



Elmbridge
Borough Council
... bridging the communities ...

Elmbridge Local Plan

Design and Character
Supplementary Planning Document

**Consultation Statement
(Regulation 17 (1) (b))**

Website: www.elmbridge.gov.uk
Email: tplan@elmbridge.gov.uk

Page left deliberately blank

Contents

1. Introduction	1
Background to Design and Character SPD	1
2. Initial Consultation on the Draft SPD	2
Who was consulted and how?	2
Key issues raised and how they were addressed in the draft SPD	6
3. Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment	9
4. Formal consultation on the draft SPD	9
Who was consulted and how?	9
Key issues raised during the consultation and how they were addressed in the final SPD	10

1. Introduction

The purpose of this consultation statement

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared by Elmbridge Borough Council in accordance with Regulation 17(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (Amended 2008 and 2009).
- 1.2 Regulation 17(1)(b) states that prior to a local authority adopting a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) they must prepare a statement setting out:
 - The names of any persons whom the authority consulted in connection with the preparation of the SPD
 - How those persons were consulted
 - A summary of the main issues raised in those consultations; and
 - How those issues have been addressed in the SPD
- 1.3 This statement is therefore a record of the consultation undertaken during the preparation stages of the SPD, prior to formal public consultation. This includes informal consultation undertaken with a select number of consultees to aid the preparation of the initial draft. This statement has also been updated to take account of the formal consultation undertaken in accordance with Regulation 18(1).

Background to Design and Character SPD

- 1.4 The purpose of the Design and Character SPD is to provide a comprehensive and locally distinctive design guide, which will promote high quality sustainable design in the Borough for all new development. It has been developed in partnership with the local community with experienced design consultants commissioned to work with local people in the development of the SPD and, in particular, provide expertise on characterisation and design guidance. The draft SPD will provide greater detail on policies within the Core Strategy, in accordance with Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 12: Local Spatial Planning.
- 1.5 The draft document has been structured in three parts, which follows an overall design process. Understanding the local context is imperative to creating well-designed developments. Therefore, part one looks at the character of Elmbridge and provides detailed character assessments of each of the settlements in Borough. These character assessments have been produced with the help of local community groups and include local issues identified at the community workshops.
- 1.6 The second part of the document focuses on design guidance demonstrating how to appraise the setting of the site and the development site. It illustrates how a design concept is generated providing information on how to incorporate placemaking and sustainability principles. This section also includes detailed design guidance on specific aspects of design as well as additional design guidance relating to specific types of development. Six case studies are included in order to explain how the

design process works in practice and presents possible design solutions relating to development pertinent to Elmbridge.

- 1.7 Part three discusses how to submit a planning application. A home extension guide is included in the appendices, as well as a glossary and notations chart.

2. Initial Consultation on the Draft SPD

Who was consulted and how?

Internal Steering Group

- 2.1 At the commencement of the project, an internal steering group meeting was established to ensure communication across all disciplines. The members of this steering group are detailed below.

- Planning Policy Manager
- Development Control Manager
- Senior Planning Policy Officer
- Heritage and Landscape Manager
- Councillor Representative (Design and Heritage Champion)

- 2.2 This coordinated approach has ensured that all the different professions have been able to add their views and expertise in the development of the document. To date there have been three formal meetings. One of the formal meetings included an extended session with three senior development control officers in order to understand how the document could be used in practice. Steering group members have regularly been kept informed of progress with the project through e-mail, telephone and a number of informal meetings.

Councillors

- 2.3 Ward Councillors have been kept informed of progress through a variety of measures including Information Bulletins, reports to the Planning Committee, reports to the Local Development Framework Working Group and by direct contact via email.

Website

- 2.4 A design and character webpage was created early on in the project to ensure people were aware of the work and could find up to date information quickly. It includes information on progress to date, the timetable and how you can get involved.

Community Workshops

- 2.5 The involvement of local communities has been key to the development of this document. Taking the government's localism agenda on board, it was considered vital to encourage people to get more involved in the future planning of their local

areas. From the very outset of the project, local community groups, residents associations, conservation area advisory committees (CAAC) and business groups were contacted in order to gauge interest and build community workshop groups for each of the eight settlements. In January 2011 80 individuals, who were registered on the town planning database, were contacted by letter and e-mail. In addition an advert was placed in the local newspaper advertising the project. 40 groups replied with 84 people expressing an interest in participating in the project. Every ward Councillor also received an e-mail inviting them to participate in the project.

- 2.6 In April and May 2011, eight community workshops took place and were attended by 54 people. The workshops were a day in length and provided the community with a chance to discuss local design issues as well as learning more about characterisation studies and the design guide itself. Community representatives were able to participate fully, dividing their local areas into sub-areas and identifying key characteristics on a map. The afternoon session provided information about the design process and included a site visit where the community learnt how to appraise a site and annotate maps using townscape and design notations.

List of attendees at the community workshops

Weybridge- 5 April 2011

- Queens Road Business Guild
- Weybridge Society
- Portmore Quays Residents Ltd
- Templemere Residents Society

Walton on Thames- 7 April 2011

- Councillor (Walton North)
- The Walton Society

Cobham, Oxshott, Stoke D'Abernon- 12 April 2011

- Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust
- Envisage
- Cobham, Downside, Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon Labour Party
- Stoke D'Abernon Residents Association
- Cobham & Downside Residents Association
- Knott Park Residents Association Ltd
- Cobham Conservation Area Advisory Committee
- Danes Court Estate

Thames Ditton, Long Ditton, Hinchley Wood and Weston Green- 10 May 2011

- Thames Ditton and Weston Green Residents Association
- Councillor (Long Ditton)
- Councillor (Thames Ditton)

East and West Molesey- 11 May 2011

- East Molesey CAAC

- Councillor - Molesey Residents Association
- Molesey Business Association

Esher- 18 May 2011

- Esher Residents Association
- Esher & District Local History Group
- Clare Hill (Esher) Association
- Black Hills Residents Association
- Esher CAAC
- Milbourne Local Group

Claygate- 25 May 2011

- Claygate Parish Council
- Councillor (Claygate)
- Labour Party Representative
- Liberal Democrat Party Representative

Hersham- 31 May 2011

- Burwood Park East Residents Association
- Councillor (Hersham South)
- Hersham Residents Association
- Hersham Village Society

Town Planning User Group

2.7 A presentation explaining the purpose of the Design and Character SPD was given on 13 July 2011 at a Town Planning User Group. It gave the group an update on the community workshops and how the document was progressing. The group consists of local architects, estate agents, local businesses, professionals and community groups. Detailed below is a list of people who attended this meeting:

- Burwood Park East Residents
- Catling & Co Estate Agents
- Catriona Riddell Associates
- Claremont Park Residents Association
- Claygate Parish Council
- Richard Gardiner Architects
- Crane Associates
- East Molesey CAAC
- Envisage
- Garland Group
- Heritage Period Properties
- Knott Park Residents Association
- Mary Hackett & Associates
- Rosemary Elliott
- Surrey Police
- Weybridge CAAC
- Weybridge Society

Community Feedback Sessions

2.8 Feedback sessions with each of the eight community groups took place on 14 and 15 September and provided community representatives an opportunity to discuss the draft settlement area character assessments with the consultants and the Council. They received the document two weeks in advance of the feedback sessions, as well as a list of key questions to facilitate discussion. Out of the 54 community representatives that attended the original workshop, 36 people attended the feedback sessions from the following groups:

- Weybridge Society
- The Walton Society
- Walton CAAC
- Burwood Park East Residents Association
- Hersham Residents Association
- Hersham Village Society
- East Molesey CAAC
- Councillor- Molesey Residents Association
- Long Ditton Residents Association
- Councillor (Long Ditton)
- Councillor (Thames Ditton)
- Esher Residents Association
- Clare Hill (Esher) Association
- Esher CAAC
- Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust
- Envisage
- Cobham, Downside, Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon Labour Party
- Stoke D'Abernon Residents Association
- Cobham & Downside Residents Association
- Knott Park Residents Association Ltd
- Cobham Conservation Area Advisory Committee
- Claygate Parish Council
- Councillor (Claygate)
- Liberal Democrat Party Representative (Claygate)

2.8 When developing the landscape design section of the document, an e-mail seeking general advice on links and information to be included was sent to Natural England, The Wildlife Trust and Surrey County Council. There were no replies.

Key issues raised and how they were addressed in the draft SPD

2.8 Key issues that were identified and how the Council addressed these issues are outlined below:

Community Workshops

- Community representatives discussed a number of local design issues that were common across each community workshop. These were the main areas of concern affecting the design new development,
 - Dominance of gated developments
 - Popularity of pastiche and oversized mansions
 - Dominance of car parking and hard standing on drives
 - Minimum parking standards on new development
 - Prominence of refuse wheelie bins and recycling waste bins
 - Scale and dominance of new builds especially flatted development
 - Loss of trees and landscaping
 - Need to protect the historic environment
 - Use of hard boundary treatment
 - Quality of materials

Council response – Every character area assessment for each settlement highlights the issues identified at the community workshops. Any specific issues relating to a sub-area have been included in the sub-area analysis section. This information is intended to be of assistance in prompting applicants to carefully consider the local context and the sensitivities of the site's surroundings. It provides the applicant with the opportunity to show how they might address specific concerns raised by the local community. Specific design guidance on boundaries, landscape design, materials, massing and scale are also included in the document. Additionally, the six case studies provide advice relating to many of the design issues raised above.

- Will the SPD include the control of development noise and disruption to neighbours during construction?

Council response – The document provides guidance on how to achieve high quality design proposals, it is beyond the scope of the document to include any reference to the construction effects of development. Every planning approval document already contains guidance to applicants setting out measures to control noise, parking and pollution and this approach continues to be considered the most appropriate mechanism for minimising the impacts of construction.

- Will the SPD have any weight when an applicant appeals a decision?

Council response – The SPD will be a material consideration when adopted and so an independent inspector will have to take account of the guidance included in the document when making their decision.

- Two community groups raised the needs of young people and how design could attract younger people to the area.

Council response – A Young People’s Planning Forum was held on the 21 September 2011 and allowed young people to share their views on a number of planning related issues including the design of new development. Young people favoured variety in built form and supported more innovative design solutions. The SPD is not prescriptive and makes it clear that the Council would support innovative design proposals provided they meet the general design guidance.

- Many of the groups raised the issue of development pressure and how new development impacts on local services and local transport networks.

Council response – Issues relating to infrastructure delivery will be addressed in the Settlement Investment and Development Plans DPD and the Developer Contributions SPD.

- There were many other wider planning issues discussed at the workshops such as social exclusion, vitality of town and village centres and specific enforcement/development control issues. These matters have been noted and will be addressed in other documents.

Town Planning User Group

- Will contemporary design still be allowed in Elmbridge? Will Planning Committees take on board the new design guidance?

Council response –The Council will continue to encourage innovative design solutions provided they meet other key policies and general design guidance. Planning Committees will take account of the new guidance once adopted.

Feedback Sessions

- Overall six out of the eight settlement community groups provided positive feedback and felt that the assessments reflected the character of the area. Community representatives thought the assessments provided enough detail to explain the characteristics of each sub-area while keeping readers engaged with just the right amount of information. All of the groups said that the content was presented in a manner that was easy to read. There were various minor/factual errors that were highlighted during the meetings.

Council response – All minor/factual errors have been corrected. The positive feedback on format, presentation and content meant that the assessments could progress to formal consultation with the rest of the document.



- All community groups commented on the scale and size of maps, which people found difficult to read.

Council response – hard copies of the SPD will have A3 pullouts and the sub-area boundary lines have been changed making them easier to read. Inset maps of Weybridge, Walton on Thames and Cobham town centres have also been included in the document. Additionally, the design and character map will be available on 'My Elmbridge' the interactive mapping system available on the Elmbridge website once the SPD has been adopted. This will allow users to search for their address, identify the settlement area and sub-area. The sub-area layer will also provide a link to the assessment.

- Claygate Parish Council requested that their Village Design Statement be given a higher profile and believed that the sub-areas should reflect building age and style rather than character area. They produced an alternative map to be used in the document.

Council response – Although the alternative map offers an additional layer of information, it does not easily lend itself to overall area assessment, which in most cases comprise of a number of building types, all of which contribute to overall character. For this reason, the approach to the subdivisions has not been changed. Instead, the descriptions of the sub-areas have been expanded to provide more details with regards to housing types in order to address their concerns. Additionally, the introduction now makes a significant reference to the Village Design Statement.

- The Weybridge Society was dissatisfied with the sub-area divisions, as they did not reflect those submitted by them to the consultants. It was agreed that the group would give further consideration to the sub-areas with a view to providing suggestions for a more accurate sub-division of the area. The Weybridge Society also considered the assessments to be lacking in the appropriate level of detail.

Council response – The suggested revisions to the boundaries of the sub-area divisions were generally accepted and have now been changed. However, with regard to further sub division, which would undoubtedly provide a more detailed level of assessment, this would not be possible given the amount of resources available and the inevitable repercussions on the length of the document should such an approach be rolled out to all character assessments. Given the approach adopted in the document, it is also questionable how useful deeper analysis would be. Whilst the character assessments provide a useful start to defining the character of the area, they are not meant to act as a substitute to visiting the site and assessing the character of the immediate area.

- As well as a revised map, a detailed schedule of changes to the text and photographs was submitted from the above group for consideration.

Council Response- The suggested changes have been taken into account and incorporated into the assessment and the sub-area divisions where appropriate.

- The Weybridge Society raised objections to the overall approach to the Design and Character SPD. They consider that a borough wide approach should be adopted, more akin to the existing residential design guide.
- Council Response- This would be at odds with the spatial approach adopted in the Core Strategy as well as the preference of other communities across the Borough who is supportive of this more localised approach.

3. Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment

3.1 The Design and Character SPD has been subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment screening process¹. The Council consulted the relevant statutory environmental bodies on a draft screening report between 20 June and 18 July 2011:

- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- English Heritage
- Surrey County Council Ecologist
- Surrey Wildlife Trust

3.2 Responses were received from the Environment Agency and Natural England. Both organisations agreed that an SEA and Appropriate Assessment is not required. Details of their comments can be viewed in the final determination².

3.3 It should be noted that in accordance with the Environment Agency's comments, the SPD has been reviewed with regards to any mitigation measures recommended for inclusion following the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) / SEA report for the Core Strategy. Furthermore, a high level assessment of the SPD against the original SA/SEA objectives has also been undertaken.

4. Formal consultation on the Draft SPD

4.1 Following initial consultation on the draft SPD the document was then made available for a formal six week consultation in accordance with Regulation 18 (1). The consultation ran from Monday 28 November 2011 to Monday 9 January 2012.

Who was consulted and how?

4.2 The Council consulted:

¹ In accordance with Regulation 9(1) of the Environmental Assessment Regulations 2004 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010

² Screening Report – www.elmbridge.gov.uk/planning/policy

- each of the specific consultation bodies to the extent that the local planning authority thinks that the SPD affects the body; and
- such of the general consultation bodies as the local planning authority considers appropriate.

- 4.3 Over 1000 organisations / companies were consulted including local residents groups, businesses and over 170 developers, consultants and surveyors (as set out in Appendix 1).
- 4.4 Consultees were informed of the documents being available for comment via email or letter (see Appendix 2). Included with the letter and attached to the email was key information including how to view the document, make comments, and the SPD matters in accordance with Regulation 17(2)(b) (see Appendix 3). Specific consultation bodies were sent copies of the documents. A questionnaire was produced which asked for specific responses to certain aspects of the documents (see Appendix 4).
- 4.5 The Council also gave notice by public advert as required by 17(2)(c) of the Regulations (see Appendix 5) in local newspapers, on borough noticeboards and via Twitter. All information was made available on the Council's website in accordance with Regulation 17(2)(a) (see Appendix 6), including the front page banner for the first week. Copies of the document were also made available in all local libraries.

Other consultation

- 4.6 Every Councillor received a hard copy of the draft document prior to the Cabinet meeting to allow Councillors to study the detailed assessments of their local areas and respond during the public consultation.
- 4.7 Steering group members were informed of the consultation via e-mail and a date was set to discuss the consultation responses.
- 4.8 The Development Control Manager and three Senior Development Control Planning Officers (that had originally attended the community workshops and feedback sessions) were given a hard copy of the consultation document. A working meeting of development control and planning policy staff was set up to discuss how the document would work in practice.

Key issues raised and how they were addressed in the final SPD?

- 4.9 22 responses were received in total:
- 9 local residents / individuals
 - Weybridge Society
 - Claygate Parish Council
 - Cobham and Downside Residents Association
 - Cobham Heritage Trust
 - Burwood Park East Residents Association
 - 3 Councillors

- 3 Statutory bodies, (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, Natural England)
- Open Spaces Society
- 1 Developer

4.10 Appendix 7 sets out the comments received and how these have been addressed in producing the final SPD. The main issues raised are summarised as follows.

- Apart from one resident who seemed to find the document difficult to understand, the majority of individual residents have submitted positive comments about the documents format, approach and accessibility. Many of the issues raised relate to the sub-area descriptions. 3 ward Councillors provided additional information about their local areas for inclusion in the character assessments, as well as suggestions for the case study guidance section.
- The Statutory bodies made various comments with regard to the sustainability principles section.
- Both Cobham Heritage Trust and Cobham and Downside Residents Association questioned a change in the sub division of an area, which was made at the feedback session.
- Cobham and Downside Residents Association also asked some specific questions about the effectiveness of the document and whether it will prevent poorly designed development, citing several past developments as examples.
- Claygate Parish Council submitted a thorough and constructive response to the SPD. Positive comments include reference to Claygate in the overview of Elmbridge, preservation of the Green Belt and the character assessment being more successful than the current Residential Design Guidance. They provided an erratum detailing some minor errors within the text along with further detail on some omissions and changes. They had a number of concerns regarding the ease of use of the design guidance chapters and also queried the omission of the building type map that they had produced after the feedback sessions. They also provided feedback on the case studies and home extensions guide.
- The Weybridge Society has spent considerable time analysing their local area providing information and maps throughout the preparation of the document. They acknowledge in their submission that earlier comments submitted after the feedback sessions have been taken into account by the Council. However, there are still areas in the assessments they wish to expand, correct and 'sharpen up'.
- Overall, the Weybridge Society considered the document to be long and complicated, repeating the Core Strategy and containing unreadable maps. They consider the document to be fundamentally flawed in its approach when compared to the 2002 Residential Design Guidance. This is particularly relevant in the case study section. After carrying out a critical analysis of the case studies, they do not support the different format adopted and feel that there is missing information.

- 4.11 A significant amount of work has been undertaken to address the consultation comments, as well as feedback from the internal steering group and Development Control Officers. Full details of changes made as a result of the consultation can be found in Appendix 7. The document has been restructured and streamlined in order to improve its accessibility and make it more user-friendly. The changes made in producing the final SPD can be summarised below:

Reducing the length of document

- 4.12 The consultation document was some 200 pages long, which raised concerns about the usability of the document. To address this issue, a suite of documents using 10 companion guides has been created. The companion guides contain details of the 8 settlement area character assessments together with an overview of the Borough and specific guidelines relating to home extensions. This reformatting removes over 100 pages from the main document. The consultation responses clearly state support for the detail and content of these assessments, but not all will be relevant to a proposal. Users can work with the main document and consult the relevant settlement companion guide wherever the site is located. This reduces the 'bulk' of the main document considerably and gives the assessments greater value as separate stand-alone documents.
- 4.13 Even though the detailed assessments are now located in companion guides, the main document still includes a chapter on assessing character. This is the first step in the design process and important in understanding context and creating distinctive places. A series of double page overviews give a 'snapshot' of the eight individual settlement areas which link to the relevant companion document. This visual representation results in the main document being more engaging, but still maintaining the detail requested by the local community.

Improving usability

- 4.13 Although most of the residents found the document easy to read, one resident found the document very difficult to understand. The Weybridge Society and Claygate Parish Council considered that the document was difficult to follow in some areas.
- 4.14 To address this issue, the document now includes a step-by-step guide explaining how to use the document with the aim of helping navigation and improving usability. The document has also been thoroughly edited and the glossary expanded, to ensure clarity of language.
- 4.15 In order to take account of concerns raised by the Claygate Parish Council and to address Weybridge Society's comments with regard to missing information from the Residential Design Guidance, the design guidance section has been revised and restructured. Originally referred to as placemaking and sustainability principles, it is now included in one general design guidance chapter. A new section on 'layout' has been added, as this is a common reason for refusal in Elmbridge.

4.16 Sustainable design has been given much greater emphasis, relocated at the beginning of the general design guidance. This section takes account of the consultation responses from the Environment Agency, Natural England and the Open Space Society.

Settlement Area Character Assessments- amendments/additions

- 4.17 Many of the consultation responses relate to the 8 settlement area character assessments. Claygate Parish Council, Weybridge Society, Cobham Heritage Trust, Cobham and Downside Residents Association, individual residents and 3 local ward Councillors have all suggested additions and/or clarification of information. All these changes have been made where appropriate. (See appendix 7 for exact responses)
- 4.18 Cobham Heritage Trust, Cobham and Downside Residents Association and the Weybridge Society requested amendments/ additions to sub areas. In addition, the Weybridge Society requested additional sub- areas that fall within the Green Belt. Some considered that the maps are difficult to read.
- 4.19 Sub dividing by character is not an exact science, and there is often no definitive change of character at the boundaries of the sub-areas. The sub divisions are intended to offer no more than a broad description of the area and cannot provide a substitute to visiting the site. The role of the character assessments and their limitations is explained fully in the document.
- 4.20 The spatial strategy in the Core Strategy (Policy CS1) clearly states that new development will be directed towards previously developed land within the built up areas. This is to ensure protection of the Green Belt. To create 3 new sub-areas that fall within the Green Belt as the Weybridge Society suggest is not only beyond the scope of this document but would clearly be contrary to policy. It would also imply that the Council would consider development in the Green Belt.
- 4.21 Clearly it is not the intention of the Weybridge Society to promote the development of the Green Belt and their suggested inclusion of the areas is for comprehensiveness rather than any other reason. However given the Council's adopted strategy to accommodate all development in the urban area, the inclusion of sub-areas within the Green Belt are not only considered irrelevant but could also have a significant effect on the length of the document as the approach would have to be 'rolled out' though the whole of the document. It may be that, once the Council can commit resources to developing a Green Infrastructure strategy, the information could make a useful contribution to that document.
- 4.22 Comments and suggestions with regard to sub-area analysis have been changed where it strengthens the document. However any language that appears to be overly restrictive has not been included. In addition, the document makes it clear that references to case studies simply offer a 'signpost' to development that could potentially occur- they do not give the 'green light' to development.
- 4.23 Claygate Parish Council has produced a building type map, which provides another layer of information. This has been included in the character assessment.

- 4.24 The maps will be legible through My Elmbridge, which will be prepared after adoption. The hard copy companion guides will include A3 maps.

Improving the effectiveness of case studies

- 4.25 Weybridge Society, Claygate Parish Council and a local ward Councillor raised concerns about the content and/or effectiveness of the case studies. The Weybridge Society carried out a critical analysis of all the case studies and considered that there was missing information and the '4 stage development process', fundamental to the new approach adopted within the SPD, was not as effective as the method adopted in the case studies contained in the 2002 Residential Design Guidance (RDG). Claygate Parish Council also provided detailed comments, some positive and some negative.
- 4.26 In response, planning officers and steering group members gave further detailed consideration to the case study section. As a result, the section has been revised and streamlined. All four diagrams relevant to each case study can now be viewed across a double page together, illustrating the development of a design through the various stages of the process. Text has been edited, which aids readability and ease of use.
- 4.27 Case study 3 has been revised completely. Having carried out a thorough assessment of the information contained within the RDG's case studies, all relevant guidance has been incorporated within the case studies or within the design guidance section of the SPD where appropriate.
- 4.28 The case studies do differ to those contained within the RDG as they promote a 'design process', placing a greater emphasis on understanding the context of the site. They provide potential design solutions (but not the only solution) for new developments that are commonplace in Elmbridge.

Improving the effectiveness of the document as a whole.

- 4.29 The Weybridge Society does not support the process led approach of this document and considers that this is not an improvement on the existing 2002 Residential Design Guidance. Cobham and Downside Residents Association have raised some concerns about the effectiveness of the document and whether it has the capability of preventing poorly designed development, citing several past developments as examples.
- 4.30 In response, it is considered that the SPD improves on the Residential Design Guidance in that it has a greater focus on the local character of the Borough's eight settlement areas. It also includes guidance on sustainable construction, as well as non-residential developments, and has the benefit of extensive community engagement.
- 4.31 The SPD is also far less prescriptive as it encourages an appreciation of different characters/contexts and how these determine a design proposal, relying on considered judgements that will inevitably be influenced by a variety of factors.

4.32 In order to make sure the document is effective, the document now includes detailed monitoring arrangements that will reported on annually in the Council's 'Authority's Monitoring Report'.

Appendix 1 – List of Consultees

Woking Borough Council	Mr	Ian	Bonnett
Mole Valley District Council	Mr	Alan	Buften
Thames Water Property Services Ltd	Mr	Alan	Smith
Spelthorne Borough Council	Mr	Alan	Coe
Coal Authority	Mr	Alton	Brown
RSPB	Mrs	Stephanie	Alderson
NHS Surrey	Mrs	Alison	Lornie
Runnymede Borough Council	Mr.	Mohammedali	Tayyib
Highways Agency	Mr	Andrew	Giles
RB of Kingston upon Thames	Miss	Anita	Morrish
Veolia Water Central	Mrs	Ann	Sheppard
Guildford Borough Council	Mrs	Anne	Hills
Ockham Parish Council	Mrs	Ann	Kirk
Natural England	Mrs	Antonia	Izard
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure UK Limited	Mrs	Judith	Barker
East Horsley Parish Council	Mrs	Barbara	Bowman
Environment Agency	Mrs	Dee	Medawar
UK Power Networks	Mr	Bob	Fisk
Surrey County Council - Strategy, Transport and Planning	Captain	Timothy John	Seeman
Civil Aviation Authority	Mr	Clive	Browne
Claygate Parish Council	Mr	Bruce	Perry
Sutton and East Surrey Water Plc	Mr	Bruce	Allum
Scottish and Southern Energy	Mrs	Conra	Nevitt
British Telecommunications plc	Mrs	Carol	Thierry
Hutchinson 3G UK Ltd	Mrs	Catherine	Stewart
NTL	Mr	Derek	Mason
Cable and Wireless	Mr	Chris	Nason
O2 (UK) Ltd - Telefonica Europe plc	Mrs	Christine	Craig
Vodafone Group Plc	Mr	Carl	Jaffer
Virgin Mobile Holdings plc	Mr	Ross	Prideaux
T-Mobile UK Ltd	mr	clive	bennett
LB Richmond upon Thames	Mr	David	Nash
Surrey Police	Mrs	Sarah	Waite
English Heritage (South East Region)	Mr	Michael	Courtney
Department of Transport	Mr	Michael	Doyle
British Gas	Mr	Dave	Brown
Homes and Communities Agency	Mr	David Michael	Simms
GLA Greater London Authority	mr	david	foreman
SGN	Miss	Dawn	Carritt
Virgin Media Limited	Mrs	Deborah	Bennett
Orange PCS Ltd		Dorothy	Stone
Surrey Chamber of Commerce	Mr	Donald	Bearshall
Claygate Chamber of Commerce	Mr	Douglas	Hodgkiss
Cobham Chamber of Commerce	Mr	Nicholas	Drury
Elmbridge Business Network	Mr and Mrs	M.D	Dunn
Age Concern Surrey	Mr	Ernest	Rich
Elmbridge Access Group	Mrs	Katherine	Emerson
Showmen's Guild of Great Britain	Mr	Ian	Johnson
Elmbridge Multi-Faith Forum	Mr	Evan	Schulz
	Mr	Francis	Clauson
	Mr	John	Hornby

Elmbridge Housing Trust	Mr	Clive Sait
Voluntary Action Elmbridge		Geoff Herbert
Walton, Weybridge, Hershams Citizens Advice Bureau	Mr	Geoffrey Banks Ray Smith
FFT Planning	Mrs	Georgia Warner
Network Rail	Mr	Gerard Frain
North Area Office	Mr	Gerald Gilbert
1914-1919 Oatlands War Memorial Charity	Mrs	Gillian Money
33 Wolsey Road (East Molesey) Ltd	Mrs	Gillian Hall
A2 Housing	Mr	Harold Pettinger
ADM Architecture	Miss	Heather Edkins
AKH Associates	Dr	Heather Patel
Aldous Craig Estates	Mr	Hugo Boylan
All Saints Catholic Church	Mr	Iain Nisbet
Alliance Environmental Planning Ltd	Mr	Ian King
Antler Homes Southern plc	Mr	Ian Douglas Maidment
Anyards Designers & Surveyors Ltd	Mr	Graham Warren
Apex Housing Group	Ms	Ingrid Morris
Argent Estates Ltd	Mr	Joseph O'Driscoll
Asda Stores Ltd	Mr	Martin Wapshott
Ashley Park Residents Association	Mrs	Jane Ward
Assoc of Riparian Owners of River Mole	Mr	Jani Ahmad
Aston Mead	Mrs	Joanne Barlow
Avenue Van Removals	Mrs	Jenny O'Donoghue
Bairstow Eves	Mr	James Byworth
Barons Estate Agents	Mrs	Maria Young
Barratt Southern Counties	Mr	John Trafford
Barton Willmore	Mr	John FitzPatrick
Batcheller Thacker	Mr	John Brine
Bell Farm Junior School	Mr	John Millen
Bellway Homes South East	Mr	Jeremy Palmer
Berkshire Homes Ltd.		Jonathan Best
Beveric Cleaners	Mr	John Gurney
Bewley Homes	Mrs	Julie Taylor Vincent
Bigwood Associates Ltd		
Blackhills Residents Association Ltd	Mrs	Roz Newman
Bomb Davidson Chartered Quantity Surveyors	Mr	Richard Bell
Bonsor Penningtons	Mrs	Katherine Ernest
Boyce Thornton	Professor	Keeping Stum
British Waterways	Mr	K Purssey
Broadway Malyan	Mr	Kenneth Brown
Brooke-Taylor Commercial	Mr	Terence King
Building Design Co	Mr	Terry King
Burhill Badminton Club	Mrs	Nicola Pallitt
Burhill County Infants School	Mr	Ian Harvey-Samuel
Burhill Estates Co. Ltd	Mr	Guy Greaves
Burwood Park East Residents Association	Miss	Linda Wilkin
Burwood Park Residents Ltd	Mrs	Sharon Linney
C H K Esher	Mrs	Loretta Draper
Cadsquare Ltd	Mrs	Louise Reynolds
Cala Homes South Ltd	Mrs	Maeve Strachan
Carer Support Elmbridge	Mrs	Margaret Emery
Carrick Howell Lawrence	Mr	Mark Harrington
	Mr	Mark Mayhew

Castle Wildish	Mrs	Candy Maxted
Centre for Ecology and Hydrology	Mr	Mervyn Searle
CgMs Consulting	Mrs	Teresa Carrick
Chalford Property Co Ltd	Mr	Adrian Mills
Chancellors (Chartered Town Planning Consultantss)	Mrs	Mollie Kingham
Chartridge Developments plc	Mrs	Monique Herne
Chief Executive Octagon Developments Limited	Ms	monira khatun
Churcholds Estate Agents	Ms	Syeda Monira Akter Khatun
Civil Aviation Authority	Mr	Neil Flarry
Claygate & Esher Labour Party	Lord	Donald Nicholls
Claygate Allotment Holders Association	Mr	Nick Matthew
Claygate Women's Institute	Mr	William Botting
CNBS	Mr	Peter Almond
Cobham & Downside Residents Association	Mrs	Pamela Goodyer
Cobham Chamber of Commerce	MRS	FREDA COLLINS
Colliers CRE	Mrs	Leila Brown
Community Support Services	Mrs	S A Parnell
Community Support Services	Mr	Patrick Hulls
Countrywide Residential Lettings	Mr	Peter Hills
Crane & Associates	Mr	Peter R Fish
Crest Nicholson plc	Mr	Peter Lindow
Crown Estate	Mr	Philip Lewcock
Culpin Partnership	Mrs	Pippa Murphy
Curchods	Mr	Paul Saville
Cyclist Touring Club	Mr	Peter Stevenson
D2 Printing Ltd	Mrs	Patricia Notton
Dalton Warner Davis	Mr	Raymond Stenning
David Sayer & Associates		Philippa Manning
DBA Speakers	Mr	Richard Francis
Dean Design Architectural Services	Mr	Robert King
Defence Estates	Mr	Robert Hart
Denton Homes Ltd	Mr	David Wheeler
Department for Business Innovation & Skills	Mr	Roger Bennett
Department for Children Schools and Families	Mr	Roger Armstrong
Department for Culture Media and Sport	Mr	Russell Benzies
Department for Work and Pensions	Mr	Robin Williams
Department of Health	Mrs	Sally Regan
Dept for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	mr	sam collins
Dept for Innovation, Universities and Skills	Mrs	Sandra Adamson
Derek Horne and Associates	Mr	Seamus Gallagher
Design Fireplaces	Ms	Carola Eason
Development Land & Planning Consultantss Ltd	Ms	Sheena Clarke
Dialogue	Mr	Simon Hobbs
Digital Video Systems Ltd	Mr	Simon Hope
Dittons Pensioners Association	dr	sion gibby
DJF Residential Lettings Ltd	Mr	Simon Bailey
DLP Consultants	Mr	Stephen McCarthy
DMH Planning	Ms	Susan Hughes
DPDS Consulting Group	Mrs	Susan James
Drivers Jonas	Mr	Thomas Gibbon
		Cherry Eddy
	Mr	Brian Fairclough
	Sir/ Madam	T Jones
	Mrs	Sue Brown

E.Build Homes	Dr Tony Wenman
East Elmbridge and Mid-Surrey Primary Care Trust	Mr Antony Roberts
EDF Energy	Mr Anthony Palmer
Elmbridge Arts Council	Mrs Patricia Davies
Elmbridge Canoe Club	Mr Neil MacLeod
Elmbridge MENCAP	Dr Vinay Patroe
Esher & District Citizens Advice Bureau	Mrs Wendy Jane Gray
Esher & District Victim Support	Mr William Brook-Hart
Esher CAAC	St Mary's Parish Church
Esher Church School	Parish Office, All Saints Church
Esher Retail Group	Surrey Chamber of Commerce
Fairmile Avenue Residents Association	Claygate Chamber of Commerce
Fairview New Homes Ltd	Elmbridge Business Network
Feltonfleet School Trust Ltd	Age Concern Surrey
Field Place Weybridge Residents Association Ltd	Elmbridge Access Group
Fieldcommon Residents Group	Elmbridge Multi-Faith Forum
Fire Brigades Union	Voluntary Action Elmbridge
Firstplan	Walton, Weybridge, Hersham Citizens Advice Bureau
Friends of the Earth	St. Andrew's Church
Garland Group Ltd	St Peter's Church
Garry Porter	Cobham Chamber of Commerce
Garthcliff	Help the Aged
Gascoigne Billinghamurst	Showmen's Guild of Great Britain
Gascoigne-Pees	Elmbridge Housing Trust
George Wimpey Homes	Surrey County PFA
Georgian Group	"Downside Village and Plough Corner CAAC
Gerald Eve LLP	Surrey Community Action
Gladedale (South East) Ltd	Surrey Community Development Trust
Godolphin Road Residents Association	Surrey Countryside Access Forum
Goldcrest Homes	Surrey Countryside Access Forum
Golden Curry	Surrey County Council - Archaeology
Graham Johnson Optician-Contact Lenses	Surrey County Council - Education Planning
Grovelands School	Surrey County Council - Estate Planning & Management
Hamptons International	Surrey County Council - Estates & Planning Management
Hawes and Co	Surrey County Council - Estates Planning & Management
Health & Safety Executive	Surrey County Council - Transportation Development Control
Heathside School	Surrey County Council Libraries and Culture
Helas Wolf	Surrey County Council Local Partnership Team
Heritage Period Properties	Surrey County Council Local Partnership Team
Hersham Bowling Club	Surrey Fire & Rescue Service
Hersham Teaching Centre	Surrey Fire & Rescue Service
Hersham Village Society	Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
High Pine Close Residents Association	Surrey Lifelong Learning Partnerships Ltd
Hinchley Wood Residents Association	Surrey Neighbourhood Watch
Hinchley Wood Traders Assoc	
HJC Real Estate	
Holy Trinity Church	
Home Builders Federation	
Home Design Services	
Home Office	
Howard Hutton & Associates	
Hurst Park Residents Association	

Indigo Planning	Surrey Police
Jacksons Letting Agents	Surrey Police
Jackson-Stops & Staff	Surrey Police
Jason Coats Ltd	Sustrans South East
John D Wood & Co	T Wiseman Ltd
Jones Day	Taylor Associates
Jones Lang Lassalle Ltd	Terence O'Rourke
King Sturge	Tetlow King Planning Ltd
Kingston Homes Ltd, The Estates Office	Thames Ditton & Weston Green Residents Association
Kingston Liberal Synagogue	Thames Ditton CAAC
Kingstons Homes Ltd	Thames Ditton Infant School
Knight Frank	Thames Valley Housing Association
Knight Norman Partnership	The Bell Cornwell Partnership
La Voiture	The Brooklands Society Ltd
Laing Homes	The Crown Estate
Lambert Smith Hampton	The Footcare Centre
Latchmere Properties Ltd	The Garden History Society
Learning and Skills Council South East	The Gypsy Council
Leverton Maintenance Company	The Hare and Hounds
Level Consulting Ltd	The JTS Partnership
Linden Homes Development Ltd	The National Trust
Lochailort Investments Ltd	The Oxshott Way Estate Holdings Ltd/Oshott Way Estate Assn.
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames	The Princess Alice Hospice
London Buses Network Operations	The Royal Kent C/E Primary School
Long Ditton St Mary's C of E (Aided) Junior School	The Sons of Divine Providence
Lower Farm Stables	The Theatres Trust
Lower Mole Countryside Project	The Trustees of The Home of Compassion
Martin Flashman & Co	The Weybridge Office
Martin Grant	The Whiteley Homes Trust
Mary Hackett & Associates	Thro' the Looking Glass/Bluebell Lingerie/D & D Photography
Matthew Pierce & Co	Toga BC
McDonalds	Tops Pizza & Chella Caf��
Michael Shanly Group	Tredinnick & Bower
Millgate Homes	Trenchard Arldge
Mobile Operators Association	Turner Associates
Molefield Green Ltd	Urban DNA (on behalf of Burwin Investments Limited)
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	USDAW
National Housing Federation South East	Vail Williams
National Playing Fields Association	Vail Williams (on behalf of Esher Park Residents Association)
Nationcrest plc	Village Mowers Ltd
Network Rail, Town Planning Team	Voluntary Action Elmbridge
North Surrey & London Newspapers	Waitrose
North Surrey Primary Care Trust	Wakelin Associates Architectss
NW Surrey RSPB Local Group	Walchry Motors
Oatlands Conservative Association	Walton Baptist Church
Ockham & Hatchford Residents Association	Walton Lane & Thames Street R.A.
Octagon Developments Ltd	Walton Leigh School
Office of Government Commerce	Walton on Thames Charity
Old Pauline Sports Clubs	Walton Plating Ltd
Omega Partnership Ltd	
Open Spaces Society	
Orchard (Weybridge)Housing Association Ltd	
Oriental Curry Centre	

Our Lady of Lourdes R.C. Church
 Outdoor Advertising Association
 Palace Residents Association
 Paragon Community Housing Group
 Pegasus Retirement Homes plc
 Pereira-Walshe Partnership
 Persimmon Homes (South East),
 Peter Whicheloe Architects Ltd
 Phillips Planning Services Ltd(The Whiteley
 Homes Trust)
 Planning Works Ltd
 Post Office Property Holdings
 PRC Planning
 Preston Bennett Planning
 Principal Brian Prideaux Chartered
 Architectss
 Principal Group Ltd
 Proteus Architecture Ltd
 PRP Architectss
 Queen Elizabeth's Foundation for Disabled
 People
 Queens Road Business Guild
 Rawlinson & Webber
 Ray Road Allotment Association
 Richard Flowitt Partnership
 Richard Gardiner Architects
 Robert Bailie Architects RIBA
 Rodd Properties Ltd
 Roger Tym & Partners
 Rosemary Simmons Memorial Housing
 Association
 Rowan Preparatory School
 Roy James Fancy Town & Country Homes
 RPS
 Rukshana
 Rushmon New Homes
 Rydens School
 Rydon Homes
 Sandy Way Residents Association
 Savills
 Secondsite Property
 SEEBOARD Energy
 Setplan Ltd
 Snoopy Inc
 Socialist Labour Party
 South West Trains
 Southern Housing Group
 Sport England
 St Andrew's Church
 St Andrew's Properties Ltd
 St Barnabas Church
 St George's Hill Residents Association
 St James CE Primary School
 St James Group Ltd
 Walton, Weybridge, Hersham Citizens
 Advice Bureau
 West End Residents Association
 West Surrey Family History Society
 (Walton Branch)
 West Waddy ADP
 Weston Green CAAC
 Weybridge Liberal Democrats
 Weybridge Conservation Area Advisory
 Committee
 Weybridge Orthodontics
 Weybridge Society
 Weybridge Society
 Weybridge Society
 Wharf Land Investments Ltd
 White Young Green Planning (on behalf of
 Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd)
 Williamson Partnership
 Windsor Homes plc
 Woolf Bond Planning
 Wrens Hill Residents Association
 Mrs Diane Clements
 Mr Michael Cloud
 Mrs Tracy Colesell
 Mrs Daphne Colombo
 Mr J.D. Costain
 Mr R. Costain
 Mr Gordon Cove
 Mr Geoffrey Craggs
 Ms Karen Crompton
 Mr T Davies
 Mr Barry Davies
 Ms Annette Davies
 Mr Roy Davis
 Mr Robin Dickinson
 Mr T J Dolan
 Mr Jonathan Dunne
 Mrs Anne Durrant
 Mrs Kari Ellis
 Mr Philip Emanuel
 Mrs Carolyn Ezekiel
 Mrs Sharon Fenner
 Mr Hugh Fleming
 Mrs Sophie Giannini
 Ms Kasia Giannini
 Mr John Gibbons
 Mrs P Glover
 Mr A E Glover
 Mrs Victoria K L Good
 Mr Peter Greening
 Mr John Greenwood
 Mrs Anne Gregory
 Mrs Catherine Griffiths
 Mrs Helen Hamill

St Lawrence CE (Aided) Junior School	Ms	Elisabet	Hammond
St Mary's Church	Mr	Eric	Hammond
St Pauls Catholic Primary School	Mr	Simon	Harker
St Peter's Church	Mrs	D	Harris
STAR Planning and Development	Miss	Iris	Hawkes
Stewart Ross Associates	Mrs	C	Hawkins
Stoke D'Abernon & District Residents Association	Mrs	Caroline	Heather
Stoke D'Abernon CAAC	Mrs	M.	Heaver
Strutt & Parker	Ms	V.	Hilton
Surrey Criminal Justice Board	Ms	Jill	Hopkins
Surrey Fire and Rescue	Mrs	Ana	Howe
Surrey Police HQ	Ms	Jane	Hunter
Surrey Wildlife Trust	Dr	Anita	Jackson
Surrey/National Playing Fields Association	Mr	Chris	Johnson
Tandridge District Council	Ms	Susan	Johnson-Newell
Templemere Residents Society Ltd	Mrs	Alison	Johnston-Ralph
Terence O'Rourke	Mrs	Astrid	Keeling
Tetlow King Planning Ltd	Mrs	L.	Keitch
Thames Ditton & Weston Green Residents Association	Mr	Famy	Kuraith
Thames Ditton Junior School	Ms	Jacqueline	Lather
Thames Landscape Strategy	Mrs	Mary	Le Mesurier-Foster
Thames Valley Housing Association	Mr	Alan	Lewiston
The American Agency	Mr	Willie	Lister
The Bell Cornwell Partnership	Mrs	Anne	Littleton
The British Wind Energy Association	Mr	P A	Littleton
The Caravan Club	Mr	Mark	Lotinga
The Claremont Fan Court Foundtion Ltd	Mrs	Barbara	Luff
The Cookie Man	Mr	Graham	Lynch-Staunton
The Crown Estate	Mr	Gordon	Manickam
The Dittons Liberal Democrats Branch	Ms	Mikaela	Manning
The Fountain Gallery	Mr	Geoffrey	Markson
The Lawn Tennis Association	Mrs	J.	Marshall
The Manager Gascoigne-Pees	Mr	M.J.	Mason
The Orchard School	Mr	N. S.	Mayhew
The Oxshott Way Estate Holdings Ltd/Oshott Way Estate Assn.	Mrs	Lynda	McCarter
The Planning Bureau	Mr	Ian	McIntosh
The Victorian Society	Mr	John	Meech
The Walton Society	Mr	J.	Migliorini
Thornton Boyce Estate Agents Ltd	Mrs	A.	Miller
Thurleigh Homes Limited	Mrs	Anne	Millroy
Tourism South East	Mrs	Helen	Mills
Traveller Law Reform Project	Mrs	Alison	Mitchison
Tredinnick & Bower	Mr	K.	Morrell
Trenchard Arlidge	Mr	David	Mulmulland
Try Homes	Mr	James	Nash
Turley Associates	Mr	Anthony	Newman
Urban DNA	Mr	Peter	Offen
Vail Williams	Ms	Pauline	O'Sullivan
Viki Hair Design	Dr	Ann	Palfrey
Villager Laundry & Dry Cleaners	Mr	Tony	Palmer
Visioncare	Mr.	Ronald	Perrin
	Mrs	Margaret	Phillips
	Mr	Ian	Pitfield
	Mrs	Emma	Richardson

Walton Baptist Church	Ms Jackie Roberts
Walton Blind Society	Mr Andrew Ross
Walton Business Group	Mr Peter Ruddy
Walton on Thames CAAC	Mr John Sertin
Walton Retail Guild	Ms Susan Shearer
Walton Stroke Group	Mr D. Sikoek
Wates Homes	Mrs Jennifer Simpson
Waverley Borough Council	Miss Marilyn Slann
West End CAAC	Mrs Christine Smith
West Waddy ADP	Mrs Izabela Spero
Weston Green School	Mr John Statner
Westward School	Mr Michael Stein
Wey Meadows Residents Association	Mr Graham Stride
Weybridge Methodist Church	Mr R.M. Sutton
Weybridge Park Residents Association Ltd	Ms Sally Sutton
Weybridge Stroke Group	Mrs Wendy Sykes
White Young Green Planning	Mrs Edith Sykes
Windmill Drug & Alcohol Team	Mr David Symons
Windsor Homes plc	Ms Patricia Taylor
Winton Architectss	Mr Edgar Taylor OBE
Woking and Sam Beare Hospices	Mrs Carole Teicht
Mr Tony Alderman	Mrs Claire Thompson
Mr Brian Allison	Mr N. Townsend
Ms L. Andrews	Ms J. Trethewy
Mrs Aileen Aulds	Mr David Tucker
Mrs Coral Bahrani	Mr Kenneth Upton
Mr Christopher Baker	Mrs Elizabeth June Vevers
Mr G.L. Banks	Ms Brenda Vey
Mrs Jennifer Basannavar	Mr Peter Vey
Mr S. Basham	Mrs Eva Waring
Mrs Margaret Bates	Ms Clare Webb-Jenkins
Mr David Bean	Ms Catherine Welch
Mrs Jacqueline Bennington	Mr G.W. Wells
Mrs Sharp Betty	Mrs Joanna Weston-Miller
Mr D.W. Bounds	Mrs Susan Wharram
Mrs C.Y. Bounds	Mr J. White
Mrs Christine Bow	Mrs White
Ms Jean Brett	Mr Ian Whitelock
Mr Frederick Brewer	Mrs Wicks
Mr Terence Bridgman	Mrs Kay Williamson
Dr D.E. Brown	Mr Keith Wilson
Mrs Diana Burleigh	Mr Simon Wilson
Mr D. Burnand	Ms Barbara Wolstenholme
Mrs Deborah Butcher	Mr Colin Wootton
Mr E Butler	Mr C. Wroe
Ms Sukhdev Buttar	Mrs Anne Youle
Mr Neville Byrord	Ms Carole Young
Ms A. Carton-Kelly	Mrs Mary Younger
Mr B.B. Chambers	Miss Annabell Younger
Sir/ Madam Church Commissioners	Mr P Huf
Mr G Clarke	Mr Roger Bennett
Mr Robin Clarke	A W Law
Lambert Smith Hampton	A2 Housing Group
Latchmere Properties Ltd	Age Concern Surrey

Leigh Place Cobham Residents Association
 Lennon Planning
 Levvel Consulting Ltd
 Lidl UK GmbH
 Lightwood Property
 Linden Homes South East
 London Borough of Hounslow
 London-United
 Long Ditton Infant & Nursery School
 Long Ditton Residents Association
 LSM Partners
 Martin Flashman & Co
 Mary Hackett & Associates
 Mattias Billing Dental Office
 Medicom Group Ltd
 Metropolitan Police (Imber Court) Sports Club
 Michael Shanly Group
 Mitchell Evans Partnership
 Mole Valley DCMHT
 Molesey Community Church Trust
 Molesey Residents Association
 Mott Macdonald
 Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
 Network Rail
 New Approaches to Cancer
 Newphoria Ltd
 NFU South East Region
 NHS South East Coast
 Nockles Associates
 Notre Dame School
 Oatlands School
 Octagon Developments Limited
 One Elmbridge Partnership
 Open Spaces Society
 Origin Brand Consultants
 Oxshott Way Residents Association
 Painshill Park Trust
 Paragon Community Housing Group (inc.
 Elmbridge Housing Trust and Richmond upon
 Thames Churches Housing Trust)
 Parish Office, All Saints Church
 Paul Dickenson & Associates
 Pereira-Walshe Partnership
 Peter Whicheloe Architecture Ltd
 Planning Potential
 Planning Works Ltd
 Portmore Park & District Residents
 Association
 Portmore Quays Residents Ltd
 PRC Planning
 Preston Bennett Planning
 PRP Architects
 Rapleys LLP
 Reed's School
 Air Products plc
 AKH Associates
 Alliance Environmental Planning Ltd
 American Community School
 Ancient Monuments Society
 Angela Williams & Associates Ltd
 Anyards Designers & Surveyors Ltd
 Applied Energy
 Ashley Road Residents Association
 Ashley Video
 Ashton Mead
 Automotive Calibration Ltd
 Barons Estate Agentss
 Barton Willmore Planning (Racecourse
 Holdings Trust/Sandown Racecourse)
 Barwell Court Estate
 Bellway Homes (South East)
 Berkeley Group
 Bewley Homes Plc
 Bigwood Associates Ltd (for Frontsouth
 Ltd)
 Birds Hill Oxshott Estate Co. Ltd
 Birds Hill Oxshott Estate Company
 Boyce Thornton
 Boyce Thornton
 Brian Prideaux Chartered Architects
 Broadway Malyan (on behalf of Hanger
 Investments Ltd)
 Broadway Malyan (on behalf of Notre
 Dame School)
 Brooklands Museum Trust Ltd
 Broom Way Cul de Sac Residents
 Association
 Buds & Blooms
 Burhill Estates Co. Ltd
 CABE
 Cadsquare Ltd
 Cardinal Newman RC Primary School
 Carter Planning Limited
 Castle Wildish
 Catling & Co
 CgMs Consulting
 CgMS Consulting (Metropolitan Police
 Authority)
 Chalford Property Co Ltd
 Chalford Property Company Ltd
 Chandlers Field School
 Charles Planning Associates Ltd
 Chartridge Developments plc
 Christ Church Esher
 Church of the Holy Name, Esher
 Churches Together in Esher and Claygate
 Clare Hill (Esher) Association
 Claremont Park Residents Association

Rentstart
Rhodes Foods Limited
Richard Flowitt Partnership
Richmond Upon Thames Churchs Housing
Trust
River Thames Society
Roger Tym & Partners
Ron Steward Associates
Roxbury
Royal Borough of Kingston
RPS
RPS plc (on behalf of BT plc)
RPS plc (on behalf of Fairview New Homes
Ltd)
RunnymedeHomes (South East) Ltd
Safino Limited
Sandy Holt Residents Management Co Ltd
Sassi Chamberlain Architects
Scott Wilson Ltd
Setplan Ltd
Showman's Guild of GB LHC
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
Soroptomists International of Elmbridge
Southborough Residents Association
Southern Housing Group
Southern Insurance
Sport England
St Alban's Catholic Primary School
St Andrews C of E Primary School
St Andrews Church, Oxshott
St George's College Junior School
St Mary's Parish Church
St Peter's C of E Church
St. Lawrence CofE Aided Junior School, East
Molesey
Stewart Ross Associates
Stoke D'Aberton Residents Association
Surrey Care Association
Surrey Chamber of Commerce
Surrey Chambers of Commerce - Elmbridge
Branch
Husband & Carpenter Architects
Iceni Projects
Jackson-Stops & Staff
Jedco Product Designers Ltd
John D Wood
King Sturge
Kingston Churches Housing Association
Kingstons Homes Ltd
Knight Norman Partnership
Knott Park Residents Association Ltd
Lafarge Aggregates & Concrete UK

Claygate Bridge Club
Claygate CAAC
Claygate Chamber of Commerce
Claygate Parish Council
Claygate Primary School
Claygate Village Youth Club Association
Cluttons LLP
Cobham & Downside Residents
Association
Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust
Cobham Garden and Horticultural
Association
Cobham Heritage Trust
Cobham, Downside, Oxshott & Stoke
D'Aberton
Countryside Properties PLC
CPRE
CPRE (Surrey Office)
Crane & Associates
Culpin Partnership
Curchod & Co Chartered Surveyors
Dalton Warner Davis
Dalton Warner Davis
Danes Court Estate (Oxshott) Residents
Association
Danes Hill School
Day Centre Social Committee
Dean Design Architectural Services
Denton Homes Ltd
Derek Horne & Associates
DMH Planning
Domino 4 Ltd
"Downside Village and Plough Corner
CAAC
"
DPDS Consulting Group
Drivers Jonas
DTZ
E.Build Homes
East Molesey Conservatives
Elmbridge Access Group
Elmbridge Business Network
Elmbridge Crossroads - Caring for Carers
Elmbridge Environmental Forum
Elmbridge Friends of the Earth
Elmbridge Multi-Faith Forum
ElmbridgeCommunity Safety Partnership
Environmental Transport Association
Envisage
Esher & Walton Conservative Association
Esher & Walton Constituency Labour Party
Esher Baptist Church
Esher Business Guild
Esher C of E High School

Esher Church of England High School
Esher College
Esher Residents Association
Esher Rugby Club
Eurotech Computer Services Ltd
Facer Design Ltd
Fairmile Park Road Residents
Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group
Federation of Small Businesses
FEDORA
Firstplan
Friends, Families and Travellers
FSB
Future Create
Galleria
Garland Group Ltd
Gascoigne Billinghamurst
Gascoigne Pees Lettings and Countrywide
Lettings
Gascoigne-Pees
Gerald Eve LLP
GMB
Guildford Diocesan Board of Finance
Guy Salmon Jaguar Ltd
Hawes & Co
Helas Wolf
Hersham Baptist Church
Hersham Residents Association
high pine close R A
Hinchley Wood Primary School
Hinchley Wood Residents Association
Hinchley Wood School
Historic Royal Palaces
Home Design Services
Homestart Elmbridge
House of Commons
Howard Hutton & Associates
Huggins Edwards & Sharp

Appendix 2 – Consultation letter

contact: Mark Behrendt
direct line: 01372 474829
direct fax: 01372 474910
e-mail: tplan@elmbridge.gov.uk
my ref: SDP/PDCS/NOV11
your ref:
date: 25/11/2011

Dear

Planning Consultation

On the 28th of November the Council published three key documents for consultation that will form eventually part of its Local Plan. These are the:

- Developer Contributions SPD
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule
- Design and Character SPD

The **Developer Contributions SPD** will set out all the standard payments required from new development towards infrastructure, affordable housing and the mitigation of development impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA). The SPD will set out the Council's approach to the use of both planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), a new approach to pooling developer contributions introduced in April 2010.

The proposed rates of CIL to be charged are set out for consultation in the **CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**, which will eventually form an addendum to the SPD.

The **Design and Character SPD** will provide a comprehensive, and locally distinctive, design guide which will promote high quality sustainable design in the Borough for all new development.

How to respond

The Council is consulting on both these documents between the 28th of November and the 9th of January. Copies are available to view on line (see below) or in hard copy at:

- The Planning Services Reception, 1st Floor Civic Centre Esher High Street, Esher
- All libraries in the Borough – see the Surrey County Council website for locations and opening times

All comments must be submitted by 4pm on Monday the 9th of January and can be submitted:

- online at www.elmbridge.gov.uk...
- via email to tplan@elmbridge.gov.uk
- by post to Elmbridge Borough Council, Planning Services, Planning Policy, Civic Centre, Esher, KT10 9SD

If you have any further queries please contact our planning policy team on 01372 474787.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Morris
Head of Planning Services

Appendix 3 – Statement of matters

Copyright 2011 Elmbridge Borough Council



Elmbridge Local Plan Draft Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document

Notice of Matters for the consultation of the Draft Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended 2008 and 2009)

The draft Design and Character SPD aims to ensure that the design of new development in the Borough is more locally responsive, sustainable and built to a high quality. It will include design guidelines that respond to identified local characteristics of the eight settlement areas. It has been developed in partnership with the community with experienced design consultants commissioned to work with local people providing expertise on characterisation and design guidance. It is a practical tool guiding communities, developers and planning professionals through the design process before designing proposals and submitting applications. The draft SPD will support the delivery of the Council's Core Strategy, specifically Policy CS17: Local Character, Density and Design.

Elmbridge Borough Council is publishing this document for consultation for a period of 6 weeks between **28 November 2011 and 9 January 2012**. The draft SPD is available to view on the Council's website – www.elmbridge.gov.uk/planning/policy. Copies are also available to view at:

- Planning Services, Civic Centre, High Street, Esher between 8.45am and 5pm (Monday to Friday); and
- All Borough libraries – see Surrey County Council website – www.surreycc.gov.uk - or call 0300 200 1001 for locations and opening times

A comments form is available on the Council's website – www.elmbridge.gov.uk. Alternatively, comments can be emailed to: tplan@elmbridge.gov.uk or sent in writing to: The Planning Policy Team, Planning Services, Elmbridge Borough Council, Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, Surrey, KT10 9SD. Comments must be received by **4pm on Monday 9 January 2012**.

If you require further information on the documents or any other aspect of the Elmbridge Local Plan, please contact a member of the Planning Policy Team on 01372 474787 or email tplan@elmbridge.gov.uk.

Produced by Planning Services

November 2011

Appendix 4 - Representations form



Representation Form for the Draft Design and Character SPD

Supplementary Plan Document (SPD)
Consultation Stage Representation Form

Ref:

(For official use only)

Please return to Elmbridge Borough Council by 4pm on 9 January 2012

This form has two parts –
Part A – Personal Details
Part B – Comments on the Draft Design and Character SPD

Part A – Personal Details

1. Personal Details*	2. Agent's Details (if applicable)	
*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.		
Title	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
First Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Last Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Line 2	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Line 3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Appendix 6 – Webpages



Design and Character SPD - Windows Internet Explorer provided by Elmbridge Borough Council

http://www.elmbridge.gov.uk/planning/policy/develop.htm

Design and Character SPD

document in January 2012.

Planning & Property

- Building Control
- Land Charges
- Planning FAQs
- Planning On Line
- Planning Policy
- Street Naming

Refuse & Recycling

Transport & Streets

2011

Community Connect

Winter Weather Advice

What about the existing Elmbridge Residential Design Guidance 2002 and Conservation Area Appraisals?

We already have general residential design guidance but the most recent version was adopted in 2002, before the current planning system system was introduced. This guidance is not area-specific and does not incorporate measures to improve the sustainability of new buildings. The Design and Character SPD will replace the Elmbridge Residential Design Guidance 2002.

The SPD will include character area assessments of the eight built up settlement areas detailed above and these include conservation areas. A number of community based conservation area character appraisals have already been completed or are programmed. These go into greater detail than the SPD but the document has incorporated these findings and are designed to be used in conjunction with one another.

Progress to date

All eight community workshops have now been completed. These were all really successful days allowing 54 local people to discuss the character of their area, the design issues facing their locality and possible design solutions for future development. The Council and design consultants would like to thank everyone who gave up their time to participate in the workshops. Feedback sessions to discuss the draft settlement area character assessments have also taken place. Further details on this and a brief summary of the document can be found in the Consultation Statement below.

How can you get involved?

We are consulting on the Draft Design and Character SPD for a period of 6 weeks between 26 November 2011 and 9 January 2012. The document can be viewed below along with other supporting documents.

- Draft Design and Character SPD
- Statement of SPD matters
- Consultation Statement

Copies of the documents are also available to view at:

- Planning Services, Civic Centre, High Street, Esher between 9.45am and 5pm (Monday to Friday), and
- All Borough libraries - see Surrey County Council website or call 0300 200 1001 for locations and opening times

Comments can be submitted using the Council's online form, emailed to Planning Policy or sent in writing to: The Planning Policy Team, Planning Services, Elmbridge Borough Council, Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, Surrey, KT10 9SD. Comments must be received by 4pm on Monday 9 January 2012.

Next steps

Comments will be analysed and taken into account in preparing the final SPD for adoption in April 2012. Please see the Local Development Scheme

Development Contributions SPD - Windows Internet Explorer provided by Elmbridge Borough Council

http://www.elmbridge.gov.uk/planning/policy/develop.htm

Development Contributions SPD

Why are they needed?

Both documents will ensure that the cumulative impacts of new development on local infrastructure and Thames Basin Heaths are addressed and support the delivery of affordable housing. By setting out all contributions in a single document the Council is also seeking to make the process of collecting developer contributions more transparent. Both developers and residents will be able to easily find out all the costs placed on development by the Council.

What about existing guidance on infrastructure, affordable housing and Thames Basin Heaths?

Planning Obligations and Infrastructure SPD - our existing tariff-based system of collecting contributions through planning obligations from new development towards infrastructure adopted in 2006. From 2014, we will no longer be able to use planning obligations to secure contributions in this way.

C521: Affordable Housing - Procedural Guidance - our procedural guidance on affordable housing was adopted in August 2011. This has not been subject to consultation and is intended only as a guide to assist applicants in making planning applications where affordable housing is a requirement.

Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Interim Mitigation Strategy for Elmbridge - this was adopted in 2007. The document was only intended to have a lifespan of 5 years and needs to be updated to reflect current practice.

Progress to date

We have undertaken some initial engagement with the local community, developers and affordable housing providers which is outlined within the consultation statement below as well as a brief summary of the content of the document. In addition, we have prepared an updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Viability Study to support CL.

How can you get involved?

We are consulting on a draft Developer Contributions SPD and CL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS) for a period of 6 weeks from 28 November 2011 to 9 January 2012. A number of background studies have also been undertaken.

- Statement of SPD matters
- Consultation Statement
- Background studies- Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace Proposals and Viability Study 2011

Copies are also available for inspection at:

- Planning Services, 1st Floor, Civic Centre, High Street, Esher between 9.45am and 5.00pm (Monday to Friday), and
- All Borough libraries - see the Surrey County Council website or call 0300 200 1001 for locations and opening times

Comments can be submitted using the Council's online form, emailed to Planning Policy or sent in writing to: The Planning Policy Team, Elmbridge Borough Council, Civic Centre, Esher, Surrey, KT10 9SD. Comments must be received by 4pm on Monday 9 January 2012.

Next steps

Comments will be analysed and taken into account in preparing the final Developer Contributions SPD for adoption in April 2012. Comments on the CL



Appendix 7 – Schedule of Consultation Responses and Analysis Report

Q1: 1. Is the document set out in a format that is useable and accessible?

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council Response/Recommendation
1.1	Revd Phillip Johnson		I received a series of documents this morning from you regarding the Elmbridge Local Plan. I have to say that they are of high quality and are put together very well.	Noted
1.2	Mary Le Mesurier-Foster		No! A load of gobble-de-gook!	Noted. The document has been reformatted and edited in order that it is easier to understand.
1.3	Ronald Truin	Burwood Park East Residents Association	Yes	Noted
1.4	Laurie Keitch		It is written in clear, understandable English- no terminology, which would be used by those in the trade/profession. There is easy instruction on how to process through the document. It should not faze anybody!	Noted
1.5	Nicholas Driver		Yes	Noted
1.6	Caroline Heather		Yes	Noted
1.7	R. D Clarke	Weybridge Society	NO- The document is too long and complicated, therefore too difficult to follow in comparison to the Elmbridge Residential Design Guide. We suggest that an evaluation is required, for instance is the information in the Core Strategy of value to be repeated in this document. -Often the wording is complicated and rambling, suggest use simple language. -Suggest paragraphs should be numbered according	The document has been reformatted and edited in order that it is easier to use. Separate companion guides will help to achieve this and address the issue with paragraph numbering. It is inevitable that there will be some repetition with the content of the Core Strategy and the SPD. The maps will be legible through My Elmbridge, which will be prepared

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council Response/Recommendation
			to the section and each paragraph should have a title so that the document is easy to use. -The on line document maps are virtually useless. You need at least A2 to be able to see the detail required.	after adoption. The companion guides include A3 maps should anyone wish to use a hard copy.
1.8	Doreen Harris		I spent approx. 4 hours (2 and 2) I found it most interesting obviously a great deal of thought and expertise has gone into it. I look forward to interesting and excellent days ahead. Congratulations, only the best will do for Elmbridge.	Noted
1.9	Cllr Sandra Dennis		I have read the Design and Character Document and I think it reads very well. I have only 4 comments to make which I would ask you to incorporate.	Noted

Q2: The draft document has been structured to take account of the design process including understanding the local context, appraising the site/setting and generating a design concept incorporating design guidance and case study examples. Do you think this approach will ensure high quality designed development in the Borough?

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council Response/Recommendation
2.1	Mary Le Mesurier-Foster		I haven't the faintest idea	Noted
2.2	Ronald Truin	Burwood Park East Residents Association	Yes	Noted
2.3	Laurie Keitch		It will certainly bring attention to the need of good design reflecting the style of the area. Whether it will avoid altogether the higgledy-piggledy mess of recent civic centres I don't know! The French are very strict on their design and quality reflecting the locality, and it shows. England has equally successful, beautifully designed, along local traditions, villages and towns and it would be nice to see this happening in Elmbridge-the means do exist.	Noted- it is considered that the SPD provides the means to deliver high quality design in Elmbridge.
2.4	Nicholas Driver		Hopefully	Noted
2.5	Caroline Heather		Yes- Will provide a foundation of strong guidelines	Noted
2.6	R. D Clarke	Weybridge Society	NO -As in our opinion the document has serious failings in providing an improvement from the existing Elmbridge Residential Design Guide. More detail is contained in other answers.	The Elmbridge Borough Council Residential Design Guidance 2002 is a Borough wide document that has served us well. However, the aim of this SPD is to take greater account of local character as well as involve local people in shaping the future of their local areas. The document improves on the Residential Design

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council Response/Recommendation
				<p>Guidance in that it has a greater focus on the eight settlement areas identified in the Core Strategy. It also includes guidance on sustainable construction as well as non-residential developments. It is considered that the inclusion of minimum requirements, which are set out in the Residential Design Guidance would improve the SPD and this has been taken into account within the layout section. However the overall approach is significantly different in that it takes you through a design process from first principles rather than putting forward a one size fits all approach.</p>
2.7	Doreen Harris		Yes- well thought out.	Noted.

3. Do you think the Character of Elmbridge (An Overview) at section 2 is helpful?

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
3.1	Mary Le Mesurier- Foster		I haven't the faintest idea	Noted
3.2	Ronald Truin	Burwood Park East Residents Association	Yes	Noted
3.3	Laurie Keitch		Yes, it explains well my comment under 4. It also brings the further dimension into the equation, i.e. that things evolve and they must- we cannot live in the past. Fabrics/materials of new design must not be disregarded, but worked into the surrounds making a pleasing, although different, whole.	Noted. Whilst the document aims to respect and enhance local character it also promotes contemporary design where appropriate.
3.4	Nicholas Driver		Yes	Noted
3.5	Caroline Heather		Very helpful	Noted
3.6	R. D Clarke	Weybridge Society	Due to the time constraints we have not had time to evaluate this at the time of writing this document.	Noted. The Weybridge Society were given an extra week to respond to the document. This allowed 7 weeks to respond. The statutory minimum is 4 weeks. Comments from the Weybridge Society were received up until the 31 January 2012.
3.7	Doreen Harris		Yes	Noted
3.8	Sue Kilpatrick and Sandy Brook	Cobham and Downside Residents Association (CDRA)	Para 2.24 The area is known as Street Cobham, not Cobham Street.	Noted. This will be corrected.

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
3.9		Claygate Parish Council	<p>2.19 Fig C07 is a good example of high status Urban Vernacular.</p> <p>2.36 Fig GT09 is a good example of Art and Craft Movement building with catslide roof.</p> <p>2.46 Agreed that greens are an important characteristic.</p> <p>2.51 and 2.56 Good emphasis for trees in Claygate.</p>	Noted

4. The character assessments have been developed in partnership with local community groups. Do you think they offer the right level of detail to inform an initial assessment of the character of the area?

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
4.1	Mary Le Mesurier-Foster		I haven't the faintest idea	Noted
4.2	Ronald Truin	Burwood Park East Residents Association	Yes	Noted
4.3	Laurie Keitch		Yes! Although broad-brush, it highlights distinctive areas.	Noted. The detail contained within the settlement area character assessments has been an issue of significant discussion. The aim is to give a snapshot of the area in a succinct way without getting bogged down in too much detail. It is not the purpose of the character assessment to be a substitute for visiting the site and studying the

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
				local context in detail. This is one of the first steps, which should be undertaken when considering the design of a new development.
4.4	Nicholas Driver		In general, yes, but I have a specific representation to make in relation to Section 3.272 and the 'Specific Issues box' which appear on page 112 to which I refer in answer to Question 5 below	Noted.
4.5	Caroline Heather		Yes- hopefully the views of local community groups will be continuously updated so as to reflect the views of current members/residents.	Whilst these community issues reflect the issues at April 2011, it is agreed that these could change over time. As such it is intended to put into place a monitoring arrangement that not only addresses the performance of the document but also the changing views of the community.
4.6	R. D Clarke	Webridge Society	<p>NO-Unfortunately the development of character assessments in partnership with local community groups has been disappointing.</p> <p>-Massive effort has been wasted by the Council/Consultants initially insisting on limiting the number of areas and producing inappropriate character areas. Some work is still required to resolve the more minor problems that are left.</p> <p>-The documents have a number of errors; these will need to be corrected.</p> <p>-The assessments rather than being an improvement on those in the Elmbridge Residential Design Guide are in our opinion far worse.</p> <p>-The Weybridge Society believes that there is a</p>	The approach to the preparation of the document has prioritised the involvement of the community from the start. 77 people took part in daylong community workshops across the Borough and significant resources have been allocated for this work. Whilst it is noted that Weybridge Society consider that this engagement was disappointing, other groups found it highly beneficial and were appreciative of the Council's efforts to involve them in the future planning of their areas. It is agreed that some of the character

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>fundamental error in the way the document is constructed and this opinion was given, in writing, with alternative suggestions in our previous feedback.</p> <p>-We will supply a set of documents to indicate changes to each character area, in some areas we will be able to show the level of detail required, in others it will not be possible, in the consultation time schedule, to do more than provide some suggested changes.</p>	<p>areas in Weybridge have benefited from further sub division as suggested by Weybridge Society. This is indeed the purpose of early community engagement and involving the community throughout the process rather than presenting them with a 'fait accompli' produced by officers and consultants without the benefit of local knowledge from local people. The RDG did not have this level of community input.</p> <p>Through considering responses to consultation errors have been corrected and amendments have been made where appropriate. However, there will be no fundamental changes to the approach taken to the character assessments as this is considered an appropriate way to embrace localism. The information sent to the Council with regards to the Weybridge Character assessment has been extremely helpful and changes have been made where appropriate.</p>
4.7	Doreen Harris		<p>Yes I do - I find this most pleasing. Surrey is a beautiful County; this attracts thinking active residents with a sense of involvement in the locality and local matters.</p>	<p>Noted. The community representatives have willingly given up their time to be involved in the preparation of this document and it is considered that the SPD will be a good example of</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
				community engagement.
4.8	Sheila Parnell		<p>On page 96 under the heading Claremont Park and Clare Hill you state in paragraph 3.240 that a single architect designs most of the houses in the estate, the extent of which you show in your plan on page 93 extends to Esher High Street to the north and Esher Common to the south. To my knowledge this can not possibly be correct as I am sure a perusal of EBC planning records will confirm many architects have over the years been employed to design extensions and rebuilds over the years and up to the present day. Oversight of the ensuing building works has no doubt evolved differently for different residents associations in this area of Esher. My own residents association only in very recent years I believe calling on a consultant architect for planning approval advice if necessary.</p> <p>It is fair to say the original estate in major part was laid out by one original architect and a large portion of the original houses designed and built by him (Blair Imrie) but this level of control petered out during the years of the second world war and is recorded in historical documents and deeds pertaining to the estate properties.</p> <p>You refer to on page 96 (3.237) to the 18c landscape so it was with astonishment that I discovered on Friday from you that the Clare Hill Golf Course is no longer protected by English Heritage as part of the Historic Park and Garden of Claremont Mansion, which is extremely</p>	<p>Noted. The text at paragraph 3.27 in the Companion Guide for Esher has been revised to take account of the comments made.</p> <p>The designation of historic parks and gardens is solely an English Heritage matter. It is for the Council to represent the designation on the proposals map.</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>concerning. I notice also that you do not make direct reference to the restrictive planning and building covenants applicable to properties in the Claremont Park area on pages 96 and 97 but you do refer readers to Case Study CS1 which in the main supports the replacement of large single dwellings with apartment buildings. This could be misleading to potential developers. It is my understanding an increase in housing density on plots in Claremont Park roads and Clare Hill is the big no no so I hope EBC planners will make this clear in the final edition of the local plan documents and in a more prominent manner than your statement on page 143 (6.2).</p>	<p>Covenants are not a planning matter and would need to be dealt with by private individuals. In order to help explain why these have affected the low-density character, reference to these have been made in the opportunities section. (See paragraph 3.31)</p> <p>Case Study 1 is for a replacement residential building, which could contain flats as one possible design solution. With regards to low density and special low-density areas it has been made clear in the assessments that applicants need to look at the design principles of case study 1 in relation to a replacement house.</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
4.9	Cllr Sandra Dennis		<p>Page 89 3.221</p> <p>Please delete from line 7 "this area is likely to see some replacement of houses and intensification of plots". We should not be advising that this is our suggested way forward for development in this area particularly as "garden grabbing" is listed on page 79 as a key concern of residents. This wording would also be used by the Planning Inspectorate at appeal should it appear in the SPD. Much better that we judge any new applications on their individual merits. I note that this sort of guidance is not included for all other areas in the SPD, so should be deleted here.</p>	<p>Whilst proposals may come forward for this sort of development it is agreed that appropriateness of such development should be considered on its own merits taking account of the advice in the case studies.</p> <p>The character assessment will inevitably be different to each other however through editing the document we have sought to adopt a consistent approach to the way in which potential development opportunities are addressed.</p> <p>Accordingly, the paragraph has been amended. (See Companion Guide: Thames Ditton, Long Ditton, Hinchleywood and Weston Green paragraph 3.88)</p>
4.10	Cllr Tannia Shipley		The structure of the sub-area text for Weston Green needs improving. New photos are submitted.	Agreed and amended.
4.11	Robert Collett	WYG Planning and Design	I write in response to the Council's current consultation on the draft Design and Character SPD on behalf of our clients, Wates Developments, who control land at Imber Court Trading Estate, Orchard Lane, East Molesey. As you will be aware, my client's site is located within the East and West Molesey settlement area of the Borough and is situated within Character Sub Area MOL10 within	It is agreed that Imber Ct Trading Estate should be included in the area description and this omission has been rectified. (See Companion Guide: East and West Molesey para 3.96) Whilst the character of the Trading Estate is different to general mixed residential

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>the draft SPD (referred to as Ember Lane Environs (north).</p> <p>It is noted that the text at paragraph 3.175 of the draft SPD describes the Ember Lane Environs (north) Character Sub Area (MOL10) as an area of mixed residential development with two key phases, with the remainder of the section referring to the residential character of the area. The Imber Court Trading Estate however is a commercial site that accommodates B2 and B8 Uses in large industrial buildings with large areas of hard standing used for storage and parking. The character of the Imber Court site is therefore clearly inconsistent with the mixed residential character, design and visual qualities of the wider character sub-area. Consequently, the redevelopment of the site for residential uses would be beneficial to enhance the character of the area.</p> <p>It is requested that reference should be made in the SPD to the Imber Court site and that this site is inconsistent with and damaging to the character and appearance of its surroundings and the wider Ember Lane Environs (north) character sub-area due to its large industrial buildings and large areas of hard standing. Furthermore, it is requested that reference also be made in paragraph 3.178 of the SPD (relating to future development within the area) to the redevelopment of the Imber Court site with appropriately designed residential dwellings and the removal of the large industrial buildings and areas of hard standing being beneficial to the character, design and visual amenity of the local area.</p>	<p>character of the area this is inevitable given that it is a commercial site. The future use of this Strategic Employment site is not a matter that should be dealt with through this SPD. The agents have taken part in the Core Strategy examination to promote their site for residential use and will continue to do so through the settlement ID plans. This is considered to be the most appropriate route.</p> <p>The respondents raise an important point regarding the compatibility of commercial development located within residential areas. As such, specific design guidance relating to this has been included in paragraph 6.6.</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
4.12	Revd Phillip Johnson		I was slightly surprised to discover that the spire of All Saints Weston is not on the map as a key landmark when it can be seen from a considerable distance and has a profound effect on the views of the green and associated housing. It is not mentioned anywhere on either Pg. 79 or 80 of the document. Architecturally, it is one of the most significant buildings in Weston Green, and has an impact on the view and vista, which the document so carefully highlights. I'm obviously sensitive to the inclusion or not of the Church as I'm the Vicar, but most of the residents would know "the white church by the pond" and it seems a bit odd its not mentioned.	Noted. It is agreed that All Saints, Church, Weston Green is a local landmark and reference to this has been added to the text and map. See Companion Guide: Thames Ditton, Long Ditton, Hinchley wood and Weston Green paragraph 3.82 and the local landmarks box and map.
4.13		Claygate Parish Council	<p>Pg 119 – 3.302 bullet 3 has clearly defined gateway at Hare Lane Green; we should prefer it to follow on from bullet 1 e.g." Only the only three motorized accesses to the settlement there are clearly defined gateways".</p> <p>Identified concerns include the loss of features of the two centres; this is expressed as a need to retain mixed uses, which could imply facilitating residential elements; it needs to be more clearly stated that the historic centre needs preservation.</p> <p>The map on page 121 still treats Raleigh Drive as being similar to Fox warren, and ignores all the suggestions we made and the alternative submitted with the change in colours and headings, having spent considerable time identifying the areas of pre and post war housing stock. Why have our suggestions not been taken on board?</p>	<p>Reference has been included to the 3 accesses/gateways to the settlement "Vehicular access is restricted to three key routes". This has also been repositioned. See Companion Guide: Claygate- summary of key features.</p> <p>Revised issue with new text "There was general concern that the commercial core had shifted from the High Street to 'The Parade' and although the two areas perform different roles, it is important for both to retain their historic features and overall character." Companion Guide: Claygate- Issues identified from Community workshop box.</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>photo is a two storey glazed box, which is totally out of keeping with the street scene and does not reflect the character of the road. One wonders what this paragraph is promoting or saying. Unfortunately the only other new building in this area at the other end of The Parade is also not a good example of a harmonious, sympathetic development.</p> <p>Pg 124 – 3.312 One of the many favorable references to street trees, which are very important to the character of the area.</p> <p>Pg 124 – 3.313 Advocates residential development above shops, but fails to warn the overdoing this threatens the vitality of the shops. It should also be noted that any use of ground floor storage for inclusion in new residences should be avoided as this leads to insufficient flexibility for future retail space.</p> <p>Pg 124- 3.315 The picture figure SA 127 does not do the road justice as it does not show much to do with the architecture described in the paragraph as too much foliage and shrubbery on view, a different view using a wide angle lens would be better.</p> <p>Pg 125 – 3.317 This emphasises well the value of openings to see the countryside.</p> <p>Pg127 – 3.328 It has succeeded in placing most of the groups of “workers cottages” within one sub area. There</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The matter raised with regards to loss of storage for shops would be an issue for the retailer to consider when submitting a planning application. This is not a design and character matter.</p> <p>Noted. Figure SA127 has been replaced to reflect the text.</p> <p>Noted. However, lighter photo has been substituted.</p> <p>Noted. The building types map produced by CPC show where the 3 areas of workers cottages fall within the settlement.</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>are in fact three areas in Claygate with them.</p> <p>Pg129 – This does well to emphasise the need to avoid terracing effect and spacing between dwellings.</p>	<p>Noted and to further emphasise this, a new section on 'Layout' has been included in the general design guidance and will be referenced here.</p>
4.14	David Bellchamber	Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust	<p>1. At Paragraph 3.253 it is said, "The A3 to the north of Cobham presents a significant physical barrier between the settlement area and the rest of the Borough". It is the view of the Trust that it should rather be stated that it is "The Commons and Green Belt to the north of Cobham.....". The history is that it was possible, some 30 years ago as part of the creation of the Esher by-pass, to drive the A3 through in its current form because of the existence of the Commons. There are adequate crossings of the A3, which show that it is not really the physical barrier. Rather, it must be emphasised that it is the Commons that are the barrier against development.</p> <p>2. In the section titled COS03 "Tartar Hill" (at paragraphs 3.263 to 3.267) the Trust is concerned that the Victorian area that is the lower part of Hogshill Lane, Cedar Road and Spencer Road is included with other development, which is predominantly from the twentieth century and that there is insufficient definition of character for conservation purposes. Tartar Hill itself is really that area off Portsmouth Road to the north, and the Trust sees no difficulty with that name for the district to include the area bounded by Anyards Road, Freelands Road and even Hogshill Lane north west of French Gardens. However,</p>	<p>Agree-this has been revised to include reference to the Commons and the Green Belt. The commons and Green Belt to the north of Cobham presents a significant physical barrier between this settlement area and the rest of the Borough (please see paragraph 3.1 in the Cobham companion guide).</p> <p>Noted- this has been more clearly differentiated. (See para 3.33)</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>while acknowledging there is a brief summary that seeks to establish this, the Trust considers that the earlier period (lower part of Hogshill Lane, etc. as above, some of which warrants special protection) deserves a separate section or should be more clearly differentiated.</p> <p>3. The section titled COS05 "Riverhill Mill Road and the Tilt" (at paragraphs 3.270 to 3.274) may be correctly defined but the Trust considers there is a special area that is the continuation of the Tilt Conservation Area along Tilt Road and takes in Korea Cottages to the south and Elm Grove Gardens and other buildings to the north that does not sit comfortably with COS06 "Oxshott Way environs" (at paragraphs 3.275 and 3.276) as currently defined.</p> <p>4. Regarding the section titled COS07 "Stoke d'Abernon" (at paragraphs 3.277 to 3.280) the Trust considers that there is not sufficient differentiation between the area around the Station at Stoke d'Abernon and other Residential parts of Stoke d'Abernon such as those off Blundel Lane (Lodge Close, Evelyn Way) and off Bray Road, (Vincent Road, D'Abernon Way). Both Stoke Close and Knowle Park fit in with such an area and it is debatable whether the whole of the area South of Stoke Road fits more comfortably into this area rather than the "Oxshott Way " area. (This was envisaged by the first draft.).</p>	<p>Agreed- this has been amended on map.</p> <p>Sub-area 05 has been extended to include The Tilt Conservation Area. After further consideration sub-area 07 and 06 have been revised to better reflect the main characteristics of these areas. This has been changed within the text and on the map. (See para 3.63 of the Cobham Companion Guide)</p>
4.15	Gerry Acher	Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust	I should be grateful if you would consider the inclusion of the following points:3.256 insert in the first sentence "...was historically two separate areas – Street Cobham and Church Cobham - with the latter now the main	Agreed and revised text.

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>shopping area and linked by..... After this first sentence "...20 century development. This development to the south side of Between Streets retains the original character of individually designed two storey dwellings set in wide grass verges making for a pleasing entrance to Church Cobham in addition a new sentence " the main shopping centre is further shaped by the significant amount of green areas in the three main approaches to the Centre ie from the south the Leg O' Mutton field; from the west the very wide grass verge the length of Between streets mentioned above; and from the east green area of The Tilt leading to the River and then the High Street.</p> <p>3.258 insert a continuation of penultimate sentence ".....small shop units in a traditional high street setting i.e. a long line of shops either side of the road and not broken up with separate shopping precincts...(figure SA103).</p> <p>3.259 continue the penultimate sentence ".....this part of the settlement area which it is understood the local Heritage Trust are keen to see corrected.</p> <p>3.260 in the box of issues raised include under the first bullet "Estate Agents"</p> <p>3.276 insert new penultimate sentence after "...future change in this sub area. This equally applies to the houses on either side of the Stoke Road leading to the</p>	<p>Agreed and revised text.</p> <p>Agreed and revised text.</p> <p>Agree and revise first part of the sentence. The second part of the sentence relating to precincts is not necessary.</p> <p>Noted. The information has been passed on to the officer dealing with the town centre improvements.</p> <p>This has been added.</p> <p>No change. Stoke Road lies within the sub area and so we would not need to highlight this as the statement applies</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			Tilt where their design characteristics and placing in relation to the road itself also give rise to a distinctive form of development.	throughout.

5. Do you consider the issues identified at the community workshops fully represent the local design issues experienced in that area or are there any additional issues you wish to raise?

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
5.1	Mary Le Mesurier-Foster		I haven't the faintest idea	Noted.
5.2	Ronald Truin	Burwood Park East Residents Association	Yes	Noted
5.3	Laurie Ketch		More or less.	Noted
5.4	Nicholas Driver		Page 112: At the Workshops and, subsequently, at the consultation Meeting at the Esher Civic Centre on the 14th September strong approval was expressed for a new Conservation Area to be created to include the 'green corridor and Open Urban Areas in Leigh Hill Road' together with their surrounding houses, or for the existing Tilt Conservation Area to be extended to include them. I submit that suitable wording to reflect this specific issue raised by the community in the Workshop and Feedback Session should be recorded as a second bullet point in the 'Specific Issues' Box,	During the community workshops participants raised a number of issues. These were of concern generally but did not specifically relate to Design and Character. In order to maintain the focus of the SPD and also to ensure that the concerns were directed to the most appropriate part of the Council that could action or response to their concerns, a decision was taken to include only those issues relating to Design and Character. The Council's Landscape

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			which appears on page 112.	and Heritage Manager is dealing with this particular issue.
5.5	Caroline Heather		Believe my views were identified and concur with the local design issues experienced.	Noted.
5.6	R. D. Clarke	Webridge Society	NO- One workshop of an hour or so and an afternoon site visit could in no way do more than touch on problems like parking. No design issues were evaluated in any detail this would take a series of meetings with experts to discuss each character area.	It is considered that a full days workshop with local communities strikes the right balance between the use of Councils resources and community engagement. There have been additional opportunities to add to information since these initially took place. With regards to the specific issue relating to parking this has been included in the new Layout section of the document.
5.7	Doreen Harris		Yes	Noted
5.8	Sheila Parnell		I hope EBC planners will include more references to the mix of autumnal shades of tan, peach, orange, brown, cream for bricks and tile colours in the semi-rural locations of Esher. These were the colours of choice of the original architect Blair Imrie and tone in so well to the semi-rural landscape rather than the reds and soft reds often mentioned.	Agreed. This has been referenced in paragraph 3.28 of the Esher Companion Guide.

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
5.9	Cllr Sandra Dennis		<p>Page 79 Issues identified from the Community Workshops.</p> <p>Could we please add a bullet point here regarding the loss of retail outlets, which are converted into offices or residential units? We face huge pressure in Thames Ditton to convert the shops into office/retail use and if it continues the village centre is lost. We need a core group of shops and if these become eroded then there is no passing trade, and the remaining shops become unviable. This would significantly change the nature of the village.</p>	This is a matter relating to planning permission for change of use rather than a Design and Character issue. Core Strategy CS18 deals with matters relating to loss of retail units.

Q6: Is the information on the maps sufficiently clear and comprehensive? Do you consider that the sub-areas have been identified correctly?

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
6.1	Mary Le Mesurier-Foster		No idea- do not understand	Noted
6.2	Ronald Truin	Burwood Park East Residents Association	Yes	Noted

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
6.3	Laurie Keitch		Yes	Noted
6.4	Nicholas Driver		Yes, but the scale of some of the maps makes them very difficult to read	The maps will be legible through My Elmbridge, which will be prepared after adoption.
6.5	Caroline Heather		Yes	Noted
6.6	Sue/ Sandy Kilpatrick Brook	Cobham and Downside Residents Association (CDRA)	Looking at the content of the document, the boundaries between areas 06 and 07 have been re-drawn in this draft, but seem to differ from the discussion we had about this at the Feedback Session. Surely we decided that The Tilt Conservation Area should be part of area 05, that Stoke Road should remain in 07 and that all of Fairmile Lane should be in 06. Page 104 The map refers to Chobham instead of Cobham.	Sub-area 05 has been extended to include The Tilt Conservation Area. After further consideration sub-area 07 and 06 have been revised to better reflect the main characteristics of these areas. The spelling error has also been corrected.
6.7	R. D. Clarke	Weybridge Society	NO-The Planning Panel is of the opinion that excluding the Open Urban Areas, Green Belt and Landscape setting from character assessment is a fundamental error. Each of the areas in Weybridge has existing buildings and uses that have a defined character. -The on line document maps are virtually useless, (please do not say they can be enlarged as the detail is not in the file), the A3 versions in the library are better but still not adequate. You need A1 or A2 to be able to see the detail required. In Weybridge Town Centre and Conservation areas it is not possible to determine where the Character area boundaries finish.	The document is aimed at ensuring that new development is designed to respect local character and is of a high quality. The Core Strategy does not envisage building on the Green Belt and as such it would not be appropriate or a good use of Council resources to expend a lot of time on undertaking character assessment where new buildings are not envisaged. The character and function of the Borough's open spaces would be more appropriately addressed in the Green Infrastructure Strategy, which the Council will

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>-The Character areas are now a reasonably correct. However corrections are required to remove minor errors in the boundaries, for instance Hillcrest should not be in 3 character areas.</p>	<p>produce when resources allow. The maps will be legible through My Elmbridge, which will be prepared after adoption.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to have maps at a scale of A1 or A2 as it is not the role of the maps to substitute a site visit.</p> <p>The character area sub area boundaries have been off set so that you can see the conservation area boundary more clearly.</p> <p>Following detailed discussion and review, it is pleasing that the Weybridge Society now consider the Character Assessment to be reasonably correct. The minor errors identified by them have now been taken account of.</p>
6.8	Doreen Harris		I was delighted with this section- there may be more that can be discovered as new ideas come to light.	Noted
6.9	Cllr Ben White		I think Oatlands Park warrants further partition with another area of distinct character that includes Beechwood Ave, Broom Way and Cleves Wood. This is a well-defined sub-area, only 2 entrance/exit points and while not gated	This reflects comments raised by the Weybridge Society. As a result, the sub-area has been added due to its local distinctiveness. (See para 3.78-3.81)

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			it has many of the characteristics of area WEY05 and the description used there would seem to be equally applicable here. The more generalised description of WEY09 does not reflect the difference of this cluster of streets. Based on the electoral roll these 3 streets contain 94 dwellings and it may be worthwhile including the houses fronting on Oatlands Ave from St. Marys Road east to the corner of Millbrook, about another dozen or so. These are generally Victorian/Edwardian and while their styles are mixed there is a consistency in their layout and setting. From Millbrook, moving towards Cleves School, the character becomes mixed and is adequately covered in WEY09.	

Q7: Do you think the general introduction to the design process including placemaking / sustainability principles and general aspects of design (section 4,5,6,7) have been considered to the right level of detail and will be a useful reference when designing development?

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
7.1	Mary Le Mesurier-Foster		No idea- do not understand	Noted
7.2	Ronald Truin	Burwood Park East Residents Association	Yes	Noted

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
7.3	Nicholas Driver		Hopefully	Noted
7.4	Caroline Heather		Yes- useful information	Noted
7.5	R. D. Clarke	Weybridge Society	Due to the time constraints we have not had time to evaluate this section at the time of writing this document, therefore we ask the following:- Weybridge Society question whether all the aspects covered in the Elmbridge Residential Design Guide are covered to a full degree of detail. In particular Part 2 Design Principles pages 4 to 11. These pages cover Urban Design Objectives, Key Aspects of Built Form, Residential Amenity, Landscape, Scale, Height and Massing, Appearance, Density and Public Transport Accessibility.	Noted. A thorough review of the content of the Residential Design Guidance has been undertaken in order to ensure that the SPD takes account of all elements of design principles. Policies relating to density are included in the Core Strategy. This gives a general indication of the density of development to be promoted across the Borough however using densities to judge the acceptability of specific developments can be misleading and is considered to be a very blunt instrument which should not override more relevant issues regarding design and character.
7.6	Doreen Harris		Yes I do	Noted

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
7.7	Katie Gosling	Environment Agency	<p>Sustainable Design Factors We support the use of renewable energy solutions in new and existing developments. We are pleased to see paragraphs 6.12 and 6.13 included and suggest that recommending water efficiency measures could be added</p> <p>Riverside Development River corridors within the borough are an asset, their associated ecological value must be maintained and enhanced where possible. The fluvial floodplains in the borough also need to be protected and allowed to perform their function. We support new buildings being designed to relate to the river frontages in Elmbridge Borough. These developments must be appropriate to the flood zone and enhance and maintain the ecological value of the area.</p>	Noted. The section relating to sustainable design has been reconsidered and expanded in order to provide a comprehensive overview of sustainability issues and also to show the priority that the Council places on such matters. This section now includes reference to ecology and the importance of river corridors. The need to protect fluvial flood plains is also noted and this will be taken into account when considering the objectives of the Lower Thames Strategy. The reference to riverside development and flooding is already included in the specific design advice (para 6.10).

Q8: Section 8, relating to specific aspects of design, largely relies on references to other documents. Do you think this is the right approach? Are there any other documents that you consider should be referenced?

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
8.1	Mary Le Mesurier-Foster		No idea	Noted

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
8.2	Ronald Truin	Burwood Park East Residents Association	Yes	Noted
8.3	Laurie Keitch		It is useful.	Noted
8.4	Nicholas Driver		No comment	Noted
8.5	Caroline Heather		Yes providing the documents referenced to are very easily accessible.	All the documents are now easily accessible with weblinks supplied.
8.6	R. D. Clarke	Weybridge Society	Due to the time constraints we have not had time to evaluate this at the time of writing this document.	Noted.
8.7	Doreen Harris		Elmbridge has done very well so far, in keeping with local character. I have in mind the improvements around the Thames Lock area in particular.	Noted

Q9: Do the case studies in section 9 reflect the nature of development that occurs in Elmbridge? Do you consider this approach will result in a better quality of design that is more responsive to the local area?

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
9.1	Mary Le Mesurier-Foster		No idea	Noted

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
9.2	Ronald Truin	Burwood Park East Residents Association	Yes	Noted
9.3	Laurie Keitch		Yes! I do	Noted
9.4	Nicholas Driver		Hopefully	Noted
9.5	Caroline Heather		Yes- nature of development reflected. Hope it will result in design quality improvement.	Noted
9.6	R. D. Clarke	Weybridge Society	NO- A detailed report is provided comparing the Elmbridge Residential Design Guide with the current case studies. In our opinion the new case studies are certainly not an improvement and we are concerned that there is missing information.	<p>The purpose of the case study section is to illustrate the process required when developing design proposals. It provides potential design solutions to developments that are commonplace in the Borough. The four-step process is explained in section 4 and the case studies aim to illustrate how this works.</p> <p>The case studies do differ from the Residential Design Guidance 2002 (RDG) case studies as they are trying to depict this important design process putting much more emphasis on understanding the context and site.</p> <p>Having carried out an assessment of the information contained within the RDG's case studies, all relevant guidance has been incorporated within the new case studies or within the design guidance section of the SPD</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p><u>Case Study 1 (ERDG 2002 Case Study 4)</u> Par. 9.13 The statement on side boundaries should be “minimum 6 meters or more” and not reduced by the average spacing of adjacent buildings. Par. 9.14 Last sentence, “It may be appropriate” should be “It is essential”. Par. 9.20 Height 2 and half stories should be have “qualifying clause which assesses the neighbouring properties” Par. 9.21 Not “photovoltaic panels” on the front.</p> <p>ERDG Case Study 4, on 2 pages and says more than the proposed Case Study 1 on 4 pages</p> <p><u>Case Study 2 (ERDG 2002 Case Study 2)</u> Par. 9.24 Add “site > 30m wide”. Par. 9.26 Not “photovoltaic panels” on the front. Show “multi-plot division” which probably has more flexibility see Case Study 2 , ERDG 2002 .</p> <p><u>Case Study 3 (ERDG 2002 Case Study 6)</u></p>	<p>where appropriate.</p> <p>It is not the purpose of the case studies to include prescriptive standards. Instead it encourages applicants to understand the context of the site to inform appropriate distance to boundaries. Additional information regarding heights will be included in the case study text.</p> <p>There is a Government commitment to sustainable development and solar panels on front elevations will be acceptable.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is not a planning requirement.</p> <p>There is a Government commitment to sustainable development and solar panels on front elevations will be acceptable.</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>Indicative scheme shows a less than mediocre solution and is all too depressing.</p> <p>Par. 9.32 Figure A05 missing. Disagree with central access, dispersed parking and play area. "Indicative design" should detail "Design Concept" not repeat.</p> <p>Consider an updated "Case Study 6, ERDG 2002" as a replacement for this.</p> <p><u>Case Study 4 (ERDG 2002 Case Study ?)</u></p> <p>This would seem to have very little value as these sites are unique opportunities with their own peculiarities and character.</p> <p><u>Case Study 5 (ERDG 2002 Case Study 5)</u></p> <p>Potential for greater density see Case Study 5 ERDG 2002.</p> <p>GF access in centre of building takes up valuable frontage. Access too prescriptive. Outlook poor = poor design.</p> <p>"Indicative design" should detail "Design Concept" not repeat.</p> <p>The site character and potential was far better described in ERDG 2002</p> <p>Consider an updated "Case Study 5, ERDG 2002" as a replacement for this.</p> <p><u>Case Study 6 (ERDG 2002 Case Study 5)</u></p> <p>This is so similar to Case Study 5 that it is hardly worth commenting on, but detailed comments are available above.</p>	<p>This case study has been revised to create a more appropriately designed scheme.</p> <p>There are examples of this development in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p> <p>The purpose of this design solution is to mitigate the impact on the listed building at the rear.</p> <p>There are also many sites on the edge of town centres where a mixed-use</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p><u>Missing Case Studies/Guidance from ERDG 2002</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the above analysis it is our opinion that the information/guidance/data from both ERDG 2002 Case Studies 1 and 3 are missing. ERDG Case Study 4 has an important "Poor Urban Design example" which indicates many of the un-neighbourly elements, which are difficult to control with prescriptive clauses. <p><u>General Statement</u></p> <p>Having reviewed the ERDG 2002 (35 pages) and the Draft D&CSPD (198 pages) I know I would prefer to use the ERDG 2002!</p> <p><u>Comment</u></p> <p>On reading and reflection, the Case Studies would be more robust and meaningful if only the "Design Concept" was shown, as this covers all the main prescriptive issues of the individual examples. The "Indicative Design" is one person's personal interpretation, and probably the same person that did the "Concept"! In ERDG 2002, it was about concept with some well designed words / photographs.</p>	<p>development maybe appropriate.</p> <p>The case studies in the RDG have been subject to a thorough review and cross referenced with the information contained within the new case study sections. The Council is confident that all the information contained within the RDG case studies has been included in the new case studies or new 'layout' section.</p> <p>The case studies follow the 4-stage design process and provide one possible design solution based on the understanding of context. It is not necessary to provide poor examples of development and this SPD moves away from this approach.</p>
9.7	Doreen Harris		Yes I do	Noted

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
9.8	Cllr Sandra Dennis		<p>Page 161 Residential plot division The houses described are mainly 2 storey in design and I think the case study should say that new buildings should reflect the existing height pattern and not introduce new elements. i.e. if the area is predominantly 2 storey then new housing with 3 storey elements would be inappropriate.</p> <p>Page 163 Case study 2 Residential Plot Division I am concerned that this case study gives no guidance at all on rear garden size yet there is very sensible guidance given in CS1.3 for flats. I have raised this at the 2 workshop meetings we had and I recall that Cllr Kapadia shared this view as this is a very common problem with applications. In Thames Ditton we are far more likely to have issues of sub division of larger houses for additional houses than flats and it is really important that we give guidance on garden size, similarly with the 45degree rule. I would very much like to see the content of paragraph 9.14 on page 159 repeated on page 163. This will help to reinforce figure CS2.4 on page 165, which shows that the gardens for the new houses should respect the existing pattern of rear garden size. Otherwise we will end up with mini estates, which ultimately change the nature of the area. By adding this it will be a very useful guide to developers and help us with the really difficult applications we see at sub committee planning meetings. It will also help by providing greater</p>	<p>Noted. Case study 2 includes reference to the existing height pattern. The purpose of the case studies are to illustrate the design process making sure designers are aware of the context and setting of the site. For that reason the case studies will avoid prescriptive standards.</p> <p>Reference to the provision of appropriate rear amenity space is included in the text and explained in the 'layout' section of the design guidance.</p> <p>Issues regarding the line of 45 degree rule and amenity space are now included in the 'layout' section of the design guidance.</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			clarification on garden grabbling, which is identified as a local concern on page 79. I cannot over emphasise how important it is that we include this information in case study 2.	
9.9		Claygate Parish Council	<p>9.5 - Case Study 1: The replacement of an existing detached house – this appears to make little difference, so perhaps irrelevant to the current trend to expand greatly and increase the number of stories within the dwelling. A long drive to a rear basement garage seems fanciful and fails to leave this space available for parking.</p> <p>9.22 – Case Study 2: Divide plot of large demolished house into two separate smaller houses – as the main impact is to reduce the views through to the rear garden trees, it is curious that the text repeatedly refers to the retention of this. The presentation of the case study is confusing, since it spends much time describing the demolished house; apart from its semicircular driveway (to be retained) this seems of little interest.</p> <p>9.28 Case Study 3: Creates 11 houses on a site of a previous telephone exchange, near a town centre; 6 houses</p>	<p>Case study 1 demonstrates the principles of a replacement building in terms of layout, building line, distance to boundaries etc. The indicative scheme relates to a flatted development as one possible design solution. The design concept and indicative scheme diagram has been revised with the long drive reduced. The text explains the possible parking solution with regards to basement provisions.</p> <p>Text in CS2 has been streamlined. the diagrams have been changed to indicate separate driveways.</p> <p>In order to avoid any confusion that any of the case studies relate to any sites in</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>reinstate the street building line, while a cul-de-sac courtyard serves the new houses, otherwise isolated from the street. The Claygate telephone exchange site would be bigger, but probably not big enough for the secondary school that some would like, so we should hope for something sympathetic, like this case study. Unlikely as EBC has ear marked it for a potential of 50 units.</p> <p>9.33 Case Study 4: Land to rear of shopping arcade - a good example of how not to do it! The new houses have no amenity space, also will immediately require obscured windows, the shops lose their service space, which in turn affects their viability, and the turning and parking space is useless.</p> <p>9.49 Case Study 5: Town centre mixed use – this example could work if handled sensitively.</p>	<p>the Borough the reference to telephone exchange has been removed.</p> <p>Whilst these opportunities are limited it is important to ensure that the Council makes the best use of its urban land if it is to continue to protect the Green Belt. The nature of development would have a particular appeal to residents who would wish to live in the heart of the town centre and would be content with having access to smaller amenity space such as terraces/balconies. This would allow for greater access to town centre facilities. In terms of service space/parking space, the indicative design clearly shows the importance of this and the need to maintain adequate services to the shops.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			9.66 Case Study 6: Edge of town centre mixed use – useful reiteration of need to reinstate the street frontage.	Noted.

Q10: Do you have any other comments relating to any aspect of the draft document? Please let us know of any suggested improvements/amendments that you have not already raised.

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
10.1	Mary Le Mesurier-Foster		I do not have a degree from a university.	It has been noted that it is important that the document is readily accessible to everyone. As such significant amount of effort has been taken to reformat the document providing simplicity and clarity in order that it is a lot more user friendly and accessible.
10.2	Ronald Truin	Burwood Park East Residents Association	We would have liked to have seen some reference to the protection of old, historic buildings in Hersham as so much of the character of old Hersham has been lost to developers over the last 50 years.	The local authority will use its powers to protect listed buildings and those located within conservation areas where appropriate. There are no planning powers to enable retention of buildings that do not fall within these categories. However the SPD seeks to ensure high quality design taking account of historic building where these exist.
10.3	Nicholas Driver		See answer to Question 5 above.	Noted and discussed above.
10.4	Sue Kilpatrick and Sandy Brook	Cobham and Downside Residents Association (CDRA)	The draft Design and Character SPD incorporates both local opinion and the opinion of planners, but how much weight will be given to the final document by those wishing to develop? It offers guidance and aspirations. What force will it have behind it? Both in the past and currently we have seen that little attention is paid to the character of the new	The SPD will be an important document for the consideration of new development from the pre application stage to decision. It will also carry significant weight at appeal due in part to the extent of community involvement in its preparation. Understanding local issues raised by the community will be

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>development and how it would fit into its environs. Would this new SPD have stopped the following Cobham examples of poor or out of character designs being recommended for approval?</p> <p>Development behind 26-38a High Street. A bad design, totally out of character with the Church Street Conservation Area, objected to by many local people and groups and yet recommended for approval by planners.</p> <p>Materials used for 3 new (linked) houses in Copse Road that were completely out of character for the area and more suitable for a public toilet.</p> <p>Gated developments.</p> <p>Badly designed and characterless properties with gardens that are too small, changing the nature of Estates, e.g. the Oxshott Way Estate, to their detriment.</p> <p>These are examples of past applications that would fail to meet the guidelines in the draft SPD. Could future applications of this type be turned down on these grounds and would an Inspector uphold this?</p> <p>We hope that there will be a review of this SPD and an opportunity for us to comment once there has been time to assess how it works in practice.</p>	<p>a useful tool to developers at an early stage in the application process. In accordance with the government's drive to promote localism, developers in many instances will be required to show how they have involved the community in the preparation of their schemes. This will provide a good indication of local views for them to consider in the first stages.</p> <p>Whilst the design guide will offer objective design guidance, it cannot offer a blueprint and a solution to all schemes and it is inevitable that in certain instances views with regard to design differ.</p> <p>It is important that the SPD is monitored to assess that it is being instrumental in delivering high quality development across the Borough that respects local character as such monitoring will be undertaken on an annual basis through the Council's authority monitoring report.</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
10.5	R. D. Clarke	Weybridge Society	<p>YES</p> <p>A full set of suggested improvements/amendments will be provided in a set of documents as described in para. 2 above.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>The Planning Panel are of an opinion that this Draft Design & Character Supplementary Planning Document Nov 2011 does not satisfy the requirement to replace the Elmbridge Residential Design Guide. This is because it fails to supply a sufficient level of detail and may have lost some vital statements and information. Our response to this consultation is intended to illustrate the detail we think is required. The Weybridge Society provide this response to the consultation with the understanding the information is as correct as possible, but accept no responsibility in this matter.</p>	<p>The Weybridge Society has contributed a significantly amount of time and resources to the consideration of this document which is appreciated. In response the document has been reformatted and amendments made in order to supply a sufficient level of detail with the inclusion of important information that was omitted from the draft. Whilst not all suggestions have been implemented, all have been taken into account and discussed in detail. It is considered that this final version of the SPD has been significantly improved and responds to many of the points raised by the Weybridge Society.</p>
10.6	Patrick Blake	Highways Agency	<p>We have reviewed the documents and do not have any comments at this time.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
10.7	Doreen Harris		<p>I think that you have produced an excellent Draft Document. I am proud to have Elmbridge as my Council.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
10.8	Colin Bannon	Colin Bannon- Policy Officer	The Draft Design and Character SPD is an informative and well-illustrated document, which has used up to date reference sources that would be useful for any LPA to reference. The only suggestion I have regards the Code for Sustainable Homes. It is referenced under "Placemaking Principles", however I feel it could maybe be elaborated on in "Sustainability Principles", maybe going into details about the desire to maximise the "sustainability ratings" of homes....?	The sustainability principles section has now been completely redrafted and the principle of maximising the sustainability of home generally has been addressed.

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
10.9	Rodney Whittaker	Open Spaces Society	<p>I would like to make the following comments on the above draft on behalf of both myself as an Elmbridge resident, and also on behalf of the Open Spaces Society of which I am the local correspondent for Elmbridge.</p> <p>1. I commend the references to the character of Elmbridge and its many open spaces. In any individual planning application (particularly larger ones), attention must be given to enhancing and preserving this.</p> <p>2. Specific emphasis should be given to the viewpoint of the walker and cyclist - if Elmbridge is to preserve its character, motorised travel has to be contained. In any application (again, particularly the larger ones), it must be asked whether the overall design will increase the likelihood of local journeys being undertaken on foot or by cycle.</p> <p>3. As the draft notes on p 78, for a borough with so much riverside, there is remarkably little access for walkers and cyclists. The provision of more such access should be a major consideration in any application regarding a waterside property.</p>	<p>Noted. Promotion of sustainable modes of transport is embedded within the Sustainability chapter, which has been rewritten and is now more comprehensive. It is not accepted that the riverside has limited access. However the SPD does include reference to ensuring new development provides public access to the waterway wherever possible.</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
10.10	Julia Coneybeer	Natural England	Whilst we do not have detailed comments to make on the Design and Character SPD, we welcome the inclusion of the Sustainability Principles, including sustainable drainage measures and renewable energy generation. However we would encourage the SPD to elaborate further on how development can create and enhance biodiversity, beyond trees and hedges, and contribute to Green Infrastructure (GI).	The section relating to sustainability principles has been redrafted and is now much more significant and includes reference to biodiversity.
10.11	CLlr Tannia Shipley		Para 2.24 requires a rewrite, 2.39 should refer to Blair Imrie and 2.51 needs to include Weston Green.	All issues raised have been addressed.
10.12		Claygate Parish Council	<p>Errata:</p> <p>Pg118 – 3.301 This should read (Ruxley Heights Estate)</p> <p>Pg119 – In summary of Key features, at the end of the 4th bullet point, it should read (Foley Estate, Ruxley Heights Estate).</p> <p>Pg125 – CLAY 04: 3.319the private estate of Ruxley Heights Estate.....</p> <p>Pg125 - CLAY 04: 3.319Ruxley Towers (currently used as a dwelling).....</p> <p>1.4 Good that Green Belt is to remain protected as Claygate is surrounded this. Good that Brown field/ urban sustainable development to be promoted.</p> <p>1.5 It must be remembered that the quality contemporary designs must respect the character</p>	Claygate Parish Council had a significant input to the Design and Character SPD and their comments have served to improve the document and its usability. The errata have been addressed and their general observations of support noted.

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>of the settlement areas into which they are to be built.</p> <p>1.7 The replacement of the Elmbridge Residential Design Guidance 2002 (ERDG) by this document will be difficult. The separate characters of the settlement areas has been done more effectively in this new SPD, but the elements regarding design and guidance on alterations have not been improved upon from the easy to read and reference point of view of the ERDG. An example being backland and infill development, this forms a major part of new urban development in this area. The case studies do not relate properly to this and better explanations and diagrams are shown in the adopted SPD of Swindon Borough Local Plan 2011 as attached to our comments.</p> <p>11 Home Extensions: This section is very dry with no direct guidance on preferred good design practice and is taken directly from the existing A4 leaflet. Due to LDC's, many of the submissions are non-professionally drawn; this is an area where we see a lot of bad design. Due to the way planning comments are handled, we cannot comment on terrible design but have to look at the criteria and see if there is anything at all which does not configure to very basic guidelines offered.</p>	<p>The concerns with regard to the improvement on the existing RDG is noted and has been taken into account in the redraft of the case studies and general design guidance. Whilst there is no specific case study relating to backland development it is considered that the general design guidance is applicable and will assist in the delivery of high quality development should such development come forward. The case study does exist in relation to infill. We are grateful for the reference to Swindon as we will benefit from any examples of good practice.</p> <p>It is correct that the home extension section is taken directly from the existing A4 leaflet other than minor updating. This document has served us well and is popular with professionals and applicants alike. It is understood that Claygate Parish Council would welcome stricter guidance that is more prescriptive potentially giving a greater degree of control over home extensions, which can have a</p>

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comments	Council's Response/Recommendation
			<p>11.4 is a case in question where flat roofed extensions still get through, along with the back flipping of roofs to get an extra storey. It is a case of coulds and shoulds not definitives.</p> <p>11.24 is another situation whereby we do not have sufficient grounds to not pass a submission as they always fall just below the ridge.</p> <p>A topic not even covered is where there is a pair of semis with hipped roofs, one side decides to do an extension and removes the hip to become gabled ended thus, creating an imbalance in the flow of roof configuration.</p>	<p>significant effect on the street scene in some instances. However many of these extensions do not require planning permission and there needs to be an element of flexibility in order that each case can be considered on its own merits. It is intended to be good guidance for extending your home whether you require it or not. In conclusion, it is considered that the home extensions continue to be fit for purpose and there is no overriding reason to make significant changes.</p>