

Working towards...

The Spelthorne Local Development Framework

Spelthorne Development Plan Report on the Issues and Options Consultation September - November 2005



May 2006



SPELTHORNE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

**REPORT ON THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS
CONSULTATION**

SEPTEMBER - NOVEMBER 2005

May 2006

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

Ref: 05/2006



Contents

Contents i
List of Tables i
List of Abbreviations ii
1. Introduction..... 1
2. Consultation 2
3. Strategy and Policies..... 4
4. Site Specific Options 24
Appendix 1 - 'Bulletin Special' 57

List of Tables

Table 1 Proposals with a supporting statement - Green Belt Sites 47
Table 2 Proposals with a supporting statement - Non Green Belt Sites 50

List of Abbreviations

DPD	Development Plan Document
LDF	Local Development Framework
R/O	Rear Of
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this document is to set out the responses to the 'Issues and Options' consultation undertaken by the Council in the autumn of 2005 as part of its preparation of a new Development Plan for the Borough.
- 1.2 The way in which the consultation was undertaken is explained in the next section and details of the responses are set out in subsequent sections.
- 1.3 The 'Issues and Options' consultation is part of the early stage of plan making under the new Local Development Framework (LDF) system introduced through the Planning and Compensation Act 2004. This stage is part of Regulation 25 of the new system.
- 1.4 A feature of the new system is active and early involvement of communities in the preparation process. The aim of 'early involvement' is to identify local needs and issues the plan needs to address at the very beginning, and to identify realistic options available to deal with them.
- 1.5 The Council is preparing three Development Plan Documents which will comprise the 'Spelthorne Development Plan'.
 - Spelthorne Development Plan - Strategy and Policies
 - Spelthorne Development Plan - Proposals
 - Spelthorne Development Plan - Proposals Map
- 1.6 The Council has consulted on Issues and Options relating to both Strategy and Policies and to Site Specific Proposals. These were set out in two documents:
 - A Special edition of the Council's Borough Bulletin (dealing with Strategy and Policies)
 - Site Specific proposals document
- 1.7 Responses to the consultation have been used by the Council to assist it in preparing its Preferred Options for the new plan published for consultation from 4 May to 15 June 2006. This will be followed in the Autumn of 2006 by the publication of a formal draft 'submission' version of the plan.

2. Consultation

- 2.1 The formal consultation period was for six weeks between 19 September and 31 October 2005. Those attending two of the Council's Area Forums in November were invited to submit any comments within a week of those meetings. All representations received up until 12 December have been considered..
- 2.2 The Special edition of the Borough Bulletin cross-referred to the Site Specific Proposals document and included specific reference to the Airtrack proposal. Site Specific Proposals were, however, dealt with in a separate document with different consultation arrangements.
- 2.3 The Strategy and Policies consultation was based on eight key issues which were considered the most pertinent in establishing the direction of the new plan. These were elaborated on in the Bulletin by reference to both evidence and policy considerations. The Bulletin had 21 questions on which people could tick yes, no or no opinion. Seven boxes were provided in which people could set out any comments they wished to make either on specific questions or generally. A copy of the Bulletin is set out at Appendix 1 to this document.
- 2.4 In summary the consultation arrangements for both documents were as follows:
- a) Strategy and Policies
 - i. Publishing of the eight key issues in a Special Edition of the Council's Borough Bulletin with an integral questionnaire. These were distributed to every resident and business in the Borough. Copies were also available from the Borough's five libraries and Tesco Superstores at Sunbury and Ashford. Some 43,000 copies were distributed.
 - ii. A letter and copy of the Bulletin was sent to every organisation and individual on the Council's LDF contact list (some 600 groups/people)
 - iii. Presentations were given on the issues at the following meetings (some presentations were at the request of specific organisations). The presentation to the Shepperton Residents Association was at their request and although after the consultation period provided an opportunity to inform people generally about issues and the plan making process.

19 September 2005	-	Local Strategic Partnership
22 September 2005	-	Spelthorne Business Breakfast
22 September 2005	-	Spelthorne Youth Council
18 October 2005	-	Shepperton Area Forum
17 October 2005	-	Wraysbury Gardens Residents Association
20 October 2005	-	Silvery Sands Residents Association
25 October 2005	-	Sunbury Area Forum
28 October 2005	-	Spelthorne Business Forum
15 November 2005	-	Stanwell Area Forum
22 November 2005	-	Ashford Area forum
7 March 2006	-	Shepperton Residents Association AGM
 - iv. Publicity and documents available on the Council's website.

- b) Site Specific Proposals:
 - i. Letter to all relevant owners of sites.
 - ii. Letter to all adjoining residents/businesses and occupiers of the sites.
 - iii. Reference was made to the Site Specific document in the Special Bulletin and a letter was sent to those on the LDF contact list with an invitation to identify any additional sites suitable for development.
 - iv. Reference to the specific sites at the meetings referred to above.
- 2.5 Some 1679 Bulletins were completed and returned by 12 December and all of these have been analysed. In addition:
- a) 96 letters raising general issues were received.
 - b) 92 letters in response to consultation on specific sites were received.
 - c) Two petitions were received.
- 2.6 The following sections of this document assess the responses to the consultation on the 'Issues and Options' and the Site Specific Proposals.

3. Strategy and Policies

- 3.1 Information on the 'Issues and Options' for the Strategy and Policies was set out in the Special Edition of the Borough Bulletin. The following section analyses the responses to the Bulletin made by completion and return of the integral questionnaires and also letters from individuals and organisations.
- 3.2 Those completing the Bulletin were invited to provide some details about themselves including whether male or female, age group, ethnicity, how they received the Bulletin and if they were a local resident, Business or 'other'. This information was gathered to provide an indication of the extent to which those responding were representative of the population of the Borough as a whole. No equivalent information is available for those who wrote letters.
- 3.3 The composition of those who completed the 1679 Bulletin questionnaire is as follows:

a) Type of respondent		
Local resident	1474	88%
Local businesses	22	1%
Other	22	1%
No reply	172	10%

b) Gender		
Male	734	44%
Female	754	45%
No reply	191	11%

c) Receipt of Bulletin		
Delivered to home/business	1406	84%
At a meeting	21	1%
With a letter	25	1%
No reply	231	14%

d) Age Group		
Under 18	2	0.1%
18-24	15	1%
25-44	372	22%
45-64	574	34%
65+	528	31%
No reply	188	11%

e) Ethnicity		
White	1352	81%
Black or Black British	2	0.1%
Asian or Asian British	19	1%
Chinese	5	0.2%
Other ethnic group	21	1%
No reply	270	16%

- 3.4 Between 10-16% of respondents did not complete one or more questions about themselves. The information confirms that a very high proportion of those replying were local residents. The gender split was around 50/50 and this reflects the local population. A higher proportion of those who gave their age were in the older age groups.
- 3.5 The ethnic mix showed 2-3% as non-white whereas the actual non white element of the population is around 4%. However 16% of people did not complete this section.
- 3.6 Those responding via the Bulletin and letter were by definition self-selected and do not represent a structured cross section of Borough residents that could be gained from a structured sample survey. Nevertheless, other than age the profile of those responding does not appear to be substantially different from the actual population structure.
- 3.7 The following sub-sections take each of the eight key issues raised in the Bulletin. The specific questions and information provided in the response boxes is summarised under each heading. Overall approximately two fifths of those responding provided written comments. In some cases these comments related to issues dealt with in other parts of the Bulletin. This report has grouped responses according to where they most appropriately fit. Some responses related to matters outside of the scope of the LDF and are dealt with in paragraph 3.9 below.

Q1. What should we be trying to achieve?

- 3.8 Of the 1679 who returned a Bulletin, 620 made comments on the proposed 'Vision Statement' under this section. 299 related to the vision itself and 321 related to more detailed issues dealt with later on in the Bulletin. Of the 299 comments which related directly to the vision 164 of these agreed with the statement and 135 disagreed. A few comments were raised in individual letters. Those disagreeing had comments which fell into two broad groups:
- a) those seeking additions or reordering of the words
 - b) those who had alternative objectives
- 3.9 The issues/suggestions raised are summarised below:

a) Additions to or reordering of words

- change the order of the statement so protection and enhancement of the environment comes before reference to new development
- change the word 'better' to 'a more pleasant and attractive place to live and work'
- add 'proactively' before the word 'make' in the first line
- after 'environment' add 'and the quality of life'
- at the end add 'while ensuring democratic needs are met'
- add reference to the effect that services must be adequate to meet the needs of an increased population and that the resulting traffic does not impact on health and safety
- 'protecting' the environment will make it difficult to develop/redevelop
- there should be reference to improving air quality
- add the words 'natural' and 'historic' before the word environment

b) A range of comments were made which would result in a fundamentally different vision. These were as follows:

- difficult to 'enhance the environment' if you have more development - social and environmental needs should be considered before business
- object to the implied priority of development
- vision should seek to 'balance' development and protect the environment not just provide for development
- vision should be about retaining the character of Spelthorne
- should be more specific about the economic and social needs requiring priority
- should focus on either protection of the environment or development and not both
- vision should focus on better utilisation and development of existing facilities as a way of protecting and enhancing the environment
- vision should support the creation of both financial and environmental wealth for the benefit of all residents
- vision cannot be achieved due to Government guidance requiring more development
- vision appears to be limited by the options which seem to seek to restrain development

3.10 The core strategy of the new LDFs are required to have a 'vision' statement although inevitably these will be rather general if they are to be succinct. In part the ability to deliver a vision is dependent on the strategy and detailed policies behind it.

3.11 The more fundamental comments in section (b) above pull in various directions and are indicative of the inherent tensions of planning in this area between the strong support to protect and enhance the environment and the need to provide for some new development, whether resulting from locally arising needs or requirements by regional plans and structure plans. Many see protection of the environment as only possible under a 'no development' scenario, while a few welcome greater support for the economy.

3.12 The reality facing the Council is that some more development must be provided for, including local needs such as new/improved health centres, specialist accommodation for an increasingly aging population and the inevitability that older worn out buildings at some time need redeveloping. Currently the vision as drafted

reflects the thrust of national planning policy guidance applicable to this area. The Vision is referred to first in order to make the Council's approach to development clear from the outset. About three fifths of those who did comment supported the vision as drafted although some were sceptical about the ability to deliver it. This included concerns about consequent increases in Council Tax.

- 3.13 It is considered that the more fundamental changes reflected in (b) above would not be consistent with local needs and planning policies to which the Council is required to have regard. Some suggestions would make the vision too detailed for a vision statement. References to air quality form part of enhancing the environment and comments such as references to 'natural' or 'historic' environments would make the vision too narrow in its intent.

Conclusion

- 3.14 The vision will be revised to give greater clarity to the Council's intentions and read as follows:

"To make Spelthorne a better place by ensuring provision is made for new development to meet the economic and social needs of residents and businesses, while at the same time protecting and enhancing the environment".

Q2. Where should we build?

- 3.15 People were presented with two main options about the green belt and areas liable to flood and an open question about sites and areas they thought would be suitable for development. The results were as follows:
- 3.16 Option 1 - Restrict new housing and commercial development to existing urban areas rather than allow expansion onto the Green Belt.

Yes	1453	87%
No	113	7%
No opinion	25	1%
No response	88	5%

3.17 Option 2 - Restrict new housing and commercial development in areas liable to flood.

Yes	1217	72%
No	270	16%
No opinion	53	3%
No response	139	8%

3.18 Both options were supported by around three quarters or more of respondents.

3.19 A few of those completing the Bulletin also made other comments on these two issues. Comments on the Green Belt generally supported a firm stance on its protection with only two people taking a different view that Green Belt restrictions should be removed. Comments on flooding supported restrictions and in addition several referred to the importance of maintaining watercourses.

3.20 A number of the letters raised specific points relating to the Green Belt, some of which were also advocating the development of specific sites or areas. Some advocated a review of the Green Belt so as to provide scope for more development and in particular expansion of the economy and to meet assumed longer term needs of Heathrow. Two parties referred specifically to releasing Green Belt land in the north of the Borough and it was also suggested this could assist in rejuvenating deprived areas in that part of the Borough. One suggested that a dogmatic approach to the Green Belt was inconsistent with the flexibility LDFs should have and could result in growth not being dealt with in a sustainable manner. Another emphasised the need to give particular protection of the Green Belt adjacent to Hounslow because of its strategic importance.

3.21 Some letters also commented on flooding with support for an appropriate policy. Concerns that more development might add to flood risk; problems of dealing with storm water. One person suggested that dredging the Thames, erecting barriers and expanding the flood plain, could enhance flood capacity. One person made comment that there should be greater clarity in what should be allowed. One party did suggest there should be a presumption in favour of development in the floodplain unless a flood risk assessment demonstrated otherwise.

3.22 A number commented on development generally in Spelthorne with some wanting no more development at all and others wanting certain types of development to be limited. Of these some questioned the need for any additional housing whilst others expressed concerns about particular aspects of development including general increases in density, the increase of one and two bedroom properties and the loss of family housing for flats. Some wanted new development for local people only and some wanted more protection for the environment generally. Some wanted further development by particular businesses, such as Heathrow and Tesco's, to be controlled. Some of these points were set out in letters including concern generally about the amount of development and congestion in Sunbury believed to be accentuated by there being three large secondary schools and where further infill development is felt likely to make things worse.

Conclusion

- 3.23 Some further development and redevelopment of sites in the Borough with buildings coming to the end of their useful life will need to be accommodated during the plan period. However, these comments underline the concern about the impact on the environment and reinforce the importance of policies to ensure that high quality developments are secured with no detriment to the character of the Borough, including maintaining the Green Belt and protecting areas at flood risk. These are issues the plan will deal with.

Q3. What should be the balance between the number of homes and space for businesses?

- 3.24 People were presented with three options reflecting different balances between housing and commercial development and invited to choose the amount of commercial development that should be retained.

Option	Response
Option 3a - Allow existing commercial sites to be redeveloped for housing	244 (15%)
Option 3b - Prevent further loss of existing commercial sites to housing	147 (9%)
Option 3c - Aim to keep enough of the best commercial sites to meet the needs of the Borough's future workforce and only allow other commercial sites to be redeveloped for housing.	1151 (69%)
No opinion	32 (1%)
No Reply	114 (7%)

- 3.25 A few comments were made about the commercial and housing balance and development levels generally. Development trends have been commented on in the preceding section and more detailed comments on housing are dealt with in the following section. Comments on the actual balance between housing and employment were very limited but most focused on the need for various types of housing. A few suggested more employment, this mainly related to provision for smaller firms. There was concern that there are many empty office premises. A few comments were made about Heathrow and the likely impact of Terminal 5 and a possible third runway and Terminal 6. In particular these commented on the environmental impact of the additional employment as well as the extent to which it would increase the demand for housing.
- 3.26 Individual letters raised some additional points of concern including; more homes being built than required; adverse impact on traffic from very major developments e.g. Kempton Park; warehousing should be discouraged because of the disproportionate traffic impact; one objected to the loss of employment sites for housing and another that the best employment sites should be kept. One commented that not enough emphasis was given to the growth needs of Heathrow. Another commented that employment sites should not be jeopardised just because they are less accessible by

public transport. A comment was also made that employment sites could accommodate waste treatment facilities.

Conclusion

- 3.27 None of the specific comments detract from the very strong support for Option 3C to 'Aim to keep enough of the best commercial sites to meet the needs of the Borough's future workforce and only allow other commercial sites to be redeveloped for housing', which will be reflected in the new plan.

Q4. What sort of houses should we build?

- 3.28 Five options (Options 4 to 8) representing aspects of housing provision were presented. The text of Options 6 and 8 in the Bulletin had a minor drafting error with options presented as 'a' and 'b' instead of 'yes' and 'no', however, it was clear people understood this and in many cases corrected the term by hand.

Option 4	a)	increase the proportion of affordable housing in new developments	598	(36%)
	b)	reduce the proportion of affordable housing	243	(14%)
	c)	maintain the proportion at the current level	671	(40%)
	d)	No opinion	63	(4%)
	e)	No response	104	(6%)
Option 5	a)	require some affordable housing in developments of less than the current threshold of 15 units	560	(33%)
	b)	maintain the threshold at the current level	813	(48%)
	c)	No opinion	125	(7%)
	d)	No response	181	(11%)

Option 6 - Seeking funding for affordable housing from commercial development that brings more jobs to the area

Yes	779	(46%)
No	221	(13%)
No opinion	292	(17%)
No response	387	(23%)

Option 7	a)	give priority to increasing the number of small dwellings in new housing	962	(57%)
	b)	give no priority and leave it to house builders to decide the size of new dwellings	469	(28%)
	c)	No opinion	106	(6%)
	d)	No response	142	(8%)

Option 8 - Encourage higher density development where good design and layout can ensure it blends successfully with the local environment

Yes	690	(41%)
No	453	(27%)
No opinion	170	(10%)
No response	366	(22%)

- 3.29 It is of note that the questions relating to affordable housing, whilst receiving clear overall support for increases in provision, gained greater support from women, the older age groups and the under 25s. Giving greater priority to smaller dwellings also received clear support, again particularly from women and the over 45 and under 25 year age groups. Support for higher density housing emerged as the highest preference but support was less amongst the older age groups. a
- 3.30 People were asked for views on any groups in the community with particular accommodation needs that they thought should be catered for. Some 549 suggestions were made including suggestions in letters. These covered both specific groups and accommodation types.

Young/single people/first time buyers	191
Elderly (including accommodation to enable downsizing, sheltered accommodation and nursing/care home provision)	178
Affordable housing (including 76 referring to key workers)	110
People with physical or mental disabilities	55
Small accommodation	24
Gypsies and travellers	11
Other (including larger houses, airport workers, skilled staff)	17

- 3.31 The suggestions were broadly consistent with the Council's research on needs and these were reflected in some of the options presented in the Bulletin.
- 3.32 The nature of the options on housing generated a wide range of comments from both the Bulletin and in letters. Some comments expressed concerns that there was not enough space to build 2580 more houses with some suggesting that the Council was already building more than was required. There were a range of comments supporting the provision of affordable housing and citing the needs of young people. Others commented that new housing should only be for local people.
- 3.33 The need for housing for young people was identified but a few commented that there needed to be accommodation suitable for the elderly. Comment was made on the need to meet the needs of gypsies.
- 3.34 A number of comments were made about ways of providing for housing including accommodation above shops and using vacant office buildings. A few commented on the merit of locating housing near railway stations whilst some did not want any more 'back land' development. Comments need to be seen in the context of the responses to the options. The balance of these comments support a continuation of providing affordable housing along current policy lines, however, a significant number also supported increasing the proportion of affordable housing and lowering site size thresholds. A few individual letters suggested greater flexibility in the use of thresholds and % requirement for affordable housing. A clear majority supported securing funding for affordable housing from commercial development as well as residential. Many also supported giving priority to increasing the number of small dwellings as well as encouraging higher density development where good design and layout can ensure it blends successfully with the local environment. There was some comment about the need to ensure homes were built to lifetime home standards enabling adoption for a variety of needs.

Conclusion

- 3.35 The comments underline the importance of ensuring that the additional housing which the Council is required to provide is suitable in terms of tenure and size to best meet the needs that exist as well as being of high quality. This will be reflected in the new plan.

Q5. How can we provide sufficient services and facilities to support new development?

- 3.36 Option 9 related to the requirement of contributions from new development to be secured in order to meet the needs of any additional services.

Option 9 - require new housing and commercial development to

a)	always contribute to the cost of extra services and facilities	951	(57%)
b)	only contribute where specific facilities are needed due to the development	587	(35%)
c)	No opinion	51	(3%)
d)	No response	90	(5%)

- 3.37 There is a clear balance of opinion from those responding to the Bulletin to seeking contributions from all development.
- 3.38 A few comments were made about the need for services and facilities in both the Bulletin responses and individual letters. These included facilities needed to support both the existing needs as well as future needs. Some commented that more development would strain local services generally whilst some made comments on particular needs including those of an aging population and the requirements of both the young and those with learning disabilities. There is undoubtedly a concern that new development might harm the delivery of services to which people attach particular importance/rely on - notably health related. Specific references were made to Health Centres and both Ashford and St Peters Hospitals.
- 3.39 Other detailed points included; parking at Health Centres, capacity at the Mogdon sewerage treatment works, over concentration of secondary schools in Sunbury; need for the Council to be more effective in getting money from Section 106 agreements and secure money from smaller developments. Two letters expressed concern about a 'blanket' requirement for developer contributions and the need to ensure the contributions were commensurate with the impact of the development.

Conclusion

- 3.40 A significant amount of background work has been done by the Council to establish the extent to which further development will require/strain existing services. It will be important for the dialogue with various providers to continue. The plan will be drafted

with policies to ensure appropriate funding is secured from developments which increase the need for services and provide guidance against which specific proposals can be assessed.

Q6. How should our town centres develop in the future?

- 3.41 Two options were presented relating to the future role of Staines and then to other centres. A box was provided for comments on specific developments people thought should be allowed in town centres.

Option 10	a)	Promote further development in Staines Town Centre to provide more retail, leisure and other related activities to maintain its competitiveness	914	(54%)
	b)	Keep Staines to its present size and accept that over time some trade will go to other towns outside Spelthorne as they expand	613	(37%)
	c)	No opinion	63	(4%)
	d)	No response	89	(5%)
Option 11 - Support the continued role of Ashford, Shepperton and Sunbury Cross as local centres by:				
	a)	Not allowing further loss of shops	1408	(84%)
	b)	Allowing other developments even if they result in the loss of shopping	130	(8%)
	c)	No opinion	77	(5%)
	d)	No response	54	(3%)

- 3.42 Responses to the above options were supported by a range of general comments in both the Bulletin and individual letters. It seems clear from the comments that many people see developing Staines and maintaining other centres as alternatives. Concerns about traffic congestion in Staines may in combination explain the degree of support for further retail development in the town which, whilst greater than other options, was not overwhelming being only 54%.

- 3.43 Many of the detailed comments made in response to the specific question about particular developments reiterated these points. The suggestions made are dealt with in the conclusion below.

- 3.44 Some general comments were made about the number of vacant shops in Staines and the scope to improve the area behind Debenhams. The level of vacancies in the Elmsleigh Centre is in part currently due to refurbishment which has just started around the BHS unit. Redevelopment of the area between the Elmsleigh Centre and Debenhams is a specific site proposal. The Council is consulting on an Initial Draft Planning Brief at the same time as this consultation. There was also support for the further growth of Staines; the need for a detailed vision for Staines town centre. A few suggested that there is scope to intensify the development of Two Rivers with decked parking.
- 3.45 Comment was also made about both Ashford and Sunbury Cross where there is a perceived need for better shops and general improvement. Comments were also made in support of the general need to protect local shopping parades. One respondent commented that more non-retail uses may need to be encouraged in these centres to strengthen their role. The purpose of Option 11 was to establish the level of support for centres other than Staines, this came across as being very strong.

Conclusion

- 3.46 So far as planning policies can, it will be important to seek to maintain the valued retail role these centres achieve. The Council's latest Retail Study shows a strong case for additional retailing, in due course, in Staines A major expansion would be viable from around 2011. Appropriate policies will be included in the plan.
- 3.47 A wide range of suggestions for specific development ideas or issues in town centres were identified by those responding to the Bulletin. 440 respondents made 167 distinct suggestions. Where appropriate, specific actions for inclusion of policies in the new plan are identified in conclusions.

- a) 206 related to suggestions for particular types of shop people either did or did not want in town centres. Most of these were specific to Staines. This included for example 21 who wanted more individual independent and smaller shops, 18 who wanted more variety of shops, 13 who wanted a department store, 13 wanted fewer clothes shops, 12 who wanted more local shops.

Whilst Councils can seek to encourage the building of more shops and can control the change of use of shops there are no planning controls as to which particular retailers occupy the premises that are available, nor can it sustain the viability of shops for which there is only limited demand.

The comments on this issue however complement the support to increase retail provision in Staines (through which a wider range of shops can be provided in the town centre as a whole) and maintaining retailing in the other main centres.

- b) 110 comments related to the provision of leisure and other services in town centres. Again most were Staines related. This included 22 who wanted a 'proper leisure centre' like the Spectrum at Guildford, 24 who wanted more youth/children's facilities (coffee bars, football, Quazar, theatre, youth clubs), 16 who wanted more high quality restaurants, 7 who wanted a bowling alley.

Other facilities with more limited support were a Museum, skating rink, concert hall, provision for older people, arts centre and libraries with coffee shops.

Many of these types of facility are traditionally run by Councils and can be very costly. In principle the provision of leisure related facilities, where there is demand, should ideally be in or very near to town centres where there are generally more accessible locations.

Conclusion

Scope to require a leisure element within town centres. For example, a further extension of the Elmsleigh Centre could be considered as part of the site specific proposals for that site.

- c) 54 responses in this particular comment box related to parking and 36 to traffic. These are addressed in paragraphs 3.52 to 3.63 of this report where other comments on these issues are considered.
- d) 32 comments related to the scope for increased housing in town centres by various means including, building over car parks, converting empty offices, the need for centrally located sheltered housing, provision above shops and converting vacant shops where possible. These suggestions are consistent with government planning guidance on the location of housing as well as the Surrey Structure Plan.

Conclusion

Policies and proposals will be drafted to encourage, as far as possible, housing in town centres.

- e) 24 comments related to health care/education provision including the need for a new health centre in Shepperton, need for community centres and halls, facilities for doctors/dentists/opticians and police.

Conclusion

Whilst the running and funding of health centres and other medical facilities is outside the control of the Council it will liaise with the relevant organisations to ensure that, so far as possible, the new plan can assist in meeting identified needs through it's policies

- f) 17 comments related to the need for facilities such as seats and toilets in town centres. This is a level of detail not covered in development plans but can be considered in dealing with major development proposals, and by the County Council in managing street furniture.
- g) 17 comments related to the provision of appropriate commercial premises for small businesses as well as office blocks for company headquarters.

Conclusion

The new plan will be drafted to ensure an appropriate amount of commercial development is available to meet needs overall.

Q7. How should we tackle traffic congestion?

3.48 People were presented with three options including a strategic site specific proposal for a rail link from Staines to Heathrow called Airtrack. The options sought to gather views on measures to help reduce congestion and encourage 'environmentally friendly' forms of travel.

3.49 Option 12 - only allow development that generates a lot of traffic where it is accessible by non car based means of travel.

Yes	967	(58%)
No	381	(23%)
No opinion	157	(9%)
No response	174	(10%)

3.50 Option 13 - require development that generates a lot of traffic to include measures to encourage less car use, for example subsidising public transport, provision for cyclists, car sharing schemes and less car parking.

Yes	1074	(64%)
No	356	(21%)
No opinion	88	(5%)
No response	161	(10%)

3.51 Option 14 - support a rail link from Staines to Heathrow if the environmental impact can be made acceptable.

Yes	1158	(69%)
No	316	(19%)
No opinion	85	(5%)
No response	120	(7%)

3.52 Traffic related issues were by far the source of the greatest number of comments. The majority of the 600+ people making comments in the Bulletin raised the issue in one way or another. Comments were noted in the vision, environment, town centres, in the general comments section and often in all of these. Over 30% of the topics raised in the general comments section were on this issue. Traffic issues were also raised in individual letters but to a lesser extent.

- 3.53 The comments reflect not only the frustrations of moving about Spelthorne at certain times but also the deterrent this has to many on using some of our town centres and the adverse impact of congestion on the quality of the environment. A number of specific locations were referred to - some on numerous occasions of which Staines was by far the greatest. Other major locations referred to were Sunbury Cross, Green Street, Sunbury generally, Ashford, A30 junction at Ashford, railway bridges at Clockhouse Lane, Church Road, Ashford (issue of inadequate cycle/pedestrian facilities) and Walton Bridge. Many have made the point that they do not agree with having further development when there is traffic congestion already. This has in addition led to a lot of suggestions of how to overcome the problem.
- 3.54 There were many who commented on the need to improve public transport to increase its attractiveness as an alternative to private car use. The nature of the comments reflected a largely positive view on the importance of public transport as part of the solution to congestion. There were comments about the cost of public transport but also the need for more services to meet current journey needs. Such suggestions included better links to Charlton Village and Ashford Hospital and better bus links from Sunbury to Walton. In addition suggestions such as a rail link from Shepperton to Heathrow, better links to the airport generally, rail links from Shepperton to Richmond and the underground and extending the rail line to Addlestone to enable links to Woking were all put forward.
- 3.55 Comments on Airtrack are dealt with in the next section of this report which deals with site specific proposals. However, it is worth noting here that whilst some saw this as a potential contribution to encouraging public transport use and reducing congestion, some also saw it as likely to make traffic worse in Staines because of those locally seeking to use the service.
- 3.56 Comments on Staines focussed on three main aspects:
- a) General frustration with congestion and the apparent lack of action to deal with it (many commenting on vehicles being held up at lights with empty road space around).
 - b) Specific comments about the perceived causes. The major ones of which were seen as; too many traffic lights, lack of synchronisation of lights, too many crossings, too many right turns across traffic and illegal parking of vehicles (e.g. High Street end of Iron Bridge).
 - c) Suggestions to solve the problem included a one way gyratory system, additional Staines Bridge, getting rid of some traffic lights and having roundabouts etc.
- 3.57 Clearly some further development for housing will need to be accommodated in the Borough although almost all by redevelopment and in many cases replacing commercial development. This will result in more limited net additional traffic impact, if any at all. However, the greatest cause of any traffic growth is likely to be from increased car usage generally and major developments outside the Borough at Heathrow, for example, than within the Borough.
- 3.58 Staines Town Centre presents a more complex issue. There is a case for further retail development as well as some specific scope for employment development (in part replacing what may be developed for residential use elsewhere). Town centres offer the greater scope for access by public transport and if development is to take place may still be preferable overall in traffic terms. If major retail development went to other towns outside of Spelthorne it would simply mean some local residents

driving elsewhere (and further) to shop, adding to overall traffic movements in the wider area.

- 3.59 Nevertheless, there are undoubted problems in Staines which have been voiced by residents as well as by the Council in the past. There appears to be some substance in the argument that the problem, in part, lies in the management of the traffic on the road system rather than the capacity of those roads themselves.
- 3.60 In other parts of the Borough some areas of congestion have been assessed in the past or have remediation pending. In the case of Green Street and Lower Sunbury generally a traffic study for the Council in 2005 concluded that in traffic terms there was still some scope for limited residential development in Green Street if opportunities arose. A recently approved enhancement of facilities at Kempton Park has resulted in related contributions to highway improvements in the locality including increasing capacity at the Sunbury Cross roundabout. This is expected to lead to some improvement generally to congestion at this point as well as the associated air quality issues. There also remains the need to secure safe pedestrian and cycle facilities at Clockhouse Lane railway bridge which is still an outstanding proposal in the current Local Plan and has been the subject of extensive discussion between Surrey County Council and Hounslow.
- 3.61 The public response to the options for the new plan showed support for new development which generated a lot of traffic, so long as it was accessible by non-car based means and such development included measures to encourage less car use. There were also suggestions for measures such as park and ride schemes, congestion charging, greater promotion of travel plans and flexible working.
- 3.62 Finally there were comments on parking provision in particular to ensure significant provision was made in new development. Some parking related comments were concerned with on street parking at schools and generally a need to ensure sufficient provision for those with disabilities. On street parking is again an issue the County Council need to be advised of.

Conclusion

- 3.63 The key issues for the new plan to address will be to include policies and proposals to reflect the support for the above two options. It will be important for the transport impact of major development proposals to be assessed prior to planning applications being submitted and to include an appropriate package of measures to mitigate any adverse impacts as well as optimise non-car based travel. In the case of Staines and major development in particular, any major extension of the Elmsleigh Centre will need to demonstrate the town centre highway network can accommodate any significant increase in traffic and, if necessary include a range of measures to ensure it can operate effectively. In addition to development related improvements in Staines the County Council needs to take account of the substantial concern about the town centre and consider what measures it should include in its Transport Plan including adjustments to traffic management arrangements. The support for public transport in various comments is to be welcomed.

Q8. How can we improve the environment?

- 3.64 Five options concerning the environment were presented on which people's views were invited. People were also invited to add anything else the Council could do to improve the environment in an additional comments box.

Option	Yes	No	No opinion	No response
Option 15 - improve areas of poor quality landscape and create new habitats of nature conservation value by seeking developer contributions for improvement schemes.	1452 (86%)	66 (4%)	48 (3%)	113 (7%)
Option 16 - protect existing public open space and land used for sport and recreation.	1577 (94%)	14 (1%)	10 (1%)	78 (5%)
Option 17 - focus efforts on improving the environment in more deprived areas of the Borough.	1320 (79%)	144 (9%)	105 (6%)	110 (7%)
Option 18 - promote higher standards of design in new development and ensure new development and open spaces are attractive and accessible to all.	1526 (91%)	23 (1%)	34 (2%)	96 (6%)
Option 19 - require new development to include energy conservation measures and encourage greater use of renewable energy and recycling in new development.	1488 (89%)	29 (2%)	64 (4%)	98 (6%)

- 3.65 In the written comment box under this section of the Bulletin a wide range of comments were made. Overall 1062 comments were received which fell under 272 distinct issues. Of the 1062 comments 282 were traffic related and are dealt within paragraphs 3.52 to 3.63 under the previous sub-section of this report. A number of environmental issues were also raised in individual letters and are included in the summary that follows. Matters that will be reflected in the new plan are identified in conclusions to the issues considered below. A number of issues raised, though important, do not relate directly to issues the new plan can address and include:

292	-	related to highway maintenance and management (including condition of roads grass cutting, letter)
97	-	maintenance of Council land including parks
28	-	community safety/crime and disorder
109	-	other non planning (including 18 related to fees for public car parks)
11	-	related to gravel extraction

These comments will be forwarded to other relevant sections of the Council and Surrey County Council for consideration.

3.66 The substantive comments are dealt with under the themes expressed in the five options first, followed by the other matters raised.

- a) Landscape improvement - a number of people commented on the need for landscape improvement. There were specific references to Staines Moor and its scope for greater use, enhancement of the Green Belt generally, enhancement of specific parts of the Borough including Ashford Town, Stanwell, Sunbury Village, Shepperton and Charlton. Comments were received on the need for developers to be made to improve the area. Comment was also made about the need to deal with contaminated sites. These comments are supportive of the proposition in Option 15. Whilst restriction of mineral workings is a matter for the County Council's Mineral Plan the other issues are appropriate for consideration in policies in the new plan in addition to being addressed through the Council's other environmental enhancement work. Reference was also made to the merit of supplementary guidance on landscape improvement, character assessments of the Borough's landscape, importance of countryside management policies and the merit of securing biodiversity gains. Some people considered that landscape improvement should come through development and not developer contributions.

Conclusion

The new plan will set out policies related to protecting and improving the landscape.

- b) Protecting public open space - some 50 comments were made on open space and the need to protect it. Comments were also received on related issues such as facilities for young people including, suggestions for leisure/sports facilities, updated/enlarged youth centres and open space generally. A detailed study of open space, sport and recreation needs has been undertaken which will be used to draft appropriate policies and proposals in the new plan. Youth centres are a County Council responsibility. Their advice

has been sought on any additional requirements they have for which provision will need to be made in the new plan.

Conclusion

The new plan will include policies to protect land used for open space sport and recreations. It will make any appropriate proposals and protect urban open land.

- c) Improving the environment of some deprived areas - there was acknowledgement that some areas may need redeveloping but little substantive comment.
- d) Promoting higher standards of design. A large number commented on the need to ensure high standards of design in new residential development and ensuring that densities are appropriate. There were also concerns about too much development, the loss of good houses and gardens (including loss of biodiversity), the wish to see no more development in various parts of the Borough and to generally secure more attractive residential areas.

Conclusion

Whilst the Council is required to provide some more housing the issues of design, density and general quality will be addressed in the development control policies of the new plan as well as, in due course, the review of the Conservation Area Enhancement Plans and through specific projects as part of the Council's broader environmental enhancement work.

- e) Energy conservation, renewable energy and recycling - some 138 comments related to these issues expressing considerable support and various suggestions. Some of these relate to matters to be addressed in the new plans and some relate to day-to-day waste management issues. Reference was made to the need for CO² reduction - ideally low/zero carbon development and specifically to the need to meet Structure Plan Policy SE2, that new development should ensure 10% of its energy requirements are from renewable sources and that development should meet the minimum Eco Homes/BREAM standards of 'very good' or 'excellent'. Some commented that renewable energy measures are costly to developers.

Conclusion

Policies on alternative energy provision and CO² reduction as a contribution to climate change issues will be included in the new plan.

- f) Reference was made by a few to provision of community halls, museum, arts centre. The Council is actively reviewing its community facilities and has provided new accommodation for the Staines Museum.
- g) Several people referred to the need to reduce flood risk and avoid development which added to it.

Conclusion

In line with the national guidance the Council will include a policy on flood risk in the new plan.

- h) Concern was expressed by some about air pollution.

Conclusion

The new plan will include policies to complement the Council's Air Quality Strategy which seeks to address this issue.

- i) Some also expressed concerns about noise pollution from Heathrow and noise generally.

Conclusion

Policies on containing noise from new development and sound alleviation measures for new developments close to sources of noise will be included in the new plan.

- j) Various comments were made about the need to protect the environment of the River Thames as well as encourage/facilitate its uses as well as that of the towpath.

Conclusion

Protecting the environment of the River Thames is a particular issue that can be addressed in the new plan.

- k) Many commented on the adequacy and design of parking areas in new developments.

Conclusion

The new plan will include appropriate reference to parking standards and guidance.

- 3.67 A wide range of comments expressed above will be considered in drafting the new plan. Some detailed issues will be more appropriately expressed in supplementary guidance.

Q9. Other matters

- 3.68 The comments received included a range of non-planning matters many of which are identified in the preceding sub-sections. These comments will be forwarded where appropriate for action or noting.

4. Site Specific Options

4.1 This part of the document summarizes responses to the consultation on options for individual sites and reports on other sites put forward in response to the consultation.

4.2 Response to the Consultation on Individual Sites

The site specific options consultation included 15 possible proposals. For each site responses are structured in the following way:

- Site and proposal
- Landowner comments
- Summary of neighbour comments covering total number of responses and the overall balance of views. All written responses are covered including letters, emails and the special Borough Bulletin questionnaire. Responses are divided into three categories:
 - (a) Support/no objection
 - (b) Object
 - (c) Comment only (any response not expressing a view on the principle)
- Neighbour comments in detail. A schedule summarizes the points made with accompanying response. Comments in support are presented first.

4.3 Site 1: 28-44 Feltham Road, Ashford (P/001/H)

- a) Proposal - Housing
- b) Landowner Comments:
 - i. Owner of 28-34: No objection in principle but comments that there is a need for yards and depots and asks how the existing facilities would be replaced.
 - ii. Owner of 36-40: No intention of releasing the site at any time in the near future
 - iii. Owner of 42-44: No reply
- c) Neighbours

Total of 9 responses	
Support/No objection	7
Object	1
Comment only	1

d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
Housing would be more in keeping with the environment than commercial	Noted
Housing would improve the appearance of the site	Noted
No objection to housing but would object to social housing as there is too great a concentration in the area at present	Omitting social housing would be inconsistent with proposed policies for the new plan
No objection to housing but would object to flats due to lack of parking	Parking provision would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Adequate provision for parking needed to avoid worsening existing on street parking problems	This will need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Concern about possible over development and overlooking	This will need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Provision needed for relocation of existing businesses	Relocation of businesses and timing of development could be discussed if it was decided to go ahead with the proposal. Other employment sites exist in the Borough.
Object to increased noise, traffic and pollution during construction and after occupation	Some disturbance inevitable during the construction period
Increased risk of burglary	The design of any scheme will need to include crime prevention measures

Conclusion

Whilst the site is unlikely to become available in the early part of the plan period it is suitable for housing and would result in the relocation of uses unsuited to this residential area. Progress as a proposal in the new plan.

4.4 Site 2: 158-166 Feltham Road, Ashford (P/002/H)

- a) Proposal - Housing
- b) Landowner Comments
 - i. Support the proposal. The site is suitable for residential development. It is currently well-used by a number of warehousing occupiers who are likely to remain for the short term but it will be genuinely available for residential redevelopment early in the LDF period.

c) Neighbours

Total of 13 responses	
Support/No objection	3
Object	9
Comment only	1

Separate letter from 32 residents (19 addresses) in Sandells Avenue objecting on grounds of loss of security, disruption to businesses due to relocation, existing businesses cause no harm, disruption due to demolition process, overloading of drainage and sewerage system, increased road flooding, increased noise and disturbance from new residents.

d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
Loss of privacy	This will need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Existing sewerage and drainage problems would get worse	The acceptability of any development in these respects will need to be established but there is no general sewerage capacity problem in this area
Scale of development would be out of character with the area	This will need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Loss of security due to housing at the rear of properties (rear of commercial buildings forms a wall at the bottom of gardens in Sandells Avenue)	The design of any scheme would need to include crime prevention measures
Extra noise, traffic, pollution and congestion	Noted. There is an existing commercial use on the site.
Distress to a resident suffering from multiple sclerosis	Noted
Existing businesses cause little disturbance	Noted
Good size housing with gardens is worth considering but flats would cause great concern	The form of housing will need to be considered in developing a detailed proposal for the site and be consistent with the proposed policies of the new plan

Conclusion

The site will become available early in the plan period and is supported by the owner. Progress as a proposal in the new plan.

4.5 Site 3: Land Adjoining Feltham Hill Road and Poplar Road, Ashford (P/011/H)

- a) Proposal - Housing
- b) Landowner comments
 - i. Supports the proposal. The site is suitable for residential development and is not well located for employment use. It is predominantly vacant. Royal Mail is the only remaining occupier and they are reviewing their requirements. Requests that the site be allocated for residential development with a minimum indicative capacity of 90 units.

c) Neighbours

Total of 17 responses	
Support/No objection	10
Object	2
Comment only	5

d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
Support private dwellings with only a small proportion of affordable housing for key workers. Opposed to an influx of problematic families from other council areas.	Omitting social housing would be inconsistent with proposed policies in the new plan
Housing could help provide homes for local people	Noted
Site should be developed for affordable housing. Another comment suggests a mixture of open space and affordable housing.	Noted. Provision of open space is an issue that will need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Site should be developed for high density local housing	Noted. Density is an issue that will need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Previous commercial use at the site has caused disturbance due to noise and vehicle movements.	Noted
All parking requirements should be provided on site. Another comment suggests minimum of two spaces per dwelling.	These issues will need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site and be consistent with the proposed policies in the new plan.
No loss of trees fronting Poplar Road. Another comment suggests the existing trees should be replaced.	

Comment	Response
Access should be via Feltham Hill Road. Other comments oppose access from Junction Road and suggest all access should be from Poplar Road.	These issues will need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site and be consistent with the proposed policies in the new plan.
Houses acceptable but not flats	
Development should be limited to two storey and similar density to the adjoining Aspen Gardens development	
Avoid overlooking or overshadowing of adjoining houses	
Provision needed for green space and landscaping within the development. Other comment suggests landscaping needed along the boundaries with existing housing.	These issues would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Visibility at the Feltham Hill Road/Poplar Road junction should be improved. A new roundabout could help.	
Dwellings should be built in materials similar to those used in the area and should incorporate solar panels and double glazing	
The adjacent travelling showmen's site on Poplar Road is a lawful use including storage and maintenance of fairground equipment and movement of large vehicles. The site owners would not support any development that affected the running of their affairs or exposed them to complaints or being labelled a nuisance.	Noted. Housing need not be incompatible with use of the showmen's site.
No need for more housing in the area.	The Council must meet its housing allocation and make provision in response to housing needs.
Object to affordable housing due to anti social behaviour of residents	Omitting social housing would be inconsistent with proposed policies in the new plan.

Conclusion

The site will become available early in the plan period and is supported by the owner. Progress as a proposal in the new plan.

4.6 Site 4: Works Adjoining Harrow Road, Ashford (P/031/H)

- a) Proposal - Housing
- b) Landowner comments.
 - i. Would in principle be interested in redevelopment. Assume that residential would be preferable to commercial
- c) Neighbours

Total of 3 responses

Support/No objection	1
Object	2
Comment only	0

- d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
Loss of security due to loss of workshop wall that forms rear boundary of neighbouring property	The design of any scheme will need to include crime prevention measures
Overlooking of neighbouring property	These issues will need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Loss of light to neighbouring property from new building	
Extra traffic will make the A30 London Road more dangerous	The existing commercial site has access direct on to the A30. The acceptability of any increase in traffic will need to be established through a planning application before the site could be developed.

Conclusion

The owner is interested in redevelopment and the commercial use is considered inappropriate adjacent to the adjoining residential area. Traffic congestion should have no greater impact on the A30 than the existing use. Progress as a proposal in a the new plan.

4.7 Site 5: Govett Avenue, Shepperton (P/008/H)

- a) Proposal - Housing
- b) Landowner comments
 - i. No direct response but various applications have been submitted for residential development, most recently an application for 96 dwellings in November following appeals dismissed for 111 and 98 dwellings.
- c) Neighbours

Total of 21 responses	
Support/No objection	5
Object	8
Comment only	8

- d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
Support demolition of this old fashioned business site and redevelopment for housing	Noted
Concern about over development	These issues will need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Concern about traffic congestion and existing on street parking	
Object to inclusion of underground parking	
No access from Catlin Crescent	
Need to safeguard setting of River Ash	
Support for sheltered housing on the site	
Part of the site should be used as a station car park	Noted but access to the site is through a residential area
Site should instead be used as a wildlife amenity or to relocate the health centre.	The site has an established commercial use and it would be unrealistic to attempt to reserve it for wildlife. There is a recognised need for a new health centre for Shepperton but other options are being considered.
Site should be retained for commercial use	Noted but access to the site is through a residential area via roads unsuitable for commercial development. Appeal decisions have accepted the principle of housing on the site.

Comment	Response
Infrastructure cannot cope with major development of the site	A general issue for the LDF is ensuring infrastructure is provided to support new development but lack of infrastructure was not a reason for dismissing the recent appeals.
Concern about development in the flood plain	The Environment Agency have recently objected to a residential development of this site.
Inadequate space and infrastructure will give rise to increased crime and social unrest	The design of any scheme would need to include crime prevention measures

Conclusion

A planning application (05/1132/FUL) for a scheme of 96 dwellings was refused planning permission on 1 February 2006 for several reasons including the Environment Agency's concern that, as the site was at flood risk, a dry route of escape had not been provided to a point outside the flood plain. Given this flooding issue is a matter of principle as to whether the site can be developed for housing it is proposed to remove it as a proposal site in the plan unless and until the flood issue can be resolved.

4.8 Site 6: Route of Airtrack Rail Scheme (P/027/T)

- a) Proposal - New railway heading north from Staines and new stretch of track in Staines town centre. New station north of the High Street

Note: Airtrack was also included as one of the questions in the Borough Bulletin consultation. Responses to the Bulletin are reported separately

- b) Landowner comments
- i. Network Rail: Confirm the accuracy of the route. Would look to Spelthorne Council to support the promoters of the scheme.
 - ii. Brett Group (owners of Hithermoor and Staines Moor): Unlikely to object to the principle of Airtrack but would have comments on the detail.
- c) Neighbours

Total of 46 responses	
Support/No objection	18
Object	22
Comment only	6

d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
Scheme will take cars off the road and improve air quality	Noted
It would improve accessibility for airport employees	Noted
Development of the station could beneficially include redevelopment of the Renshaw Industrial Estate in Millmead and use of the existing pedestrian access under the railway to Mustard Mill Road	This issue would need to be addressed in developing the proposal for the station
The rail link to Heathrow is needed but concerns about local impact need to be resolved	These issues will need to be addressed by those who may eventually bring forward a scheme.
Adverse impact on nearby housing from additional trains, the new station and construction work	The LDF will need to reflect the importance of overcoming environmental objections in determining the acceptability of the scheme.
Those affected should be compensated	
Harmful impact on Staines Moor	
Loss of parking in Staines town centre	
There are other less damaging alternatives	
Additional congestion in Staines town centre due to the new station	
Concern about parking problems in Staines town centre – controlled parking must be implemented first	
Sound barriers needed to mitigate impact on existing housing	
High risk of criminal activity round the station	
Damaging impact on other rail services	
Suggest a tramway link as an alternative	The issue of alternatives will need to be assessed by those developing the scheme
Suggest extending the underground to Staines	
Question the need for the scheme.	There are benefits in providing rail access to Heathrow from the south in reducing the reliance on the car for access to the airport. Alternatives and environmental issues still need to be considered.
Concern that Airtrack will be overpriced	Noted, but pricing cannot be controlled through planning

Conclusion

The Airtrack scheme is already identified in the draft South East Plan, Surrey Structure Plan, Regional Transport Plan amongst other documents. Whilst the Council does not itself support the proposal it is required to safeguard land for the proposal in the new plan. The various concerns raised confirm the range of issues its proposers will need to resolve.

4.9 Site 7: Bridge Street Car Park, Staines (P/004/H & P/004/C)

- a) Proposal - Housing or commercial (subject to further investigation)
- b) Landowner comments
 - i. Site owned by Spelthorne Borough Council
- c) Neighbours

Total of 9 responses (4 from one address)	
Support/No objection	2
Object	6
Comment only	1

- d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
Site should be developed for an international hotel	Noted
Site should be developed for housing	Noted
Object to loss of car parking. Another comment states that parking should be increased not reduced	Retention of existing parking is an issue that needs to be considered in developing the scheme.
Traffic congestion in the area is an issue and access to Bridge Close would need improvement.	These issues will need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Concern over impact on the flood plain	
Concern at disruption during carrying out of works	

Conclusion

Housing is considered to be the most appropriate use of the site. The Council has produced an initial draft Planning Brief for the site to deal with a range of detailed issues. Progress as a proposal in the new plan.

4.10 Site 8: Land adjoining the Elmsleigh Centre, Staines (P/030/M)

- a) Proposal - Retail and other commercial uses. Possible housing. Improvement of the bus station
- b) Landowner comments
 - i. Site part owned by Spelthorne Borough Council
 - ii. Letter on behalf of the Trustees of the Staines Masonic Hall supporting redevelopment, including residential and commercial uses with leisure/community use in the upper floors.
 - iii. Letter on behalf of a company owning property adjacent to the Elmsleigh Centre supporting the proposal and suggesting the site be extended on the High Street frontage.

c) Neighbours

Total of 8 responses	
Support/No objection	3
Object	2
Comment only	3

d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
Support for more shops and expanding the Elmsleigh Centre	Noted
Site boundary should be extended to include Nos. 47-63 High Street to enable new access to be created opposite Tillys Lane	Linking any new development into the High Street is essential to ensure effective integration to the existing shopping area. Whilst not all of the premises would necessarily be required an access as part of a comprehensive development could require several of the units between Nos. 47 and 63. For this reason it is sensible to include the premises within the boundary of the site.
Friends Walk should be refurbished	Noted
The night club should be replaced with a bowling complex	Noted. The form of any leisure facilities would need further consideration in the context of a specific proposal. In principle leisure uses would also be acceptable as part of a mixed use scheme.
Allow market stalls between the library and Debenhams	Noted. This may not be compatible with redevelopment

Comment	Response
Support for development of the bus station	Noted
Objection to housing on flooding grounds	Part of the site is outside the area of flood risk.
Green areas should be maintained	Noted
No need for more shops	Noted, but the Retail Study suggests that expenditure growth is sufficient to justify extra retail floorspace. Without growth increasing amounts of trade would be lost to other centres outside Spelthorne

Conclusion

The Council has proposed an initial draft Planning Brief for the site to address some of the issues identified. Progress as a proposal in the new plan with an amended site boundary.

4.11 Site 9: Majestic House and land adjoining, High Street, Staines (P/022/M)

- a) Proposal - Retail, offices and residential
- b) Landowner comments
 - i. Comments that permission for development has now been granted and that the development also includes a leisure element
- c) Neighbours

Total of 19 responses

Support/No objection	8
Object	7
Comment only	4

- d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
General support for redeveloping the site	Noted
Development should not be permitted until the existing parking problems on the Moormede Estate and traffic congestion problems in the London Road area are resolved	Parking on Moormede Estate is an issue for control and enforcement through Highway powers. Congestion in Staines is recognised as an issue for the LDF. A planning permission for the proposed document already exists.

Comment	Response
Site should be developed for housing	Noted. Given the scale and central location of the site a wholly residential development may not be appropriate
The post office should be retained	Noted
Object to the noise, pollution and disruption that would occur if the site is developed	Some disruption is inevitable when redevelopment takes place
Question whether there is a need for more office and retail floor space given the number of empty premises	The Employment and Retail studies suggest Staines is a relatively good location for office development and further retail floor space will be needed. While the commercial property market is currently in a state of depression, planning policy needs to look beyond the current market situation and ensure provision is made for development in the longer term
Concern that there is too much office development in Staines	
Majestic House is an eyesore and its redevelopment would be beneficial provided the bulk of the building is reduced	Noted
British Telecom, who own the nearby telephone exchange wish to be kept informed about progress of the proposal	Noted

Conclusion

The site has planning permission already and it is considered clearer if the proposal is deleted and instead the commitment to development given by virtue of the permission is reflected in the text of the Strategy and Policies document.

4.12 Site 10: Knowle Green, Staines (P/006/H & P006/C)

- a) Proposal - Housing or commercial (subject to further investigation)
- b) Landowner comments
 - i. Site owned by Spelthorne Borough Council
- c) Neighbours

Total of 14 responses	
Support/No objection	12
Object	1
Comment only	1

d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
General support for development, including some support for building on undeveloped areas around Council Offices	Noted. Safeguarding of remaining open space is identified as a potential issue with the proposal
Support for redevelopment subject to no increase in the built up area	
More parking needed but these should be well maintained porous surfaces	Provision of car parking would depend on the nature of development
Staines Preparatory School would like to have access to their site from the rear so that they may improve the traffic situation in the vicinity of the school	This would cut across the Council's land and might prejudice redevelopment.
Staines Preparatory School would be keen to purchase additional land for playing fields, especially adjoining the school. Particularly interested in the open space between the Council Offices and the Leisure Centre	This is an issue which is outside the scope of the new plan.

Conclusion

Housing is considered the most appropriate use of the site. Progress as a proposal in the new plan.

4.13 Site 11: Steel works and builders merchant, Gresham Road, Staines (P/028/H)

- a) Proposal - Housing
- b) Landowner comments
 - i. Network Rail (owner of the steel works part of the site): No objection to residential allocation. Disposal of the site would need to be agreed by the Office of Rail Regulation
 - ii. Jewson: No reply
- c) Neighbours

Total of 8 responses	
Support/No objection	3
Object	3
Comment only	2

d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
Support redevelopment of the whole "Gresham Road Industrial Estate" for housing	The adjoining industrial land in Drakes Avenue is liable to flood
Support, provided no increase in built up area and porous surfaces for car parks	The qualifying comments appear to assume the site is in the flood plain. It is in fact on raised ground above the flood plain
Support ending industrial use as the site is currently a nuisance	Noted
Object to a large area of council housing due to anti social behaviour	Under existing policy the development would include a mixture of private and social housing. Omitting social housing would be inconsistent with proposed policies in the new plan.
The builders merchant provides a useful facility and should be retained	This is not a good site for traffic generating commercial uses as access to the site is through a residential area. It would be difficult to develop the site and still keep the builders merchant.
The site should instead be used as open space with planting, picnic and rest facilities and user friendly public toilets	Noted, but as the site has an existing commercial use open space would not be viable.
Site should instead be redeveloped to accommodate more businesses	This is not a good site for traffic generating commercial uses as access to the site is through a residential area.
Two responses support redevelopment but no use specified	Not clear whether these responses supports this proposal

Conclusion

Housing is considered the most appropriate use of the site. Progress as a proposal in the new plan.

4.14 Site 12: Builders Merchant, Moor Lane, Staines (P/005/H)

- a) Proposal - Housing
- b) Landowner
 - i. Agrees that the site has potential for housing but it is currently occupied by a viable business supporting the local economy

c) Neighbours

Total of 10 responses	
Support/No objection	3
Object	3
Comment only	4

d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
The site is suitable for housing as it is in the middle of a residential area	Noted
The current business regularly encroaches on the lives of neighbouring residents	Noted
Business could be transferred to the other site in Gresham Road	Noted, but only if the housing option on the Gresham Road site does not proceed (see above)
Support provided no increase in built up area	The site is suitable for a higher density of development similar to the adjoining site.
Support the proposal only if development is for houses not flats and there is no loss of privacy for existing residents, including proper boundary fencing	
Support using the site for bungalows for elderly and disabled people. Oppose development above single storey	
Object to social housing	Omitting social housing would be inconsistent with proposed policies in the new plan.
Loss of security for properties backing onto the builders merchant	The design of any scheme would need to include crime prevention measures
Building work to construct foundations will cause damage to existing properties	While the concern of residents about their properties is understandable this is not a valid planning reason for rejecting the principle of development
The site is in a high risk flood area	The site is outside the 1:100 year flood plain.
Object to over development and loss of privacy	These issues would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
More development would add to traffic problems in Moor Lane	

Comment	Response
If the site is developed it should include parking for residents of Moor Lane and Victoria Road, who have no off street parking, and implement traffic calming measures in Moor Lane	These issues would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Three comments support redevelopment but no use specified	Not clear whether these responses support this proposal

Conclusion

The site is already proposed for housing in the existing Local Plan and the site is suitable for that use. It is accepted the site may not come forward in the early part of the new plan period, however it is appropriate to progress it as a proposal in the new plan.

4.15 Site 13: Land at Wheatsheaf Lane, Staines (P/013/O)

- a) Proposal - Public open space and possible children's play area
- b) Landowner
 - i. Suggests that land for public open space could be made available to the Council free of charge if housing were permitted on the Wheatsheaf Lane frontage. Questions the value of the land as Green Belt and suggests the risk from flooding is very low
- c) Neighbours

Total of 123 responses	
Support/No objection	27
Object	89
Comment only	7

In addition a petition has been received with 504 signatures. The text of the petition reads:

“SAY NO to any development on the field at Wheatsheaf Lane, opposite the Wheatsheaf and Pigeon public house. Please sign our petition which aims to protect residents and the local area against the very real threats of:

- Increased nuisance and anti social behaviour
- Illegal settlers
- Litter and dumping
- Lunatic traffic congestion
- Greater chances of widespread flooding
- Higher incidences of neighbourhood crime

- Property devaluation
- Full scale development of the field

We the undersigned strongly object to any development of any sort on the land at Wheatsheaf Lane”

Letter from Silvery Sands Residents Association stating that 25 out of 29 residents who responded to their request for views, opposed the proposal.

d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
The facility is needed to remedy a deficiency in open space provision locally	This accords with the findings of the open space study undertaken by the Council.
A play area is particularly needed	
Facilities on this site would discourage kids loitering elsewhere in the area	Noted
Proper upkeep and maintenance is essential to avoid deterioration of the area	Noted
No objection to a park but object to any building work on flooding grounds	Noted
Support acquisition by the Council for informal open space as preferable to the site being sold for speculative development	Noted
Agree with the proposal but suggest that the area near Penton Road be used as a car park	Support noted. The open space is intended to serve the immediate locality rather than attract car drivers from a wider area. The issue of whether parking should be provided would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site.
Need for security measures including closing site at night, fencing and lighting to prevent anti social behaviour	These issues would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
No shelters or toilets should be provided because of concerns over anti social behaviour	
Cycling, motorcycling and ball games should not be allowed	
Suggest inclusion of picnic tables and barbecue area as preferable to childrens play area	
Trees should be planted on the site	

Comment	Response
Open space would encourage vandalism and anti social behaviour and pose a threat to the security of houses backing on to the site	The design of any scheme would need to include crime prevention measures
There would be an increased strain on local police resources	No representations have been received from the police about the proposal
Problems of litter and increased risk of illegal dumping	These issues would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Noise disturbance to local residents	
No need for additional open space in view of existing open space alongside the river at Silvery Sands and Penton Hook	The open space alongside the Thames is of a more informal nature. It is not a suitable location for more formal facilities such as childrens play areas
No need for childrens play area as relatively low proportion of children in the local population	Noted, but there is a substantial population within the potential catchment area for the facility which will include a substantial number of children even if the proportion is less than that for the Borough as a whole
Loss of wildlife assets	There is no nature conservation designation affecting the site. Impact on wildlife would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Increased traffic and lack of parking provision	The open space is intended to serve the immediate locality rather than attract car drivers from a wider area.
The only access is via a private road	The issue of whether parking should be provided would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site.
Objection to car parking at the site	
Unacceptable to develop in the flood plain	Open space is an acceptable use in the flood plain. The flooding impact of any building or engineering works would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Flooding would contaminate the playground and pose a health risk to children	This issue would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Object to any development on green belt grounds	Open space is an acceptable use in the green belt
Children's play facilities should not be located close to a pub	This need not be an objection in principle
The site should be left as it is	Noted

Comment	Response
The open space proposal would open the way to other development	This is not accepted. Open space is an acceptable use in the green belt and need not lead to other forms of development that conflict with green belt policy
Designating the site as open space would attract illegal travellers	Securing the site against invasion by travellers is an issue that would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Loss of ancient permanent meadow pasture Loss of an ancient hedgerow	There is no nature conservation designation affecting the site. The proposal would only use part of the field and need not require the removal of boundary hedges
Concern about dog fouling	This issue would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Loss of countryside character of field	The proposal would only use part of the field
Object on grounds of cost to Council Tax payers	It is acknowledged that there would be costs involved in acquiring the land and implementing the proposal.

Conclusion

As part of the public consultation arrangements every resident within 400 metres of the site was notified about the proposal by letter. The above schedule sets out the Council's response to the large number of issues that were raised and many of these could be satisfactorily addressed. Nevertheless the purpose of the proposal is to meet only a local need and it is clear that there is substantial opposition with only very limited support. Given that local people do not want an open space at this location the proposal will not be progressed and will not appear in the new plan.

4.16 Site 14: Land to the west of Edward Way, Ashford (P/019/O)

- a) Proposal - Public open space and possible children's play area
- b) Landowner
 - i. Would welcome the opportunity to discuss the future of the site with the Council
- c) Neighbours

Total of 5 responses	
Support/No objection	5
Object	0
Comment only	0

d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
The facility is needed to remedy a lack of provision in the area	Noted
Secure fencing needed to resist vandalism	This issue would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site

Conclusion

Progress the proposal in the new plan.

4.17 Site 15: Riverside Works, Fordbridge Road, Sunbury (P/026/H)

a) Proposal: Housing

b) Landowner

- i. Site owned by the Environment Agency. The site has been identified by the Agency as surplus to future operational needs, subject to retaining an essential operational road access to the island and wharf at Wheatley's Eyot. The Agency explain the site is to be advertised based on its existing marine industrial or other uses. They will seek best value by promoting offers that enhance the area and complement its waterfront setting. The Agency support the allocation for development but without a restriction to housing so as then to keep opportunities for other uses open.
- ii. Elmbridge Borough Council (consulted as site adjoins the boundary with Elmbridge)

Potential concerns are impact on Elmbridge residents, the floodplain, the Green Belt and Plotland Area designation, the Site of Nature Conservation Importance, the amenity of the riverside and landscape issues

c) Neighbours

Total of 3 responses	
Support/No objection	1
Object	2
Comment only	0

d) Comments in Detail

Comment	Response
Opportunity for a quality high-density development in an area where housing is in scarce supply. Could be an example of how modern sustainable development should look	Support noted. The form and density of development would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Suggest a care home for elderly people and health centre	Noted
Green margins needed to protect privacy of adjoining housing	These issues would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
More public access to the river should be included	
Object to inappropriate high density development	
Object on flooding grounds. Another comment says no housing should be allowed in the flood plain	Although the site is adjacent to the river it is on raised ground and the Environment Agency's flood risk assessment states that almost all the site is outside a 1:100 year flood event.
Access would be onto a busy road with poor lines of sight	Surrey County Council, as highways authority, does not object to the principle of residential development. Detailed access arrangements would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
More housing would add to traffic problems in Sunbury	
Retain site for commercial use	Noted.
Site should be protected from development. If no longer needed by the Environment Agency it should be returned to its natural state as part of the flood plain	Noted. But the Council has no power to insist that the site be returned to its natural state, which would involve the lowering of the ground level
Object to increased public access and Environment Agency proposal for a foot/cycle crossing of the river on safety and security grounds	Provision of public access is an issue that would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site. A river crossing would require separate consultation.
Lack of public transport along Fordbridge Road	There is an infrequent bus service into Sunbury (one trip per day, three days a week). The site is approximately 1.1 km (0.6 mile) from the centre of Lower Sunbury at the shops in The Avenue. Accessibility of the site is a relevant factor in considering the principle of housing and the appropriate density of development

Comment	Response
Concern over how children at the site would get to school	These issues would need to be addressed in developing a detailed proposal for the site
Trees at the site should be retained	
Concern at visual impact of houses as the site is higher than surrounding land	While the concern is understood, any damage to adjoining properties from construction work is a private matter. This is not an issue that can influence the decision on the principle of developing the site for housing
Concern at damaging impact of piling for foundations on adjoining properties (letter refers to problems from previous work at the site)	

Conclusion

The Council notes the owners wish to explore a range of uses for the site but considers housing is the most appropriate use for the site. There are a number of issues a proposal would need to address but it will be progressed in the new plan.

Other sites proposed for development

- 4.18 The consultation invited suggestions for other possible development sites that could be included in the new plan. Responses can be divided into two categories:
- a) Those accompanied by a supporting statement setting out reasons why the proposal should be supported. These are generally from landowners and most, though not all, are Green Belt sites.
 - b) Those without a supporting statement. These generally form part of responses to the Borough Bulletin questionnaire.

Proposals With A Supporting Statement

- 4.19 Sites with a supporting statement are set out in the following table which includes a summary of the case advanced and a brief response. In the case of Green Belt sites the Council is intending to “save” the existing Green Belt boundary and therefore make no changes. This is because the housing and other development requirements the Council has to meet do not necessitate changing the Green Belt boundary. The Green Belt in Spelthorne has a particularly important strategic role in containing the outward spread of London.

Table 1 Proposals with a supporting statement - Green Belt Sites

Site	Proposal	Proposers Reasons	Council's Response
Land south of Southern Perimeter Road and east of Stanwell Moor Road, Stanwell (P/018/C)	Airport related development on the eastern part of the site	Part of the site could be removed from the Green Belt without compromising wider Green Belt objectives The site is an ideal location for commercial and business uses particularly airport related warehousing.	Developing the site would be contrary to the strategy of maintaining the Green Belt. Provision has been made for airport related warehousing through the Terminal 5 decision
(P/017/C)	Airport related development (whole site)	The site does not properly fulfil the purposes of including land in the Green Belt Releasing it would facilitate the expansion of Heathrow and contribute to the economy of the area	Developing the site would be contrary to the strategy of maintaining the Green Belt. Provision has been made for airport related warehousing through the Terminal 5 decision
Land south of Bedford Road, Stanwell (P/015/C)	Airport related development, but would also consider a mixed development including residential	The site is virtually surrounded by development and does not contribute to separating settlements The site could provide for airport related development to meet the needs of Heathrow expansion. Would consider mixed use development including an element of residential	Developing the site would be contrary to the strategy of maintaining the Green Belt. Provision has been made for airport related warehousing through the Terminal 5 decision
Land south of Running Horse PH and east of Vicarage Road, Sunbury (P/016/H)	Housing (scope for enhanced children's play area)	The site could be removed from the Green Belt without compromising the function of the larger tract of Green Belt to the north A suitable location for new housing with scope for an enhanced childrens play area	Developing the site would be contrary to the strategy of maintaining the Green Belt.

Site	Proposal	Proposers Reasons	Council's Response
Land at the north end of Horton Road, Stanwell Moor (P/012/H)	Affordable housing	<p>The existing Green Belt boundary is arbitrary and includes existing residential and commercial sites</p> <p>The site is ideally located for affordable dwellings</p> <p>The Environment Agency has confirmed it is not liable to flood</p>	Developing the site would be contrary to the strategy of maintaining the Green Belt.
"Cricket Ground", Woodthorpe Road, Ashford (P/007/H)	Housing	<p>Release of the site would not have an impact on the wider Green Belt</p> <p>It is a sustainable location for housing development</p> <p>Release of the site would generate funds for Ashford Sports Club that could be used to improve facilities of benefit to prospective competitors in the London Olympics. This is an exceptional circumstance to justify releasing the site</p>	Developing the site would be contrary to the strategy of maintaining the Green Belt.
Land west of Short Lane, Stanwell (P/020/H)	Housing	<p>The site is unkempt and developing it would have no impact on the Green Belt and beneficially round off the boundary</p> <p>The site is well suited for housing</p> <p>Release of the site would generate funds for Ashford Sports Club that could be used to improve facilities of benefit to prospective competitors in the London Olympics. This is an exceptional circumstance to justify releasing the site</p>	Developing the site would be contrary to the strategy of maintaining the Green Belt.

Site	Proposal	Proposers Reasons	Council's Response
Notcutts, Staines Road, Laleham (P/025/H)	Housing	The site fulfils none of the Green Belt functions Redevelopment for housing would improve the environment The site is well-suited for housing	Developing the site would be contrary to the strategy of maintaining the Green Belt.
Land off Croysdale Avenue, Sunbury (P/014/H)	Housing (but could meet other development priorities)	The site does not contribute to the Green Belt and its development would provide a natural rounding off of the Green Belt boundary It is well-located for housing but could also be used to meet other development needs	Developing the site would be contrary to the strategy of maintaining the Green Belt.
Manor Farm, Charlton (P/023/H)	Housing	This is a "brown field" site and the current commercial uses are unattractive Developing the site for housing would improve the locality and this amounts to very special circumstances for taking the site out of the Green Belt Developing the site for residential or commercial use would be consistent with Government policy on development in rural areas	Developing the site would be contrary to the strategy of maintaining the Green Belt.
Sunbury Golf Centre, Shepperton (P/029/D)	Golfing and alternative uses	The Council should consider the site both for golfing and alternative uses as the owners wish to ensure the most effective use of their assets over the plan period	Any development would need to accord with Green Belt policy
Kempton Park Racecourse, Sunbury (P/010/D)	Designate as a Major Developed Site	The developed portion of the racecourse has an urban character The proposed designation would give the racecourse flexibility to bring forward further infilling or redevelopment to safeguard its continuing viability	This site is in the Green Belt and substantially undeveloped. It does not meet any criteria for identification as a major developed site and such a designation is not proposed by the Council. Such a designation was rejected by the Inspector who conducted the inquiry into the current Local Plan

Table 2 Proposals with a supporting statement - Non Green Belt Sites

Site	Proposal	Supporting Statement	Response
<p>“Merit Point”, Hanworth Road, Sunbury (Note: This is the vacant site on which permission has been granted for a mixed hotel and residential development) (P/024/M)</p>	Mixed use development to include DIY retail	<p>The proposed allocation would facilitate the beneficial redevelopment of the site</p> <p>There is a qualitative and quantitative need for additional DIY retailing in the Borough</p>	<p>Permission has recently been granted for a mixed use scheme</p> <p>The Retail Study sees no need for additional DIY retailing</p>
<p>Former tennis courts, Land off The Ridings, Sunbury (P/009/H)</p>	Housing	<p>Its former use is redundant and the land has not been used for some time</p> <p>Housing could provide significant benefits to the Borough</p>	<p>The site is designated as Urban Open Space and has been used for recreational purposes. Its development would be contrary to policies proposed in the new plan</p>
<p>London Irish RFC, Sunbury (P/021/H)</p>	Housing (could include public open space)	<p>Allocating the site for housing would reduce reliance of housing proposals on existing commercial sites and sites in areas liable to flood</p> <p>Provision for open space within the development could remedy a local deficiency</p> <p>Residential development would fund the costs of the club relocating to a permanent new home</p>	<p>The site is designated as Urban Open Space and is used for recreational purposes. Its development would be contrary to policies proposed in the new plan.</p>
<p>Ash House & Mimosa Court, Littleton Road, Ashford (P/003/H)</p>	Housing	<p>There is no demonstrable commercial demand that necessitates retaining the site for commercial purposes.</p> <p>The site is well-suited to residential development and could make a significant contribution towards meeting housing needs</p>	<p>The site is part of a larger employment site which is designated for retention in the new plan.</p>
<p>Site off Pullman Place, Staines</p>	Housing	<p>The suitability of the site for residential has been accepted in reports on previous applications</p>	<p>The site is less than 0.4ha which would be below the anticipated size threshold for identifying the site as a proposal.</p>

Other suggested proposals

- 4.20 Other sites suggested for development in Borough Bulletin responses are set out below and grouped according to locality. Where specified the suggested form of development is also shown. For some sites different opinions were expressed over the form development should take. Significant policy constraints, e.g. Green Belt, are also noted where relevant.
- 4.21 Sites have been excluded from the tables below if they are too small for consideration as proposals in the plan (generally below 0.4ha) or are outside the Borough.

Ashford area

Site	Proposal (where stated)	Response
Unigate dairy site, Church Road	Ashford Baptist Church and community centre; Housing	This is relatively small site to be identified as a separate proposal. The plan will provide policies to support provision of community facilities.
Empty office blocks, Church Road		Policies will provide a framework for considering alternative uses of vacant sites and buildings.
Church Road (general)		The policies of the plan will provide a framework for proposals in Ashford.
Kwik Save site, Church Road	Better store	The policies of the plan will provide a framework for considering such proposals.
Land adjacent to A30	General redevelopment; Commercial	This site is in the Green Belt
Ashford High School playing fields		This site is in the Green Belt
Former Bulldog Nursery, London Road/Town Lane	Flats	This site is in the Green Belt
Railway station area		The policies in the plan will provide a framework for encouraging development where required.
Ashford Road/Littleton Lane industrial area		This area will be identified to be retained as an employment site.

Laleham and Shepperton area

Site	Proposal (where stated)	Response
New Road, Littleton	Housing	This site is in the Green Belt
Existing Shepperton Health Centre and Youth Club	Youth club; Housing; New health centre	The future of the site is being considered by the PCT.
“Tin Houses” Laleham Road	Attractive flats	Any redevelopment in this area can be considered in the light of general policies of the new plan.
Shepperton High Street		The plan will include policies for Shepperton town centre
Allotments R/O Manygate Lane		Protection of Urban Open Space and allotments is dealt with in policies in the new plan.
All around Charlton waste tip		This site is in the Green Belt
Between Shepperton studios and Laleham	Small housing development	This site is in the Green Belt
By Laleham Park		This site is in the Green Belt
Behind St Nicholas School		This site is in the Green Belt

Staines area

Site	Proposal (where stated)	Response
Shortwood North allotments	Nine hole golf course	This site is in the Green Belt
Crooked Billet	Housing; Commercial	The site is below 0.4ha and too small to identify as a proposal
Commercial Road Allotments		Loss of Urban Open Space and allotments would be contrary to the policies for the new plan.
Staines Moor		This site is in the Green Belt, and is an SSSI and Common Land
High Street east of Railway bridge		Any redevelopment in this area can be considered in the context of policies for Staines town centre

Site	Proposal (where stated)	Response
Area bordered by Clarence Street, Church Street and Bridge Street	Housing	Any development in this area would need to have regard to policies on protecting listed buildings and enhancement of the conservation area.
Between Priory Green and Manor Place		This site is in the Green Belt and is Common Land
Industrial Site, Langley Road	Housing; Commercial	Future use of this site can be considered against the policies of the new plan.
Shortwood Common		This site is in the Green Belt, Common Land and is an SSSI
Between Two Rivers and Staines bypass		This site is in the Green Belt and is Common Land
Thames Water land at Birch Green		This site is in the Green Belt
Warehousing 96-104 Church Street	Housing	Future use of this site can be considered against the policies of the new plan. The site is affected by flooding
Shortwood South Allotments		This site is in the Green Belt
Mill Mead Industrial Estate	Housing; Commercial	Future use of this site can be considered against the policies of the new plan. The site is affected by flooding
Two Rivers shopping centre	Redevelop as a covered shopping mall with parking at rear; Housing (north of Colne)	This site can be considered in the context of policies for Staines town centre
Offices, London Road	Housing; Generally redevelop	This area can be considered in the context of policies for Staines town centre
Kingston Road Car Park	Offices; Elderly peoples housing (in Oast House area)	This site can be considered in the context of policies for Staines town centre
Land adjacent to M25	Commercial (interspersed with trees)	This site is in the Green Belt, and part is SSSI and Common Land

Stanwell and Stanwell Moor area

Site	Proposal (where stated)	Response
Land at Holywell Way		This site is urban open space
Land between airport and Stanwell village		This site is in the Green Belt
Stanwell Moor recreation Ground	Leisure development	This site is in the Green Belt
Unused land between Long Lane and Clare Road		This site is in the Green Belt

Sunbury area

Site	Proposal (where stated)	Response
Sunbury Cross area	General redevelopment; Housing; Replace high rise flats	The high-rise flats at Sunbury Cross are owned either privately or by a Housing Association. There are no plans to replace these.
Land adjacent to Stratton Road		This site is in the Green Belt
Windmill Road Industrial Area	Redevelop vacant premises; Housing; Retain as commercial	The employment land is to be identified for protection in the plan.
Large grassed area adjacent to Thames Street and Walled Garden (note: appears to be reference to Orchard Meadow)	Housing	This site is in the Green Belt
Land near Nursery Rd/Windmill Rd junction	Low rise housing; Youth centre	This site is in the Green Belt
Land adjacent to M3 (Sunbury to Shepperton)	General redevelopment; Commercial interspersed with trees)	This site is in the Green Belt
BP site		This site has recently been redeveloped. Policy on existing employment land will be relevant to any future proposals
R/O Kempton Park railway station		This site is in the Green Belt
Vacant land adjacent to Hazelwood Golf Course		This site is in the Green Belt

Site	Proposal (where stated)	Response
River Road Car Park	Riverside housing	Impact on parking and the setting of the river would be relevant to any proposal to redevelop riverside car parks
Tesco, Sunbury Cross		This is a modern store and redevelopment seems unlikely

Appendix 1 - 'Bulletin Special'

Spelthorne Development Plan – Options for the Future