

How Can You Reply?

- Online at:
- <http://consult.elmbridge.gov.uk/consult.ti/lpsoc/consultationHome>
 - Scroll down to: [Consultation Links](#)
 - Click: [Sign up for notifications about this consultation](#)
 - Register your Personal Details
 - Open the [Online Consultation Response Form](#)

How Can You Reply?

Alternatively:

- Print/Save the Consultation Response Form
- Use it as a template (i.e. create a document), indicate your 'yes', 'no', 'don't know' answer and write/type in your reasons.
- Send email to: planningpolicy@elmbridge.gov.uk
- Mail letter to: [Planning Policy, Planning Services, Elmbridge Borough Council, Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, KT10 9SD](#)

How Can You Reply?

No internet access?

- Friend/neighbour/relative to print off the Response Form for you?
- If so, do as previously described, or.....
- Obtain a paper copy from Elmbridge by ringing Michael Corbett at EBC on his direct line of **01372 474823**
- Try to avoid a free format response.

Suggested Responses

- The Consultation questionnaire is lengthy and complicated
- We have prepared some responses for you to use as guidance
- The Suggested Responses will be emailed to all individuals on the mailing lists
- It will also be available on
www.cobhamgreenbelt.org.uk,
www.stokedabernon-residents.org.uk,
www.cdra.co.uk, www.cobhamheritage.org.uk

The Online

Consultation Response Form

PART ONE QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTED RESPONSES

Completed questionnaires must be returned by 4pm on Friday 10 February 2017

PART ONE

The key challenges facing Elmbridge

Please read Section 2 of the Consultation Document that sets out the key challenges for Elmbridge

The key challenges facing the Borough will inform the vision and objectives the Council adopts in the way it will seek to manage development and growth in the future. It is important that we are addressing both the right challenges and the most important ones to everyone who lives, works and visits the Borough.

Therefore do you:

1. Agree that the challenges set out in section 2 of the consultation document are the key challenges facing Elmbridge?

- Yes, I agree
No, I disagree
I don't know

Please explain your answer:

There are the following additional key challenges:

- To retain the quality of life for existing residents in Elmbridge
- To address infrastructure requirements
- To resolve the transport congestion in our area – Cobham/Stoke d'Abernon/Oxshott have severe constraints due to enclosure by A3/M25
- To avoid further development on our Green Belt
- To avoid further urbanisation and in-fill
- To maintain the environment and avoid further pollution
- Elmbridge has already stated previously that a central part of its core strategy is to protect the Green Belt and this should remain an absolute
- To take account of the value of green spaces for the recreation of local people

2. Do you consider there are other challenges that we should be addressing?

- Yes
No
Don't know

Please explain your answer:

There are the following additional key challenges:

- To retain the quality of life for existing residents in Elmbridge

- To resolve the transport congestion in our area - Cobham/Stoke d'Abernon/Oxshott have severe constraints due to enclosure by A3/M25
- To avoid further development on our Green Belt
- To avoid further urbanisation and in-fill
- To maintain the environment and avoid further pollution

3. Do you consider any particular challenge or challenges that are more important than the others?

- Yes
No
Don't know

Please explain your answer:

- Maintaining quality of life for residents
- Infrastructure – schools, GPs, etc.
- Infrastructure – currently the traffic congestion and roads in Cobham/Stoke d'Abernon and Oxshott are unable to cope with current levels of traffic
- Urbanisation – increasing encroachment into the Green Belt
- Pollution – levels already unacceptably high given A3 & M25 proximity
- Erosion of environment and not protecting natural habitat
- Provision for the elderly
- Catering for the health of the current population

Elmbridge Borough Council's Preferred Option

To answer these questions, please read Section 3 of the Consultation Document

Given the expected levels of demand for land from new development do you:

4. Agree that Option 2 is the most appropriate option?

- Yes, I agree
No, I disagree
I don't know

If you disagree, please explain why and what other option would you support and why?

Please insert your comments here

- Object to the fact that the questionnaire does not provide the opportunity to select either of the other options or provide a "do nothing" option
- We disagree that the provision of housing is an Exceptional Circumstance that will allow the destruction of our Green Belt and heritage
- We understand that the Council's own figures show that only 50% of the housing planned would be needed by Elmbridge residents
- Once the Green Belt has been taken away it will NEVER be regained. This will result in encroachment of countryside and removal of green spaces

PART ONE QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTED RESPONSES cont.

- *The Council has not sufficiently explained or justified why it cannot build on brownfield land and a thorough assessment of brownfield sites should be the first priority*
- *Increased urbanisation of the more major urban areas in the borough. The Council should seek to develop social/affordable housing near to the major sources of employment and nearer to better service provision*
- *Opportunities should be explored near to established fast transport links with easy transport access. An example would be the fast Woking/Walton/Esher line*
- *Building social/ affordable housing in Parcel 14 and Parcel 20 is very unrealistic - this is one of the most expensive parts of Elmbridge and placing social/ affordable housing in this area will not meet the needs of those folks who need easy access to job opportunities and good public transport links, neither of which exist in this area*
- *The Council has not demonstrated that it has sufficiently explored options with neighbouring boroughs*

5. Do you consider the suggested exceptional circumstances are sufficient to support the amendment of the Green Belt boundary?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please explain your answer:

- *No – National Guidelines state that “unmet housing need is not a justification”*
- *No – the Consultation Documents state that Green Belt boundaries should only be adjusted “with the support of local people”. The Council does not have this*
- *No – the Alternative Options paper does not demonstrate that the Council has given due consideration to other options e.g. Urban intensification, working with other councils*
- *No - The Strategic Options paper has only explored 3 parcels of so called weakly performing Green Belt. The work should have been completed at a much lower level. Who is to say that the next levels of your identified weakly performing Green Belt Parcels are not more suitable and have more developable areas?*
- *No - We believe that the Council is taking the easy way out in targeting Green Belt and should re-focus on brownfield sites. Consideration should be given to increasing the densities on these sites.*

6. Agree that, given the appropriate exceptional circumstances, these three key strategic areas are appropriate for removal from the Green Belt?

- Yes, I agree
- No, I disagree
- I don't know

Please explain your answer:

- *Methodology and assessment is subjective and flawed. Inconsistency with the scoring and categorisation across all the parcels of land*

- *This Green Belt currently prevents the merger of “neighbouring” areas of Stoke d’Abernon and Oxshott*
- *Cobham, Stoke d’Abernon and Oxshott are distinct communities – EBC’s own Flood Risk Assessment recognises them as separate entities*
- *The Green Belt Review scoring is wrong – parcel 14 is only 2.5% built on and therefore should be 4 or 5 not 2.*
- *Description of Parcel 14 as “semi-urban” is very subjective and patently untrue – it is semi-rural.*
- *Description of Parcel 14 as having “weak links” to the strongly performing parcel 10 is untrue and solely due to Blundel Lane and the railway line*
- *Previous owners of the Knowle Hill Park area had higher protection than Green Belt (via a section 52 agreement). This was removed by the Council – there is no justification for why this has changed*
- *Infrastructure, particularly roads would not cope*
- *We believe this should be subject to review and independent audit verification as insufficient weighting has been given to the points detailed below:*
 - i. *Ancient woodlands are present on Parcel 14. These need to be surrounded with buffer zones and wildlife corridors*
 - ii. *The verified presence of Greater Crested Newts which are protected by both U.K. and EU legislation.*
 - iii. *It is also a natural habitat for bats, beetles, adders, buzzards, deer, hedgehogs and owls.*
 - iv. *Knowle Hill Park as its name suggests is on a hill and the presence of a flood plain at the bottom of the hill has not been recognised or scored*
 - v. *We also maintain these are actually Absolute Constraints and need to be recognised and scored as such*
- *Strongly disagree with Parcel 20 (next to Portsmouth Road, Cobham) being included for the following reasons:*
 - *Parcel 20 acts as a vital separation between Cobham and Esher*
 - *It protects against ribbon development along the Portsmouth Road (A307)*
 - *The Common Land and Site of Special Scientific Interest in this area must be protected*
 - *Development on such a large scale would change the character of Cobham and damage local community cohesion*
 - *The infrastructure couldn’t cope*
 - *The Green Belt Review undervalues this land which has only 4.6% built structures on it.*

7. Do you know of any sites within any of the three key strategic areas that could be considered for future development?

- Yes
- No

Please explain your answer:

PART ONE QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTED RESPONSES cont.

- *We believe that this is the responsibility of the Council and would request that details of further options be provided. If the Council has not fully evaluated all the other options in these three areas it clearly must do so.*
- *We believe that the Council's approach to only detail the largest three land masses is simplistic and erroneous. The actual amount of developable land is a more relevant and critical component.*

Parcel 14 (Knowle Hill Park and north of Blundel Lane, Stoke d'Abernon):

- *Parcel 14 topography next to Blundel Lane is steep, flood risk and was also a landfill site – so unsuitable for development*
- *Parcel 14 also has a Scout Camp which is widely used not just by Elmbridge but also by neighbouring boroughs including Kingston. Historic memorial present*
- *Parcel 14 also has a number of Ancient Woodlands*
- *Parcel 14 is covered with protected animal species*
- *Parcel 14 has a lake at the top of it and springs around the lower levels and floods*
- *Parcel 14 has clay work mine shafts and underground bunkers used during the Second World War*

Parcel 20 (next to Portsmouth Road, Cobham):

- *No part of Parcel 20 is suitable for development*
- *There are allotments on Parcel 20 which constrain development*
- *The Rugby Club has a very long lease on part of the land*

8. Do you consider that other areas of land should be removed from the Green Belt including those that are moderately or strongly performing?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please explain your answer:

- *We believe that urban regeneration is the way forward and that more joined up thinking and cooperation across boundaries is required in order to find an optimum solution*
- *The Council has admitted it has not assessed the viability or contribution of the moderately performing sites and this seems an oversight that must be urgently corrected*
- *Providing infrastructure for the three identified sites is considerably more complex and expensive than linking one larger site in a logistically better positioned area*
- *Any plan of this complexity cannot be considered in isolation and hence we fundamentally disagree with an approach that just singles out housing*
- *It is worth reiterating that housing is NOT an exceptional circumstance to remove Green Belt and does not meet with the majority support of the residents*
- *We must also strongly object and put on the record that the nature of the questions is in our opinion manipulative and self-serving seeking to justify the Council's recommendations and is thus not consultative but merely ticking boxes*

PART TWO – KEY ISSUES

To answer these questions, please read Section 4 of the Consultation Document

Housing Size and Type – Questions 9 to 21

The Natural and Built Environment – Questions 22 & 23

Heritage and Historic Environment – Questions 24 & 25

Design and Character – Questions 26 & 27

Flooding – Question 28

Sustainable transport and travel patterns – Ques 29 & 30

Infrastructure Delivery – Questions 31 & 32

Any other issues?

**4PM FRIDAY 24TH FEBRUARY
IS THE DEADLINE**

**ALL INDIVIDUALS CAN RESPOND
IT IS NOT LIMITED BY HOUSEHOLD**