

## APPENDIX B

## STATEMENT OF CONSULTATIONS, REPRESENTATIONS AND THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE

## CONSULTATION ON THE BRIEF

The consultation period ran for three months from February to May 2002. Individual letters were sent to approximately 1,000 properties within 200m of the proposed route and the Brief was made available in local libraries, at the Council Offices and on the Council's web site, where it was the most viewed document during March and April with over 4,000 "hits" during the consultation period.

A wide range of organisations were also consulted directly including key bodies in the railway industry, those concerned with Heathrow Airport, adjoining local authorities and other authorities on record as supporting Airtrack, statutory and non-statutory bodies concerned with environmental protection and nature conservation, local amenity organisations and representatives of local business.

Meetings and informal discussions took place with a number of organisations including the SRA and BAA and a presentation was made to the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee.

A total of 58 representations were received. 26 representations were received from Spelthorne residents including a petition with 108 signatures from residents mostly in the Moor Lane and Moormede estate areas and a letter from 15 addresses in the Wraysbury Gardens development. 32 organisations responded to the Brief including all the key consultees. A number of the responses are very detailed.

## SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSES

Note: Representations have been classified by number of the respondent and points made. For example Mr Bevan (9/1) indicates that Mr Bevan is the ninth respondent and this is his first point).

Issue	Representation	Response
<b>The Brief</b>	Mr Bevan (9/1), Guildford Borough Council (27/1), Runnymede Borough Council (28/1), Bracknell Forest Borough Council (31/1), Slough Borough Council (32/1), LB Hounslow (41/1), Surrey Wildlife Trust (42/1), Surrey County Council (43/1), Hampshire County Council (44/1), Staines Town Society (45/1), Community Alternative Transport Association (CATA) (46/1), British Airways (47/1), Baffin Asset Management Ltd (48/1), Airtrack Forum (51/1), Spelthorne Natural History Society (52/1), English Nature (53/1), the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) (56/1) and BAA (58/1), all welcome the preparation of the Brief.  Additionally, Runnymede Borough Council, Bracknell Forest Borough Council, Surrey Wildlife Trust, British Airways, the Airtrack Forum and the SRA all support the approach of the Brief in setting out issues that need to be addressed.	The widespread support for the preparation of the Brief both from supporters and opponents of the project is to be welcomed.
	The SRA (56/2) comment that the document plays down the important regional and national benefits of Airtrack and suggests the Brief should reflect relevant national policy and transport policy guidance.	The stated purpose of the Brief (para 1.3) is to give guidance on issues affecting Spelthorne. Detailing national policy is outside the scope of the Brief. <u>An amendment to para 1.3 is made to confirm this point.</u>
	Railtrack (49/2) suggest the Brief should consider the transport implications in terms of increased road usage of not building Airtrack.	The Council will need to consider the point in its response to the scheme but it is outside the scope of the Brief. <u>No change.</u>

	Surrey County Council (43/2) comment that the details contained in the document are a matter for Spelthorne as local planning authority and not appropriate for Surrey to comment.	Noted
	Tandridge District Council (29/1) and Woking Borough Council (35/1) have no comment on the Brief.	Noted
<b>Overview of the Scheme</b>	The SRA (56/3) comment that the final Airtrack scheme will be subject to detailed design and optioneering work and may differ from what is currently envisaged. The Brief should not be too prescriptive and an amendment is suggested to state that the physical works described are those likely to be proposed but that other options may come forward after further analysis and these will need to be considered by the Council as part of its formal consideration of any Transport and Works Act proposal.	The description of the scheme in the Brief is based on information provided by Railtrack in 2001. At this stage the SRA is keen not to rule out variations and <u>the SRA's suggested amendment is agreed.</u>
	The SRA (56/4) add that decisions on service pattern and frequency have not yet been made and are likely to be affected by decisions on related schemes including Crossrail. They suggest the Council are right to be circumspect over train frequency and add that it is likely service patterns will comprise 6 to 12 trains per hour.	Service frequency has been a cause of public concern. The SRA's comments set out the current position and <u>it is suggested the SRA's comments on service frequency have been incorporated into the Brief.</u>
	The SRA (56/5) comment that the proposal for a new station near Staines High Street should be regarded as an option at this stage. It will need to be established that the benefits of the station outweigh the disbenefits.	The Council sees the station as essential if Airtrack goes ahead. <u>The Brief has been amended to set out the SRA's view that the station should be regarded as an option at this stage and also to set out the Council's position.</u>

	<p>The SRA (56/6) suggest it is premature to rule out the option of reversing facilities at Staines Station thereby avoiding the need for the chord and the proposed new station. They suggest the following wording:</p> <p>"It is also suggested that reversing facilities at Staines Station with new sidings might be an alternative to the Staines Chord, although this option would have implications for train capacity and operations which the promoter would need to resolve".</p> <p>Conversely, Railtrack (49/3) consider the Brief understates the impracticability of reversing at Staines Station. Mr Gibbon (18/4) and the Airtrack Forum (51/3) both state that reversing at Staines is not a practical proposition.</p>	<p>In view of the SRA's comments it is not considered that the Brief should rule out the reversing option, although the practical problems are acknowledged. <u>The Brief has been amended to incorporate the SRA's wording.</u></p>
	Mr Patterson (7/1), Tidegrove Ltd (37/1), Waverley Borough Council (39/1), LB Hounslow (41/2), Hampshire County Council (44/2), British Airways (47/2), Airtrack Forum (51/2), Transport for London (55/1) all express support for the scheme.	These comments on the overall merits of the project are noted but care should be taken in drawing any conclusions on the balance of views, as consultees were not asked for their views on the scheme as a whole. The Brief deliberately does not yet

	Mr Jones (3/4), Mrs Hamdellah (8/1), Mr Bevan (9/2), Mr Hughes (10/2), Mr Gibson (11/1), Wraysbury Garden Residents (16/1), Mr Garner and Ms Brown (19/1), all oppose the scheme. Additionally, the Petition (12) expresses great concern about several aspects. Spelthorne Chamber of Commerce (40/1), Staines Town Society (45/1) and CATA (46/1) all support the view that improved rail links are needed from Staines to Heathrow but oppose Airtrack.	set out to express a view on the overall merits and <u>no change</u> is required.
--	--	---

<b>History</b>	Railtrack (49/2) make a number of detailed comments on the history in section 3.1 of the document including suggesting that reference should be made to the existence of the Staines Chord until the early 1960 's. Mr Gibbon (18/3) makes the same point.	Generally the History section is considered satisfactory. <u>An amendment to refer to the previous existence of the Staines Chord is agreed but with the addition of a comment that the area has since been substantially redeveloped.</u>
<b>Alternatives</b>	Mr Bevan (9/3), Mr Jackson (13/2), Ms Burgess (14/4), Spelthorne Chamber of Commerce (40/5), Staines Town Society (45/2) and CATA (46/2), all support the SWELTRAC scheme for a southern rail link to Heathrow in preference to Airtrack. Railtrack (49/3) comments that the Southern Rail link is less well-developed and that meaningful conclusions can only be achieved if comparisons are between schemes at similar levels of development. The SRA (56/7) comments that the Southern Rail Link does not offer the same functionality because it is not primarily designed to access Terminal 5.	These comments are noted. In response to Railtrack the onus is on the promoters to ensure they develop alternatives in sufficient detail to enable meaningful comparisons to be made. The SRA 's comment is relevant to the assessment of the alternative but is not sufficient to rule out assessing the SWELTRAC scheme as an alternative to Airtrack especially in the light of the M3 link shown in the recent consultation on Air Transport. <u>No change.</u>
	Mrs Windle (2/4) suggests extending the underground from Hatton Cross to Feltham. Mr Jones (3/1) suggests following a route alongside the King George VI reservoir instead of the route across Staines Moor. Mr Hughes (10/1) suggests following the A3044 corridor (Stanwell Moor Road) from Staines to the airport. He also suggests connections between Brentford and Southall and Clapham Junction and Acton as alternative routes that could provide access from Waterloo to Heathrow. Mr Jackson (13/1) and the Spelthorne Chamber of Commerce (40/6) suggest constructing Airtrack without the Staines Chord with passengers from the Reading line to Heathrow changing at Staines. They also suggest a tram link from Staines to Heathrow. Mr Jackson suggests these could be combined with a rail link from Heathrow to Iver permitting longer distance services via Reading. Spelthorne Chamber of Commerce (40/7) also say consideration should be given to a passenger service from Heathrow alongside the M25 to the South West main line at Byfleet, thereby connecting to Woking and Guildford. Mr Morgan (17/4) advocates the HASQUAD "eastern" route via Hounslow Heath (shown on	The various alternatives have been noted and forwarded to the SRA for their consideration. The Brief requires alternatives to be considered. <u>No change.</u>

	Plan 2 of the Brief), Mr Stevens (21/2) comments generally that alternatives should be examined.	
	English Nature (53/7) request an amendment to suggest that specific consideration should be given to alternatives that avoid impact on sites with statutory protection for nature conservation.	English Nature's proposed amendment would require alternatives avoiding Staines Moor to be investigated. <u>The proposed amendment is agreed.</u>
<b>Staines Chord</b>	Mr Bevan (9/4) considers it insane to construct a major train route through a town centre. He also expresses concern over the future development of the triangle site between the railways and questions the scope for providing and maintaining landscaping adjoining operational railway land (9/8). Mr Hughes (10/5), Wraysbury Garden Residents (16/3), Mr Morgan (17/3), Mr Garner and Ms Brown (19/3), Mr Hudson (24/2), Spelthorne Chamber of Commerce (40/3), Staines Town Society (45/3) and Baffin Asset Management Ltd (48/4) all highlight the visual impact of the Chord and Mr Hudson also refers to its barrier effect. The London Transport Users Committee (57/1) say the area is currently an eyesore and the chord if anything provides an opportunity for improvement. Surrey County Council (43/2) comment that good design, minimising severance and overcoming other environmental concerns will be a major consideration.	The comments on environmental impact of the Chord generally reflect issues already identified in the Brief. However, in response to Mr Bevan's comments it is appropriate to <u>add reference under "potential opportunities" to ensuring that landscaping is maintained.</u>

	Mrs Gardam (25/2), Spelthorne Chamber of Commerce (40/3), the Association for the Preservation of Staines Moor (APSM) (54/1), and Baffin Asset Management (48/4) all express concern at the loss of parking from the Elmsleigh surface level car park. Baffin Asset Management oppose the suggestion in the Brief that the future of the Elmsleigh surface level car park should be reviewed. They also suggest that the chord could run in a central reservation between the two carriageways of South Street. Baffin Asset Management (48/2) consider that the implications for the Elmsleigh Centre and its future extension in accordance with Local Plan policy should be identified as an additional issue. Under this heading it should be a requirement that the replacement of the access to the Elmsleigh Multi-Storey car park should be done with the minimum of disruption and that the resultant access is no less attractive than the existing arrangement.	The Brief already highlights maintaining the quality and quantity of car parking as issues that need to be addressed. Given that the Chord could significantly reduce the size of the Elmsleigh surface car park it is considered right to review its future if Airtrack is built. The Brief specifically identifies the value of the car park to the Elmsleigh Centre as a factor in the review and it may be that the outcome is to reaffirm the need for the facility. The suggestion of running the chord in the central reservation is noted but may not be practical. Baffin Asset Management's comment that <u>the implications for the Elmsleigh Centre and its future extension be identified as a separate issue and their related comments regarding the access to the multi-storey car park are agreed and the Brief has been amended accordingly.</u>
	Mr Gibbon (18/3) considers the Council should have anticipated the impact of the scheme on parking provision and retained previous proposals for a new high-level access from the west and not reduced the size of the Riverside Car Park.	In response to Mr Gibbon the high level access to the west was part of a now-withdrawn planning application to extend the Elmsleigh Centre and could not be justified in its own right. The implications of the Memorial Gardens scheme on town centre car parking was assessed at the

		<p>time to be acceptable. Abandoning this major environmental improvement because in the long term Airtrack may affect another car park could not be justified.</p>
<p><b>High Street Station</b></p>	<p>Mr Bevan (9/9), Mr Hughes (10/6), the Petition (12/3), Mrs Whittle (15/3), and APSM (54/2) are all concerned about adverse impact of the proposed station on nearby housing.</p> <p>Mr Patterson (7/2), Mr Bevan (9/7), Mr Gibson (11/2), the Petition (12/5), Ms Burgess (14/1), Mrs Whittle (15/2), Wraysbury Garden Residents (16/4), Mr Garner and Ms Brown (19/2) and APSM (54/2) are all concerned at the implications for congestion and parking in residential areas. Staines Town Society (45/7) and CATA (46/4) comment that strong parking controls will be needed.</p> <p>CATA (46/4) and SRA (56/9) support the view that long stay car parking should not be provided.</p> <p>Mrs Windle (2/3) and Mr Hughes (10/7) are concerned about increased hazards for pedestrians in the Millmead and Iron Bridge area.</p>	<p>The Brief already identifies the need to minimise impact on residential areas from the proposed station and to ensure that the station is compatible with town centre infrastructure. It is acknowledged that pressure for parking in residential areas could increase but this is an existing problem in the area around the town centre that will need to be tackled regardless of decisions on Airtrack. It should be noted that no respondent called for extra off-street long stay car parks in the town centre area. <u>No change</u> is required on these aspects.</p>
	<p>Mrs Whittle (15/6) and London Transport Uses Committee (57/3) highlight the importance of accessibility for disabled people and the importance of good station design as an element in encouraging rail travel. The SRA comment that Disability Discrimination Act requirements would need to be met.</p>	<p>The Brief already identifies the need to incorporate disabled access but it <u>could beneficially be amended to highlight the importance of a good overall design for the station both in townscape terms and encouraging rail use. This amendment has been made.</u></p>
	<p>The SRA (56/9) comment that signal overlap distance requirements between the station and the start of the Staines Chord may influence the final location of the station. Tidegrove Ltd (37/2) suggest moving the station 50m further north to avoid affecting their redevelopment at Majestic House. Renshaw (UK) Ltd (23/1) comment that, as owners of the Renshaw Industrial Estate in Millmead, they would like to discuss long term redevelopment possibilities linked to the station.</p> <p>The SRA (56/7) note that the Brief makes reference to the proposed Fairfield Avenue link and comment that it would be unreasonable to require the promoters of Airtrack to provide the link if it is already required in connection with another scheme (ie Majestic House).</p>	<p>The implications of signal overlap distance requirements for the exact location of the station have been discussed with the SRA and Railtrack. Without further technical study the extent of any constraint cannot be quantified. <u>The Brief has been amended to identify signal overlap distance requirements as an issue to be addressed in developing the scheme, adding that at this stage the Brief could not rule out any specific location for the station on grounds of signal overlap requirement.</u></p> <p>- In view of the above amendment it is not considered that a revised specific location for the station, as requested by Tidegrove, can be identified at this stage. <u>Redevelopment constraints and opportunities have been added to the factors to be considered in the final location of the station.</u></p> <p>- In response to the SRA, the Brief does not require the promoters of Airtrack to fund the Fairfield Avenue link.</p>

	<p>The SRA (50/10) supports measures to integrate the two stations but adds that two stations in close proximity would not normally be acceptable and resultant problems would be a factor in evaluating the case for a second station. Mr Gibbon (18/1) queries whether a second station would be viable.</p>	<p>The SRA's comments on integration and issues relating to two stations are noted.</p>
	<p>Mr Patterson (7/2) and Mrs Whittle (15/5) suggest relocating the station to the island created by the Staines Chord.</p> <p>Transport for London (55/2) suggest that the station could provide an opportunity to promote high density development and development likely to attract non-car-borne users in the vicinity.</p> <p>The Airtrack Forum (51/4) comment that a good level of services to Staines is a prerequisite for realising the potential of the scheme and that the Forum would not envisage supporting any proposed service pattern which failed to deliver an adequate level of service to Staines.</p>	<p>A single station location in the "island" site would be a better solution in planning terms but it entails building platforms on a curve and a more complex signalling regime which have been deemed unacceptable on safety grounds (by the Health and Safety Executive). The Council cannot promote an unsafe option and so <u>no change</u> is proposed.</p> <p>The other comments by Transport for London and the Airtrack Forum are noted.</p>

<b>Use of the Existing Line</b>	<p>Mrs Windle (2/2), Mr Jones (3/4), Mr Swainbank (5/2), Mr Westwood (6/1), Mr Patterson (7/3), Mr Bevan (9/6), Mr Hughes (10/12), Mr Gibson (11/4), the Petition (12/4), Ms Burgess (14/2), Mrs Whittle (15/4), Wraysbury Garden Residents (16/1), Mr Morgan (17/2), Mr Garner and Ms Brown (19/1), Mr Hudson (24/3) and Staines Town Society (45/5) all express concern at the impact on existing housing of extra trains on existing track. Specific mention is made of movements at unsocial hours. On mitigation for extra noise disturbance, Mrs Windle suggests residents affected should be offered assistance with double-glazing and Mr Patterson and Mr Hughes suggests track side noise barriers. Mr Hughes also suggests upgrading the track to incorporate jointless rails.</p>	<p>The issues raised are already covered in the Brief and <u>no change is required</u>. The comments of the SRA (previously reported under "Overview") suggest actual frequencies <u>may</u> be less than the maximum reported in the Brief. Nevertheless the number of responses on the issue show it is a real area of public concern that the promoters will need to address in developing the scheme.</p>
	<p>The SRA (56/6) comment that it is possible footpaths crossing the existing or new line would need to be diverted, closed or put onto a footbridge or underpass depending on the outcome of a risk assessment. Wraysbury Garden Residents (16/2) and Mr Garner and Ms Brown (19/1) are concerned that the existing footpath crossing the Windsor line will need to be closed. Mr Hughes (10/8) suggests it should be replaced by a footbridge.</p>	<p>The Brief identifies impacts on rights of way as an issue and states that the existing footpath link across the railway which gives access to Staines Moor from the town centre area should be maintained. An alternative form of crossing may be required but the Brief rules out closure as an option. <u>No change required</u>.</p>
<b>Staines Moor</b>	<p>English Nature (53/2) states that adverse impact on the SSSI and SPA/Ramsar site should be avoided or minimised. The proposed route would have adverse effects including</p>	<p>The Brief recognises the impact on Staines Moor identified in the responses including the value of trees along the railway embankment as a landscape</p>

	<p>land take, possible hydrological and pollution effects, lighting, noise and impact on grazing management. Mr Geeves (1/1), Mr Jones (3/2), Mr Westwood (6/2), the petition (12/1), Ms Burgess (14/3), Wraysbury Garden Residents (16/6), Mr Morgan (17/1), Mr Garner and Ms Brown (19/4), Mrs Brown (20/1), Mr and Mrs Larman (22/1), Mr Hudson (24/1), Mrs Gardam (25/1), the Environment Agency (30/1), Surrey Wildlife Trust (42/2), Staines Town Society (45/4), Spelthorne Natural History Society (52/2) and APSM (54/4) all express concern at the impact on Staines Moor and on wildlife and landscape of the area. Mrs Gardam highlights the value of the planting on the old railway embankment as a buffer zone between the Moor and the M25. Mr Gibbon (18/4) considers there should be no objection to the proposed route as it follows the line of the former railway.</p>	<p>feature. In response to Mr Gibbon, following the line of the embankment would entail the loss of the tree belt and the likelihood of some intrusion onto the adjoining Common Land to accommodate the necessary width of the railway corridor. <u>No change required.</u></p>
	<p>With regard to mitigation English Nature comment that ancient, unimproved, species rich grassland cannot be replaced. They state that in nature conservation terms the loss of valuable marsh and grassland is more serious than the loss of vegetation on the railway embankment, and suggest incorporating a requirement to assess the quality of the habitats either side of the embankment before land take is finalised. English Nature also suggest adding a specific reference to minimising the potential impact on Butts Pond and identifying new compensatory pond habitats.</p> <p>English Nature also suggest reference be made to the requirement under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) for public bodies in exercising their functions to take reasonable steps, consistent with the proper exercise at their functions, to further conservation and enhancement of the special features on a SSSI where these functions affect a SSSI.</p>	<p><u>English Nature's suggested amendments are agreed.</u> Regarding the railway embankment, the Brief recognises its importance as a landscape feature which will also need to be taken into account in the design of the scheme should it proceed.</p>
	<p>English Nature (53/6), Environment Agency (30/4), and Surrey Wildlife Trust (42/2) all wish to see ecological surveys of the area affected.</p>	<p>The developers will need to carry out detailed ecological surveys to address the issues raised in the Brief. <u>An amendment has been made to make this requirement explicit.</u></p>
	<p>The Environment Agency (30/9) would require compensation for any loss of flood plain. A flood risk assessment would be required. APSM (54/4) raise concern over increased risk of flooding.</p>	<p>The Brief identifies flooding as an issue and requires a flood risk assessment to include impact on the operation of the flood plain. <u>An amendment has been made to incorporate a requirement for compensation for any loss of flood plain.</u></p>
	<p>The Environment Agency (30/2) suggest there would be benefit in relocating the River Wraysbury in a more natural channel further to the</p>	<p>The Brief already identifies the possibility of realigning the River Wraysbury as a potential opportunity subject to</p>

	east, allowing Airtrack to run closer to the M25. Any such scheme would need to be acceptable to English Nature in terms of impact on the SSSI. (This issue is also raised in relation to the Stanwell Moor section). Surrey Wildlife Trust (42/4) support investigation of the option.	consideration of the impact on the SSSI. <u>No change required.</u>
	The SRA (56/11) acknowledge that the issues relating to Staines Moor are material and important but add that, if the scheme can be justified, there will inevitably be impacts on the Moor, in which case the issue becomes one of mitigation. They add that it is inappropriate to make the promoter of Airtrack resolve existing deficiencies beyond mitigation required to compensate for impacts of the scheme.	The SRA's comments are noted. The justification for the scheme would need to include justification for ruling out alternatives avoiding Staines Moor. The Brief addresses mitigation issues. It is considered appropriate to seek other compensatory improvements where residual impacts remain after the scope for mitigation has been addressed. <u>No change required.</u>

<b>Stanwell Moor Section</b>	Mrs Brown (20/2) and Mr and Mrs Larman (22/3) raise concerns about noise disturbance and pollution for residents of Stanwell Moor.	The Brief identifies impact on housing in Stanwell Moor as an issue to be addressed. It also suggests that starting the tunnelled section further south could reduce impact. (See separate comments below on tunnelling). <u>No change required.</u>
	Mrs Brown (20/3) and Mr and Mrs Larman (22/3) query whether there will be an effect on Horton Road and its connection to Junction 14.	Airtrack will probably need to pass under Horton Road, possibly in tunnel by this point to gain access to the station at Heathrow which is below ground. There should be no need to interfere with the access from Horton Road to Junction 14. <u>No change required.</u>
	Mrs Brown (20/4) and Mr and Mrs Larman (22/4) raise concern about the impact on the Flood Alleviation Scheme for Stanwell Moor.	This will need to be considered as part of the Flood Risk Assessment required under the Brief. <u>No change required.</u>
	The Environment Agency (30/2) suggest realigning the River Wraysbury in a more natural corridor to the east of Airtrack (see also comments on Staines Moor). Robert Brett and Sons Ltd (34/1) who own land east of the M25 at Hithermoor comment that they would be affected and reserve their position as to whether the opportunity identified would be viable.	The Brief identifies the possibility of realigning the river and the adjoining Moor Lane Bridleway to create a better environment for both. This would require further discussions that would need to involve the adjoining landowner. <u>No change required.</u>
	The Environment Agency (30/4) comment that sections of the route that are underground threaten natural groundwater flow systems which could consequentially threaten the SSSI, SPA and RAMSAR sites through change to the water environment. This may lead the EA to object. Detailed discussions will be needed between the promoter and the EA. The SRA (56/12) comment that in considering tunnelling options the promoters will need to consider cost, construction issues and operational aspects of a tunnel given that the area	In view of the Environment Agency's comments <u>an amendment has been made to identify the impact on groundwater flows from tunnelling as an issue to be addressed together with a reference to the need to discuss this aspect with the Environment Agency.</u> The SRA's comments are noted.

	is liable to flood. The scheme will need to balance viability and environmental considerations.	
	Thames Water (33/1) request consultation on any proposal affecting their outlet shafts east of the M25.	<u>The Brief be amended to incorporate Thames Water's request for consultation.</u>
	Surrey Wildlife Trust (42/3) comment on the need to safeguard the Greenham's Fishing Pond, a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.	The Brief identifies this issue. <u>No change required.</u>
	The Staines Town Society (45/9) and CATA (46/9), refer to the need to retain the Moor Lane Bridleway which also has value as a cycle route. The London Transport Users Committee (37/2) suggest providing a cycle route to Heathrow alongside Airtrack.	The Brief seeks to retain the Moor Lane bridleway which also functions as a cycle route. It suggests realigning the route further from the motorway which could potentially improve its attractiveness to cyclists.
<b>Construction</b>	Mr Gibson (11/5), the Petition (12/2), Wraysbury Garden Residents (16/7), Mr Garner and Ms Brown (19/5), Mr Hudson (24/5) all raise objections on grounds of construction impact.	The Brief recognises that construction impact is a major concern and identifies a range of issues that will need to be addressed.
	Mr Jones (3/3) raises concern about the use of Moor Lane as a construction access. The Highways Agency (50/2) comment that there is a general presumption against allowing new accesses onto trunk roads, but they would be prepared to consider the Brief's proposal that the main access points for construction traffic should be the M25 junction 14 and the A30 Staines Bypass. This would be on the understanding that any agreed access arrangements would not have a negative impact on road safety or significantly affect traffic flows on the trunk road network.	The Brief states that Moor Lane is unsuitable for construction traffic and should be avoided. In response to the Highways Agency <u>an amendment has been made to state that the construction access arrangements should be acceptable in terms of road safety and traffic flow considerations.</u>

	The SRA (56/13) comment that some impact from construction activity on Staines Moor is inevitable and therefore it is inappropriate for the Brief to suggest the Construction Strategy should seek to avoid damage to the Moor.	Given that Staines Moor is a SSSI, seeking to avoid impact is considered to be an appropriate objective. <u>No change required.</u>
<b>Related Projects</b>	The Highways Agency (50/1) and the SRA (56/14) both comment that M25 widening should be completed before Airtrack commences so overlap of construction unlikely.	These comments are accepted. The Brief requires cumulative impact to be examined if it is possible the construction projects will overlap. <u>An amendment has been made to state that overlap with M25 widening is very unlikely.</u>
	Central Railways (38/1) comment that they would be willing to build the section of Airtrack north of Staines that follows the same corridor as Central Railways. To accommodate both sets of services a four track formation would be needed between Staines Moor and Junction 14.	Central Railways offer is noted. The Government is currently considering whether to support the Central Railways project. Should a decision be made to go ahead with the scheme (which is far from certain) it is possible that it could be constructed in advance of Airtrack. However, it would be premature to construct part of the Airtrack line until final decisions are made on Airtrack as a whole, including evaluation

		of alternatives as required by the Brief. The situation needs to be kept under review but at this stage <u>no change</u> to the Brief is required.
<b>Other</b>	Mr Hudson (24/4), Staines Town Society (45/8), CATA (46/8) and APSM (54/3) raise concerns about the impact of extended closure of level crossings in the Hythe/Egham areas and the potential impact on traffic congestion. Staines Town Society and CATA suggest there may be an indirect impact on Spelthorne due to people changing their journey patterns.	This is primarily an issue for Runnymede Borough Council who have been sent copies of the relevant correspondence. Any consequential impacts on travel patterns would need to be assessed but there is no need to amend the Planning Brief which is only concerned with the development of the scheme in Spelthorne.