and proposals should take into account the provisions of the Structure Plan (particularly policies DN-1, LO1, LO8 and SE4), the Regional Transport Strategy, the Surrey Local Transport Plan and work in preparation on Local Transport Plan 2 and have regard to the Surrey Design Guide, the Infrastructure Good Practice Guide and the Parking Strategy for Surrey. | This will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |

Transport

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|--|
| 139 | Surrey County Council (087/10) – deliver the necessary infrastructure to support all new housing development. Setting a strategy for the various urban areas and taking into account the Infrastructure Good Practice Guide. | The provision of the appropriate infrastructure to support new development and any necessary strategies for particular urban areas is an issue that will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 140 | Mr Wright (078/1) – provision for adequate parking and public transport facilities in new developments and consideration of the effect new developments have on existing roads. | |
| 141 | Gleeson Management Ltd (065/1) – more parking will be required in Staines town centre if the shopping area is to be further developed. | |
| 142 | Strategic Rail Authority (086/7) – supportive of the movement of goods by rail rather than road. Suggest policy: 'Development which will encourage the transfer of freight from road to rail, including the development of freight handling facilities, will be permitted unless there is overriding conflict with other planning and environmental considerations. If necessary, conditions will be imposed on planning permissions in order to maximise the amount of non-road borne freight movement'. | The need for such a policy will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 143 | Strategic Rail Authority (086/3) – concentrate new development at locations where there is potential for realistic public transport usage. | National guidance encourages development at places with good public transport accessibility. This will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 144 | Strategic Rail Authority (086/4) – developers should make a financial contribution towards improving public transport provision rather than expecting the public to pick up the cost of future enhancements. | National guidance supports that use of planning conditions and obligations to secure contributions towards transport improvements. This will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 145 | Mr Heath (060/1) – ban pavement parking. | This is a matter for Surrey County Council. |

Development Control

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|--|
| 146 | Mr & Mrs Cotterell (041/5) – if the proposed new health centre in Shepperton is for the flood plain land bordering Renfree the application should be firmly rejected. | Flooding issues will be considered in preparing the new development plan. However issues relating to a particular planning application will be considered as part of the planning application process. |
| 147 | Mr Salsbury (022/1) – The Station Garage and Rodd Estate redevelopment proposals will add another 300 cars to the already congested road. The Council should look at the whole picture that is emerging for Govett Avenue not just each plan in isolation. | Concern noted. This will be considered as part of the planning application process and more generally in preparing the new development plan. |
| 148 | Surrey County Council (087/22) – achieving a high quality of design in new developments encompassing traditionally recognised aesthetic elements and design guidance. Design statements should be a pre-requisite of all developments. Malcolm Jenkins Associates (057/1) – greater design awareness in planning applications/approvals. | This will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 149 | Surrey County Council (087/23) – incorporate the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service strategy to make buildings safer through the provision of fire sprinklers in new and converted buildings. For this to be achieved adequate water supplies will need to be available. Consider opportunities to reduce arson through the design of waste collection and recycling regimes. | This level of detail is not appropriate for the new development plan but a matter to be considered in dealing with individual proposals under the Building Regulations. |

Consultation Methods

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|---|
| 150 | Green Street Action Group (091/1) – improve the appearance of planning notices ensuring they clearly mark the proposed site and are highly visible e.g. as done by Runnymede. | Whilst these are not matters for consideration in the new development plan itself they will be considered in preparing the Statement of Community Involvement which is required as part of the new development plan making process. The Statement will need to consider consultation arrangements not only for the new development plan but also for planning applications. |
| 151 | Mr Wood-Dow (080/3) – what stage of public consultation should be introduced between the Council's receipt of a planning application and it going to Committee to help resolve conflict and hear stakeholder views? | |
| 152 | Mr Allan (005/2) - that much less space should be devoted to "simple" questionnaires in the Borough Bulletin. | |
| 153 | Mr & Mrs Cotterell (041/1) – listen to local opinion. Mr. Findlay (084/1) – listen to local opinion. | |
| 154 | Surrey County Council (087/32) – experienced problems completing the online form for this consultation. | |
| 155 | Staines Town Society (026/4) – consultation should take place in the early stages of planning and not just on completed documents. | A key feature of the new system is early and continual public involvement in the process of preparing the new development plan. |
| 156 | The Bishop Wand Church of England School (095/1) – highlights the fact that people are already fully engaged but they could contribute further with Sports College Status. | Noted. |
| 157 | Mr Tucker (021/2) – concerns that the borough bulletin is only portraying an image of how the Council believes it is performing. | This is a general comment about the Council's Borough Bulletin and will be considered by those who edit the publication. |

Accessibility

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|--|
| 158 | Surrey County Council (087/7) – refer to consideration being given to new housing to be built to 'Lifetime Homes' standards. Mr Windle (067/1) – compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act. | This will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 159 | Asperger Support Group (036/2) – facilities for children with special needs. | The issue of access for people with disabilities generally will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 160 | White Lodge Centre (031/1) – accessibility of environment for disabled children and adults. | |
| 161 | Ability Housing Association (038/4) - policies to take into account the specific needs of the following groups as identified in the Surrey Supporting People Strategy: women at risk from domestic violence, young people, carers, those with multiple needs, those with learning disabilities and the elderly. | Consideration will be given to the land-use implications of providing for such groups and, through Sustainability Appraisal ensure any potential adverse impacts are identified. |
| 162 | Speakability (047/1) – free/low cost meeting rooms for disabled groups that are easy to reach by public transport. | This is not an issue that the new development plan will consider as it concerns the letting arrangements of accommodation that is available. The new development plan will consider the general accessibility of community facilities. |

Employment and Economy

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|---|
| 163 | Blue Sky Planning Ltd (069/1) – review the supply and demand of employment floorspace and the quality and location of provision. | The Council is undertaking an Employment Study as part of the plan making process. This will help to identify the need for and location of employment generating development and will inform the preparation of the new development plan. |
| 164 | Staines Town Society (026/3) – robust resistance to employment generating development and commercial overspill from Heathrow. | |
| 165 | Surrey County Council (087/2) – consider the need for employment land and the impact on economic prosperity. | |
| 166 | Lichfield Planning (083/7) – policies should seek to encourage further growth of the boroughs employment base. | |
| 167 | Arlington (027/9) – Local Economy and employment. EDF Energy (096/3) – employment development. | Interest noted. This will be addressed in preparing the new development plan. |
| 168 | Surrey Education & Business Partnership (098/1) – the education and skills gap in the borough. | This is not an issue that the new development plan will consider as it concerns service provision rather than land-use. However, this issue is being addressed in the Spelthorne Community Plan |
| 169 | Surrey Care Trust (071/2) – re-engage socially excluded people with education. | |
| 170 | BAA (079/4) – providing local people with the skills needed to maximise their potential to secure jobs with local employers. | |

Site Specific

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point | |
|------------|--|---|---|
| 171 | Mr Vermeulen (003/1) - land between Heathrow Airport, Stanwell Village and the Reservoir should be considered for future development and planned for in detail. | These sites are situated within the Green Belt. National Guidance and the Surrey Structure Plan promote the protection of the Green Belt and resistance of any inappropriate development. The Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) explains that policy GB1 of the Local Plan, relating to the Green Belt and the Green Belt boundary shown on the Proposals Map, will be 'saved' and not reviewed in the next three years. | |
| 172 | Tetlow King Planning (088/6) – request meeting to discuss the future of the Stratton Road site, its planning merits and the ways in which its development can meet key objectives. | | |
| 173 | Mr Taylor on behalf of client (081/1) – The Mill, Stanwell Moor currently provides office and warehouse accommodation for a number of businesses. Although it forms part of the village of Stanwell Moor it falls within the Green Belt boundary. Request that the Green Belt designation of the land is removed. Request that the LDF reviews and amends the current Green Belt boundary. | | |
| 174 | Persimmon Homes (South East) Ltd (034/1) – interested in promoting land at Stratton Road, Sunbury for some forms or form of beneficial use. Suggest part possibly used by local school for educational and related activities or some recreational use. Funding for this could come from some housing development on the site. Requests meeting to discuss proposals. | | |
| 175 | Stanwell Village Hall (072/1) – areas of Green Belt surrounding the airport could be utilised for development to ease the congestion of building. | | |
| 176 | Mr Vermeulen (003/2) - hospital to serve Heathrow and Spelthorne. | | Ashford, St Peter's and Hillingdon Hospitals serve the population of Spelthorne and the area surrounding Heathrow. The Council will look to the Health Authority to advise of any additional facilities that should be planned for. |
| 177 | Biscoe Craig Hall on behalf of the London Diocesan Fund (089/2) – redevelopment potential of over-sized or unsuitable parsonages. Request meeting to discuss sites and possible allocation in plan. | | Added to contact list for further consultation. Contact to determine possible sites located within the borough. |
| 178 | Tidegrove Ltd (033/1) – new station in Staines High Street. | This will be addressed in relation to the proposals for Air Track. | |

Site Specific

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|------------|---|--|
| 179 | Mrs Bulford (016/2) – ensuring a new Shepperton Health Centre has adequate parking for the elderly and disabled. Suggests special permits be available to those who experience difficulty in walking. | Parking provision at any new facility would be considered when dealing with a specific planning application. The issue of permits would be for the Health Centre to consider. |
| 180 | Surrey County Council (087/21) – discussion with SCC regarding potential mineral working sites within the borough and their possible contribution to help resolve flooding issues. | Contact at an early stage to discuss issue further. |
| 181 | Humberts (082/1) – consider land at Ashford Small Holdings, Clockhouse Lane, Ashford for future development. Site currently comprises six agricultural smallholdings together with allotment gardens in the southern part of the site. The site area is approximately 19 hectares of farmland and has dual access via two unclassified highways from Clockhouse Lane and Feltham Road. Surrey County Council (87/29) - also would like to discuss the future of the Ashford Smallholdings Estate. | The Council is in the process of carrying out a study of open space and recreation in the borough as part of the evidence base to inform the new development plan. This technical report will be published early in 2005. Contact to discuss the future of the site after the publication of the Council's Open Space Study. The site is however in the Green Belt and the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) explains that policy GB1 of the Local Plan, relating to the Green Belt, will be 'saved' and not reviewed in the next three years. Therefore at this time development of the site would not be appropriate. |
| 182 | Mrs Hunt (030/1) – 96-104 Church Street, Staines is presently warehousing situated in an old, narrow street in the Staines Conservation Area. Suggests that planning brief is produced to put forward the site for housing particularly for the elderly. The site is convenient for shops, day centre and open space. | This will be considered in preparing the Spelthorne Local Development Framework. |

Site Specific

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|--|
| 183 | <p>Barton Willmore Planning Partnership on behalf of Kempton Park Racecourse (070/1) – with the continued development of Kempton Park Racecourse including the recently permitted floodlights and associated infrastructure along the Staines Road East frontage there is a case for the existing built complex fronting onto Park Road and Staines Road East to be either designated as a Major Development Site in the Green Belt or, more logically, excluded from the Green Belt altogether. Provides example that this is already the case in respect of the built complex at Cheltenham Race Course in the revised deposit review of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan. This approach would recognise the recent Surrey Structure Plan proposals which are supportive of the development of Surrey's three racecourses. For the avoidance of doubt, the open track area at Kempton Park would remain in the Green Belt where it is clearly an important contributor to the openness of the Green Belt.</p> | <p>This site is situated within the Green belt. National Guidance and the Surrey Structure Plan promote the protection of the Green Belt and resistance of any inappropriate development. The Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) explains that policy GB1 of the Local Plan, relating to the Green Belt, will be 'saved' and not reviewed in the next three years.</p> |

Community Facilities

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|---|
| 184 | The Burgoyne Road Charitable Trust (032/1) – provision for places of public religious worship. | The general provision of community facilities will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 185 | Halliford Colts Youth Football Club (042/1) – unable to run more teams due to limited training and playing facilities. | |
| 186 | Surrey Family Mediation Service (050/1) – facility for services such as mediation, counselling etc. | |
| 187 | Mr Pembroke (055/1) – urgently requests a new museum in Staines. | |
| 188 | Zodiac Musical Society (059/1) – small (100-200 seats), fully-equipped theatre which can be hired at a reasonable cost. Concerns that the Magna Carta Art Centre is becoming increasingly unaffordable and is not suitable for many local performing societies. | |
| 189 | Tetlow King Planning (088/4) – assess the need for community facilities and address any deficiencies. | |
| 190 | Rape and Sexual Abuse Support Centre (RASAC) (024/1) – need for a RASAC centre within the borough. | |
| 191 | Mrs Coleman (099/10) – plan should recognise importance of developing libraries, museums and adult education provision. | |
| 192 | Ashford Common Baptist Church (019/1) – re-establish a community facility in Ashford Common. They were forced to move out of Ashford common as the previous premise was redeveloped for housing in 2000. There are no public indoor facilities in Ashford Common which could be utilised. They have previously made representations to Surrey County Council for a redundant building adjacent to Spelthorne Junior School but have only received negative responses. They suggest the demolition and replacement of this building or the use of an existing park at Alexandra Road. | |

Community Facilities

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|--|--|
| 193 | <p>Surrey County Council (087/26) – consider the need for new and replacement/improved facilities required as a result of new development jointly with service providers, including the County Council. County Council will be looking to re-configure the library network and improve/modernise day centres, youth centres and other community services with an emphasis on co-location, multi-use and flexibility. In the longer-term looking to secure drop-in centres for young people in town centres. Recognise the need to accommodate any potential changes in demand including the geographical spread of demand for school provision. A significant surplus of school places is projected in Spelthorne over the next few years. PPS6 advises that local strategies should ensure equality of access to local shopping centre and other facilities to serve people's day-to-day needs.</p> | <p>This will be addressed in preparing the new development plan.</p> |

General Comments

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|-----|---|---|
| 194 | Mr Beecham (043/2) – reduce Council tax. | These are not issues that the development plan will consider but will be forwarded to appropriate sections of the Council. |
| 195 | Mr Beecham (043/3) – Council spending is spiralling out of control. | |
| 196 | The Matthew Arnold School (056/3) – publicity focussed too greatly on Staines and not other areas of the borough. | |
| 197 | Laleham Residents Association (085/7) – prime objective of the medical system should enable people to visit a doctor immediately, hospital treatment for life threatening illnesses should be immediate and within one month for non-life threatening conditions. | This is not an issue that the new development plan will consider but is addressed in the Spelthorne Community Plan. |
| 198 | Surrey County Council (087/30) – plan should have regard to the developing countywide strategy. | The plan will take account of the recently adopted Structure Plan. |
| 199 | Ms Johns (090/7) – apply birth control more vigourously. | These are not development plan issues but general health issues are considered in the Spelthorne Community Plan. |
| 200 | British Heart Foundation (094/1) – looking after the health of both the young and the elderly. | |
| 201 | Biscoe Craig Hall on behalf of The London Diocesan Fund (089/1) – realise the full potential in the disposal of any church that may be declared redundant and the development potential of the sites. New use for redundant church and the need for a full range of alternatives to be available as opposed to it being put to a community use. | This issue needs to be considered on a case by case basis in accordance with the objectives and general policies of the new development plan. |
| 202 | Mr Vermeulen (003/5) - more ratepayers in Spelthorne. | Noted. |
| 203 | Mr McQueen (006/2) – dislikes the new development in Staines Town Centre. | |
| 204 | Mrs Coleman (099/3) – healthy life without threats such as mobile phone masts and waste incinerators. | |
| 205 | Mr Jackson (013/5) – promotion of fair trade products and use of organics and fair trade in council purchasing decisions for services such as schools. | This issue is outside the scope of the new development plan but is addressed by the Council so far as it can in its purchasing policies. |
| 206 | SEERA (097/1) – conformity | Agreed. |

General Comments

| Ref | Summary of Issues | Action Point |
|------------|--|---|
| 207 | Staines Town Society (026/1) – greater focus on enhancing the towns in the borough to benefit the local residents and not just commercial interests. | This will be considered in preparing the new development plan. |
| 208 | Mrs Hunt (030/5) – too little joined-up thinking. | Comment noted. The nature of the new development plan making process should avoid this. |
| 209 | Arlington (027/6) – Population trends. | Trends will be analysed in preparing the development plan. |
| 210 | Mr Barrett (009/1) – more consideration given to those people affected by small-scale planning permissions. | Noted. |

Appendix C: Copy of four-page Borough Bulletin insert