



Windlesham Parish Council

Sarah Walker
Clerk to the Council
Tel: 01276 471675
Email: sarah.walker@windleshampc.gov.uk
Website: www.windleshampc.gov.uk

The Council Offices
The Avenue
Lightwater
Surrey
GU18 5RG

Runnymede Borough Council
Runnymede Civic Centre
Station Road
Addlestone
Surrey
KT15 2AH

21st February 2018

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing on behalf of Windlesham Parish Council in response to the 2018 Runnymede Local Plan consultation. The Parish Council wish to make the following comments.

The Plan document as a whole, identifies a long list of issues, but fails to adequately address and put forward solutions. For example, the Plan acknowledges that the area already has a large carbon footprint, but does very little to address how this can be reduced. The Plan does not identify any locations for renewable/low carbon energy projects which could help in reducing the carbon footprint.

It recognises the need to protect the environment, but no plans for how this can be achieved. In particular this Council has concerns regarding Chobham Common, which many of our Parish residents frequent and appreciate. There has been no ecological survey conducted to assess the impact on flora and fauna on the Common, which is a SSSI, and is also an integral part of the TBHSPA.

The SWOT analysis given in the Plan recognises the weaknesses and threats but there is no evidence to show the methods that will be used to mitigate these. The Plan states “the infrastructure may not be able to accommodate the expected population growth in specific parts of the Borough” so if the worst-case scenario in terms of growth happens, how will the infrastructure cope? There is no evidence how the acute impacts on the road network will be assessed and action taken.

When reviewing the plans for housing in the A320 area, including St Peter’s Hospital, there is no mention of traffic impacts on motorists not using the A320 and going north along Longcross Road and Chertsey Road to Chobham. This potentially would have a serious negative effect on both Chobham and Windlesham. When you add the traffic movements with the development of the garden village, the impact could become acute.

With regard to flooding, the Plan deals with the current situation and acknowledges the Borough’s contribution to the River Thames Scheme. However, if this scheme isn’t carried forward, does this jeopardise the Local Plan, given that nearly 1/3 of the Borough lies in the flood plain? We would also like to see evidence on what the net effect of flooding would be in delivering the proposed plan.

The Council would also like confirmation that new developments will be requested to install electric car charging points into each house, as per the new SCC policy.

Longcross Development

The Council considered specifically the Longcross Garden Village section of the Local Plan, alongside the Longcross Infrastructure and Viability Assessment document.

We note that you set out at 1.1.4 the nine garden village principles, yet 2.1.1 states the report focuses on only some of the principles and the following are excluded:

- Strong vision, leadership and community engagement
- A wide range of local jobs in the garden city and within easy commuting distance of home - this is despite Longcross being given the status of Enterprise Zone so this is a serious omission
- Beautifully and imaginatively designed homes with gardens combining the best of town and country to create healthy communities
- Strong cultural, recreational and shopping facilities in walkable, vibrant sociable neighbourhoods

We believe this is a serious error and that these omissions demonstrate that Longcross could not justify having garden village status.

The report states that some of the greatest increases in traffic will be around the development of Longcross, and many of the links and junctions with high levels of stress, as a result of the proposed development, will directly impact our residents and Parish area. Whilst it is mentioned that mitigation will be required, at best some basic highways improvements have been suggested but largely there are no measures put forward.

The Council strongly objects to the statement made regarding consideration of an additional M3 junction for Longcross. The impact of additional traffic on our already overburdened local village roads is a key issue for our residents and one we are keen to see addressed appropriately. It would appear that assumptions have been made when reading the policies of Highways England and conclusions drawn that this solution would be highly unlikely to be approved. There is no written evidence from Highways England to suggest that they have conducted any sort of review of the possibility of an additional junction and the Council do not accept the statement made regarding the cost estimate of between £30M-£40M. It has been clearly identified in the IVA document that "direct access to the SRN from the site could reduce the traffic on the local road network and provide environmental benefits as there would be a reduction in mileage to access the SRN." The Council would therefore strongly urge that a proper review be conducted by Highways England.

Furthermore, there appears to be no recognition of the impact of increased traffic on Chobham roundabout or the local roads in Surrey Heath and no mention of the recently implemented HGV weight restrictions in Windlesham village. At the very least the Council and local residents would expect to have seen a full explanation of the expected impacts of what will be very large increases in traffic on our local roads and appropriate mitigation put forward, to be put in place before significant development is commenced.

Windlesham Parish Council also note that there is no mention of the Section 106 contribution of £75,000 each for Windlesham and Chobham (3.2.4), to pay for traffic calming highway works from the DERA North developments or when this will be paid. The Council wish to understand when these funds will be released as these physical measures should be implemented sooner rather than later.

With regard to public transport, it is noted that section 3.3.14 mentions rail investment - is this separate to the agreed investments detailed in section 3.2.4? In section 8.3.14, where current train frequencies are noted, there is no mention of the already agreed new December 2018 timetable, which will increase the frequency of stopping services during peak times.

Overall, the Council considers the consultation process to be inadequate and unfair, given the fact that you have only given the minimum 6 weeks response time for the public and consultees to respond to such an important document. There is a vast amount of information to consider in respect of this consultation and a 6-week response time is insufficient.

Yours faithfully,



Sarah Walker
Clerk to the Council

