

# Economic Development Committee – Special Meeting

Thursday 13 August 2009 7.30pm

**Council Chamber  
Runnymede Civic Centre, Addlestone**

## Members of the Committee

Councillors P I Roberts (Chairman), D A Cotty (Vice Chairman), A Alderson, J Broadhead, H A Butterfield, Mrs C E Gant, Mrs G M Kingerley, L C Pouyanne, A S T Ridge-Newman and P Taylor

## AGENDA

### Notes:

- 1) Any report on the Agenda involving confidential information (as defined by section 100A(3) of the Local Government Act 1972) must be discussed in private. Any report involving exempt information (as defined by section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972), whether it appears in Part 1 or Part 2 below, may be discussed in private but only if the Committee so resolves.
- 2) The relevant 'background papers' are listed after each report in Part 1. Enquiries about any of the Agenda reports and background papers should be directed in the first instance to **Mr M L White, Committee Section, Administration and Leisure Department, Runnymede Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone (Tel: Direct Line: 01932 425623). (Email: [malcolm.white@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:malcolm.white@runnymede.gov.uk)).**
- 3) Agendas and Minutes are available on a subscription basis. For details, please ring Mr B A Fleckney on 01932 425620. Agendas and Minutes for all the Council's Committees may also be viewed on [www.runnymede.gov.uk](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk).
- 4) In the unlikely event of an alarm sounding, members of the public should leave the building immediately, either using the staircase leading from the public gallery or following other instructions as appropriate.

**LIST OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**PART I**

**Matters in respect of which reports have been made available for public inspection**

|   | <b><u>Page</u></b> |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. FIRE PRECAUTIONS   | 3                  |
| 2. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP                        | 3                  |
| 3. MINUTES  | 3                  |
| 4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE  | 3                  |
| 5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST   | 3                  |
| 6. VIRGINIA WATER CAR PARKS – POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – PUBLIC CONSULTATION | 3                  |
| 7. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC  | 14                 |

**PART II**

**Matters involving Exempt or Confidential Information in respect of which reports have not been made available for public inspection.**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| a) <u>Exempt Information</u>  |    |
| 8. VIRGINIA WATER CAR PARKS – POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT     | 15 |
| 9. NEW LEASE OF 50-52 AND SURRENDER OF LEASE OF 56/56A STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE | 17 |
| b) <u>Confidential Information</u>  |    |
| (No reports to be considered under this heading)                                |    |

1. FIRE PRECAUTIONS

The Chairman will read the Fire Precautions which set out the procedures to be followed in the event of fire and other emergency.

2. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

3. MINUTES

To confirm and sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Committee held on 5 March 2009, which were included in the April 2009 Council Minute Book and the last ordinary meeting of the Committee held on 11 June 2009, which were included in the July 2009 Council Minute Book.

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

If Members have an interest in an item please record the interest on the form circulated with this Agenda and hand it to the Legal Representative or Committee Administrator at the start of the meeting. A supply of the form will also be available from the Committee Administrator at meetings.

Members who have previously declared interests which are recorded in the Minutes to be considered at this meeting need not repeat the declaration when attending the meeting. Members need take no further action unless the item in which they have an interest becomes the subject of debate, in which event the Member must leave the room if the interest is personal and prejudicial.

6. VIRGINIA WATER CAR PARKS – POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – PUBLIC CONSULTATION (DAL)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **To inform Members of the results from the local consultation into proposed development by Virginia Water Development Company (VWDC).**

2. Background Information

2.1 Members previously considered revisions to the scheme and the best way of moving forward in Committee on 12 March 2009.

2.2 It was resolved to invite local consultation by Developers VWDC prior to any renewal of commitment in the Council's landowning capacity. The Developer was asked to arrange local and Member consultation to a timescale agreed by the Chairman.

2.3 It was also resolved a further Committee report be made following such local consultation.

3. Report

3.1. This section addresses the scope of Public Consultation by VWDC.

The consultation material was shown to senior Members and Council Officers prior to commencement of the exercise, and was presented to Members at a meeting on 25 June 2009. The key issues arising from this meeting were:-

- i) Consider further car park surveys to ensure that current patterns and usage are fully understood, including any temporary reduction in demand due to the recession;
- ii) Demonstrate methodology in arriving at proposed car parking provision;
- iii) Additional material required to show visual impact of proposals on Station Parade relative to existing buildings.

3.1.2 The public consultation comprised an exhibition and a significant number of face to face meetings between the prospective developer and local interest groups.

- 3.1.3 The exhibition was undertaken to present a broad overview of the proposed development for land at, and adjoining, the railway station at Virginia Water.
- 3.1.4 Meetings were arranged with the following interest groups:-
- 1<sup>st</sup> Virginia Water Scout Group
  - Committee Members of Stroude Residents' Association
  - Wentworth Residents' Association Committee
  - Doctors Loxon Harley Packer Practice
  - Riverside Walk Advisory Committee
  - Virginia Water Community Association Committee
  - Virginia Water Community Pre School
  - Wine Circle
  - Local residents and businesses at British Legion Club, Virginia Water
  - Thorpe Ward Residents' Association Committee
  - Egham Chamber of Commerce Committee
  - Trotsworth Court Association.
- 3.1.5 Outstanding meetings currently comprise:-
- Residents of Trotsworth Avenue/Gorse Hill Lane on Wednesday 17 August at British Legion Club, arranged by and at the request of, Mrs Jean Reeves of Trotsworth Avenue.
  - Virginia Park Residents Committee, deferred until September at their Chairman's request.
  - St Ann's Park Residents' Committee, awaiting response from Management Committee following dialogue with Estate Manager.
  - Trumps Green Residents' Association, meeting arranged for 27 August through Tyser Greenwood.
  - Runnymede Business Partnership will arrange a business breakfast for local businesses for which sponsorship from VWDC has been requested.
  - Councillor Ridge-Newman.
- 3.2.1 This section addresses the exhibition details, attendance and results.
- 3.2.2 The exhibition was mounted at the Virginia Water 'Carnival Capers' on Saturday 27 June 2009. The event was held at Cabrera Open Space, Virginia Water and was open from 12 noon until 5pm. Admission was free to all members of the public.
- 3.2.3 Cabrera Open Space is in close proximity to the proposed development site. In this respect, it was chosen specifically to target most residents local to the proposed development. There was full advertisement of the exhibition, with a number of local posters advertising the event being displayed from that location, an advert in the local press (Staines Informer and Villager Newspapers) along with flyers distributed at Carnival Capers to attract people to the exhibition.
- 3.2.4 The exhibition (also used for consultation with individual groups) consisted of eight display boards, which presented a broad overview of the development proposal. The exhibition boards presented the development proposal along the following themes:-
- a) An introduction to the development;
  - b) The site and its context;
  - c) The site opportunities and constraints, and the design response'
  - d) The proposed arrangements of development'; and
  - e) A description of the phased development likely to occur.

- 3.2.5 To assist in the presentation of the proposal, Virginia Water Development Company staff were available to discuss and explain the proposal. This allowed for the Development Company staff to gauge first hand responses and opinion from members of the public.
- 3.2.6 In order to record the public's response to, and opinions towards, the proposed development, people attending the exhibition were invited to complete a comment card. The Development Company wished for the comments to be recorded to assist in developing the proposal further, and aim to present the results to the Council as part of the formal planning application.
- 3.2.7 In addition to the comment cards available at the exhibition, a website – with an on-line questionnaire – was set up to offer an alternative method of recording views and opinions. The website was [www.virginiawaterdevelopmentcompany.com](http://www.virginiawaterdevelopmentcompany.com) and was open to receive completed questionnaires one week after the exhibition at Carnival Capers.
- 3.2.8 The organisers of Carnival Capers estimated that a total of 1,500 – 2,000 people (including children) attended the fete.
- 3.2.9 To assist in the analysis of the results, a door count was held for those adults visiting the exhibition. A total of 539 adults visited the exhibition and 138 comment cards were completed.
- 3.2.10 In addition, a further 59 people visited the website and 20 people completed the on-line questionnaire.
- 3.2.11 The majority of respondents that came to the exhibition and gave their postcode were based in Virginia Water (82.5%), which is expected of a local fete. In this sense it is a useful indication of local opinion to the development proposal. 10% indicated that they came from Egham, 3% from Chertsey, 2% from Weybridge and the remaining from Woking and Ashford (Middlesex).
- 3.3 This section addresses the results from the public exhibition.
- 3.3.1 158 responses were received from the exhibition and on-line questionnaire. The replies to each of the questions in the comment card and questionnaire form are now set out below.

**Q1. DO YOU SUPPORT THE PROPOSALS FOR THE LOCAL FOODSTORE?**

| <b>Do you Support Our Proposals for a Local Food Store</b> | <b>Number of People</b> | <b>%</b> |
|--|-------------------------|----------|
| Yes  | 60                      | 38       |
| Yes with reservations                                      | 19                      | 12       |
| Don't know   | 4                       | 3        |
| No   | 68                      | 43       |
| No answer given  | 7                       | 4        |
| Void   | 0                       | 0        |
| Total  | 158                     | 100      |

- 3.3.2 The results indicate that, of the sample surveyed, there is a relatively even split between those that are in favour of the local food store proposal, and those that are not. The percentages indicate that 38% would be in favour of a local food store without any reservations, and 43% would be against the extra retail provision. 12% of the sample indicate that they would be in favour of the proposal, with some reservations.
- 3.3.3 Therefore, it would seem that, overall, those surveyed are slightly in support of the retail food store element of the proposal given that 38% supported the store, 12% supported but with slight reservations and 7% did not offer an answer.

**Q2. DO YOU SUPPORT THE PROPOSALS FOR THE EXTRA CARE HOUSING?**

| <b>Do you Support Our Proposals for an Extra Care Housing</b> | <b>Number of People</b> | <b>%</b> |
|---|-------------------------|----------|
| Yes   | 52                      | 33       |
| Yes with reservations   | 28                      | 17       |
| Don't know  | 6                       | 4        |
| No  | 63                      | 40       |
| No answer given   | 8                       | 5        |
| Void  | 1                       | 1        |
| Total   | 158                     | 100      |

3.3.4 The proposal for the Extra Care Housing indicates that there is a fairly even split again between those respondents that fully agree and those that do not. The percentage indicates that there are more opposed to the proposal with 40% of people choosing 'no' as an answer. However, the results show that 33% of the respondents support the proposal of Extra Care Housing, with an additional 17% expressing that they are in favour of the proposal, but have reservations.

In total, 51% of all the respondents are positive towards the principle of providing Extra Care Housing on the site, providing that reservations can be addressed.

#### **Q3. DO YOU SUPPORT THE PROPOSALS FOR THE HOTEL?**

| <b>Do you Support Our Proposals for a Hotel</b> | <b>Number of People</b> | <b>%</b> |
|---|-------------------------|----------|
| Yes   | 40                      | 25       |
| Yes with reservations                           | 24                      | 15       |
| Don't know                                      | 7                       | 4        |
| No  | 78                      | 49       |
| No answer given                                 | 9                       | 6        |
| Void  | 0                       | 1        |
| Total   | 158                     | 100      |

3.3.5 49% of those surveyed answered 'no' to the proposal whereas 25% indicated that they would welcome and support the hotel element of the proposal, and a further 15% indicating that they supported the hotel but had reservations. Accordingly, those opposing the hotel proposal slightly outnumbered those who support the development, albeit with some caveats.

#### **Q4. DO YOU SUPPORT THE PROPOSALS FOR THE RAILWAY STATION**

| <b>Do you Support Our Proposals for a Railway Station</b> | <b>Number of People</b> | <b>%</b> |
|---|-------------------------|----------|
| Yes   | 107                     | 68       |
| Yes with reservations                                     | 9                       | 6        |
| Don't know  | 5                       | 3        |
| No  | 30                      | 19       |
| No answer given   | 7                       | 4        |
| Void  | 0                       | 0        |
| Total   | 158                     | 100      |

3.3.6 These results appear to demonstrate a clear public opinion in favour of the railway station proposal. 68% of the people surveyed are in favour of redevelopment of the railway station, with a further 6% indicating they are in favour of the proposal but have reservations. 19% of the respondents indicated that they were against the proposal's intention towards the railway station.

#### **Q5. DO YOU SUPPORT THE PROPOSALS FOR THE MEMORIAL GARDENS?**

| <b>Do you Support Our</b> |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|--|
|                           |  |  |

| <b>Proposals for a Memorial Garden</b> | <b>Number of People</b> | <b>%</b> |
|--|-------------------------|----------|
| Yes                                    | 90                      | 57       |
| Yes with reservations                  | 15                      | 9        |
| Don't know                             | 4                       | 3        |
| No                                     | 36                      | 23       |
| No answer given                        | 11                      | 7        |
| Void                                   | 2                       | 1        |
| Total                                  | 158                     | 100      |

3.3.7 The results indicate that there are a high proportion of people that are in favour of the proposals for the Memorial Gardens. 57% of the respondents indicated that they are in favour, and support the proposals, with a further 9% indicating that they support the proposal but have reservations. However, 23% of the sample indicated they are against the proposals for the Memorial Gardens and would not support the principle of redeveloping it, in the form presented at the exhibition.

**Q6. DO YOU SUPPORT THE PROPOSALS FOR SCOUT GROUP HEADQUARTERS?**

| <b>Do you Support Our Proposals for a Scouts Group HQ</b> | <b>Number of People</b> | <b>%</b> |
|---|-------------------------|----------|
| Yes   | 91                      | 58       |
| Yes with reservations                                     | 13                      | 8        |
| Don't know  | 11                      | 7        |
| No  | 30                      | 19       |
| No answer given   | 13                      | 8        |
| Void  | 0                       | 0        |
| Total   | 158                     | 100      |

3.3.8 The results indicate that the majority of the responses indicated that they are in favour of the proposal towards the Scouts Group Headquarters. 58% of the sample indicates that they are in favour with a further 8% indicating 'reserved' support but 19% registered that they are not in favour of the Scout Group HQ redevelopment proposals. A comparatively higher percentage of the responses, when compared with other questions, indicated an indifference to the proposal, with 7% stating that they did not know whether they supported the proposal and a further 8% choosing not to fill in a response to the question.

**Q7. IF YOU SUPPORT THE PRINCIPLE OF A LOCAL FOODSTORE, WHICH RETAILER WOULD YOU MOST LIKE TO SEE IN VIRGINIA WATER?**

| <b>If you support the principle of a local foodstore, which retailer would you most like to see in Virginia Water?</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>%</b> |
|--|--------------|----------|
| Waitrose   | 53           | 58       |
| Asda   | 2            | 2        |
| Marks & Spencer  | 7            | 8        |
| Sainsbury's  | 10           | 11       |
| Budgens  | 5            | 6        |
| Morrisons  | 1            | 1        |
| Tesco  | 6            | 7        |
| Not Tesco  | 3            | 3        |
| One that supports local producers/farms/growers  | 1            | 1        |
| High Class Swiss Supermarket   | 1            | 1        |
| Co-op  | 2            | 1        |
| Local Shop/Parade of Shops   | 1            | 1        |
| Total  | 92           | 100      |

3.3.9 The results clearly demonstrate that the favoured retailer to occupy any food store is Waitrose, with 58% of the respondents indicating their preference for this store. Second favourite retailer was Sainsbury's at 11% and Marks & Spencer at a close third, with 8% of the votes cast. Tesco's only secured 6 (7%) respondents choosing to select it as a preferred

retailer, and interestingly 3 people (3%) expressed a fairly certain response that they would not like Tesco's to be a retailer of the proposed food store. Budgens – which is already established in the shopping parade at Station Approach – received 6% of respondents votes.

- 3.3.10 Other main supermarket chains such as Asda, Morrisons, received low votes, with 2% and 1% respectively. Additionally, there were relatively unique responses made by individual people including a preference to see local shops, the Co-op, one which supports local producers/farms/growers, and finally a high class Swiss supermarket.

**Q8. IF YOU SUPPORT THE PRINCIPLE OF IMPROVING THE MEMORIAL GARDENS, WHICH FEATURES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE (EG: CHILDRENS PLAYGROUND)**

| <b>If you support the principle of improving the Memorial Gardens, which features would you like to see (eg: childrens playground)</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>%</b>   |
|--|--------------|------------|
| Childrens Playground   | 40           | 41         |
| Mainly Gardens   | 6            | 6          |
| Seating  | 14           | 14         |
| Landscaping  | 5            | 5          |
| Better/more prominent memorial   | 2            | 2          |
| No change  | 5            | 5          |
| Fountains  | 4            | 4          |
| Picnic/Family Area   | 1            | 1          |
| Quiet Area   | 3            | 3          |
| Paddling Pool/Water Park   | 3            | 3          |
| Skateboard Park  | 1            | 1          |
| Flower Garden  | 2            | 2          |
| Good Lighting  | 2            | 2          |
| Bowls Green  | 1            | 1          |
| Table for cafes  | 1            | 1          |
| Better access  | 1            | 1          |
| Better usage   | 1            | 1          |
| Public toilets   | 1            | 1          |
| Sports field   | 1            | 1          |
| Make it open   | 1            | 1          |
| Whatever as long as well maintained/protected against vandalism  | 3            | 3          |
| Lidl   | 1            | 1          |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>99</b>    | <b>100</b> |

- 3.3.11 The results of question No 8 indicate that there is a clear favourite that most wish to see the playground as an improvement to the Memorial Gardens in the development proposal. The results, aided by the 'open' question also show a relatively broad number of suggestions, of how the visitors to the exhibition see the Memorial Gardens being improved.

- 3.3.12 Clearly, the results indicate that the most popular choice of features is the addition of a children's playground. 41% of the responses believed this to be the most appropriate feature to be added to the Memorial Gardens. A comparatively high number of people (14%) indicated that more, and better seating would be a useful improvement to the open space which, would on the results of this survey, appear to be insufficient at present. As the table above demonstrates, there are a number of suggestions on how to improve the Memorial Gardens, however, it is worthy to note that 5 people (and 5% of respondents) indicated that there was no need to improve the Memorial Gardens.

**Q 9. PLEASE FEEL FREE TO ADD ANY OTHER COMMENTS BELOW**

- 3.3.13 An opportunity was given to those wishing to make further comment on the proposal, and a summary of the comments is provided, on a topic basis, below:

- 3.3.13.1 Six comments expressed a positive response to developing the site, recognising that the principle of developing the site was a good one, and that the development would be an improvement on the existing centre, especially at Station Parade. One comment stated that for this development to be successful, all aspects (phases) must be completed. Another comment indicated that he/she is satisfied with the proposal, but has concerns

that the 'aspirational' principles of the development will not be adhered to in the long term. Two comments make reference to the importance of good architecture, and the need for the development to be complimentary to the character of the area.

- 3.3.13.2 21 comments were received which generally opposed the principle of development, with many stating that they would like to see their village remain as a village, and that the current proposal was considered to be overdevelopment. Some comments were less constructive indicating a simple objection to development. One in depth comment considered that the proposal would change the character of Virginia Water into a town, which would attract further development. A further 2 comments expressed a concern over the impact of cumulative development in the area, such, as those developments at Chobham Common, Stroude Road, the incinerator, and applications for gravel raising.
- 3.3.13.3 Many of the concerns regarding retail express fears that the introduction of a local supermarket in this location, would make local businesses unable to compete and go out of business. A general view of those that made additional comments was that existing retail provision in Virginia Water that provided for their needs already existed. 2 comments raised concerns that the quality of food store that occupies the development should not drop beyond that shown in the exhibition.
- 3.3.13.4 A major concern emerging in many of the additional comments, concern highways and parking matters, and this would suggest that this will be an emotive issue for objectors. 15 people made comments concerning the increase in traffic the development would bring to the area which already suffers with current levels and infrastructure. Concerns were raised that the current measures to mitigate the likely increase in traffic have not worked in the past, or are unlikely to adequately deal with the impact of the proposal. One comment indicated that more buses are required, while another requests an increase in cycle lanes/cycle parking in relation to the station.
- 3.3.13.5 Four people registered concern over the quantum of parking proposed in relation to that which will be lost. An additional 3 people raised concerns of excessive parking spilling out on to adjacent private roads, exacerbating an already existing problem. 2 people registered concerns over the pricing and supply of free parking as part of the proposal.
- 3.3.13.6 The Extra Care element of the scheme did not trigger too many additional comments. One comment indicated that there was a need for Extra Care housing scheme in the area, citing McCarthy & Stone developments as an example. One comment indicated that more affordable housing for the younger generation should form part of this development, and two comments questioned the need for Extra Care housing, in light of similar nearby developments.
- 3.3.13.7 The issue of the hotel instigated a number of comments, with two indicating support for a boutique hotel or, one of the quality shown in the exhibition. One respondent raised reservations on the quality and height of the hotel, with an additional respondent stating that a 3 or 4 star hotel would be more useful. One respondent raised the possibility of the British Legion bar moving to the hotel, with two questioning the need and the financial viability of a hotel in the area.
- 3.3.13.8 The Comments regarding the station are relatively positive, with 3 people indicating that the proposals would improve the appearance. 2 comments raised the issue that the improvement to accessibility was an important factor, and 2 recognised the importance of sustainable or other methods of transport than the car. One respondent adopted a cynical approach seeing it as a 'sweetener' to the development proposals as a whole.
- 3.3.13.9 4 comments raised the possibilities of including a pre-school facility in the development as there is currently a lack of suitable accommodation. 3 comments were made expressing their view that a new scout HQ would be beneficial to the community and the existing Scouts.
- 3.3.13.10.5 miscellaneous comments were made concerning the method of exhibition with accessibility/viewing of plans being raised as a problem. Isolated comments raised issues regarding; crime in the area; the need for continued consultation, and what will happen to the existing British Legion.

## GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS

| Postcode | No. of Respondents | %  |
|----------|--------------------|----|
| GU24     | 2                  | 2  |
| GU25     | 98                 | 82 |
| KT13     | 2                  | 2  |
| KT16     | 4                  | 3  |
| TW15     | 1                  | 1  |
| TW20     | 12                 | 10 |

3.4. This Section Summarises and Concludes the Public Exhibition.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.4.1 Approximately 1,500 – 2,000 people attended the fete, with 539 people attending the exhibition and 158 making comments on the broad development principles that were presented.
- 3.4.2 The comments received are a useful indicator of public opinion towards the development proposal, however, their significance should be considered in proportion to the fact that of the 1,500 (the more conservative estimate) only 36% of the people that attended the fete, felt strongly enough to view the exhibition (which was well publicised both before, and during the event). Of the 539 people that saw the exhibition only 29% were motivated to fill in the comment card or fill in the online website.
- 3.4.3 In summary of the main issues that the public was asked to consider, the local food store was only marginally more opposed than those who agreed with the principle. Relatively speaking, it could be argued the opinion on this aspect is split. The same situation underlies the Extra Care housing, with a relatively even split on the matter. Those people with reservations may be placated, via further consultation and detailed scheme modifications.
- 3.4.4 There appears, on the face of it a greater amount of opposition against the hotel, and in juxtaposition there is a strong agreement in favour of the improvements to the station. Equally, the proposals in respect of the Memorial Gardens and Scouts Group HQ appear to have a strong backing in favour of the proposals.
- 3.4.5 Waitrose is the preferred retailer for those in agreement with the provision of a local food store. The Children's Playground is the preferred addition to the Memorial Gardens, however, a number of interesting options have emerged as popular choices.
- 3.4.6 Some comments suggest that the overall project impact will become an emotive issue. One or two respondents have indicated strong opposition to the proposal, and may seek to organise the opposition groups.
- 3.5. This section summarises the meetings with local interest groups. Formal notes of all public meetings, as summarised below, have been agreed with the relevant consultees, and a record of each such agreement is available if required.

#### 3.5.1 **5 June 2009 – 1<sup>st</sup> Virginia Water Scout Group**

The key issues arising from this meeting were agreed as -

- i) VWDC will continue to work with the Scout Group to agree a preferred location for the proposed facility;
- ii) Potential for multi-function space to be discussed, provided this does not adversely affect the existing Community Centre;
- iii) VWDC to agree commercial terms with the Scout Group.

#### 3.5.2 **18 June 2009 – Committee Members of Stroud Residents Association.**

The key issues arising from this meeting were agreed as -

- i) Concern at potential for Extra Care to create an elderly "ghetto";
- ii) Market test alternative food retailers;

- iii) Medical Centre should not adversely affect Packers surgery.

#### 3.5.3 **1 July 2009 – Wentworth Residents Association Committee**

This meeting included a representative of the Wentworth Estate Roads Committee (ie; the Estate Management), as well as committee members representing residents.

The key issues arising from this meeting, and from subsequent emails and discussion, were agreed as –

- i) Generally in favour of proposals;
- ii) Impact on proposals if agreement with Network Rail not forthcoming;
- iii) Adequacy of car parking;
- iv) Impact of scheme on congestion and potential rat-running through Estate;
- v) Importance of protecting local services, including Post Office and Library, and potential for proposals to support these;
- vi) Meeting to be arranged with County Highways;
- vii) Further details on VWDC parent company, investors and shareholders would be welcome.

#### 3.5.4 **3 July 2009 – Meeting with Doctors Loxon and Harley, Packers practice**

The key issues arising from this meeting were -.

- i) Support for Extra Care, particularly if this provided additional support for Community Nurses;
- ii) Support for Medical Centre providing, unlike Sunrise, on-site care services for residents;
- iii) Concern if there were any intention of providing GP services in competition with Packers.

#### 3.5.5 **6 July 2009 – Meeting with Riverside Walk Advisory Committee**

No formal record of the meeting was produced, but the following key issues were agreed with the Committee Chairman.

- i) The route of the public footpath will remain substantially as at present;
- ii) The footpath will be altered to provide both a direct stepped route and a ramped alternative suitable for wheelchairs and cycles;
- iii) Cabrera Trust signage will be provided at the entrance to the Trust land;
- iv) The boundaries of the proposed Extra Care housing adjacent to the Trust land will be substantially fenced to prevent direct access.

These points confirm the principles agreed at the previous Cabrera Trust Management Committee meeting on 11 January 2008.

#### 3.5.6 **9 July 2009 – Meeting with Virginia Water Community Association Committee**

The key issues arising from this meeting were –

- i) Concern over car parking and traffic;
- ii) Potential impact on Post Office and Royal Mail Delivery Office;

- iii) Need for cyclists facilities;
- iv) Compensate local businesses for disruption during construction;
- v) Scheme provides positive and useful benefits to the village

### 3.5.7 **10 July 2009 – Meeting with Virginia Water Community Pre-school**

This was arranged at the request of the Pre-school, who made contact following Carnival Capers. The school meets an important local need, with the nearest similar facilities being -

- Windsor Montessori, Virginia Water
- Rainbow Nursery, Lyne
- Little Echoes on the Royal Holloway campus, Englefield Green
- Manorcroft Nursery, Egham
- Milton Hall Montessori, Egham

The Pre-school uses the Community Centre in Beechmont Avenue, which severely restricts their services due to the need to clear all equipment from the hall at the end of each day, (which prevents displays of children's work etc) and the unsafe, small and inappropriate external play areas. They have long term plans for a new purpose built facility, which would both secure the School's future and allow them to expand their service to, for example, younger children, after-school activities and mother and toddler groups. They did suggest that the possibility of sharing new Scouts accommodation might be explored, although this would still require dedicated areas for the school in order to avoid the need to clear the space each evening. Plans have been developed for a new facility – the "Seedlings" project – to which Surrey CC have committed match funding.

### 3.5.8 **10 July 2009 – Meeting with Wine Circle of 22 Station Parade**

This meeting was arranged at the request of the owners of the Wine Circle shop and bar/restaurant at 13 Station Parade, as they were unable to attend any of the other meetings or exhibitions.

Their principal concerns were -

- Impact of the proposed foodstore on local shops and restaurants;
- Car parking provision;
- Disruption during construction, which they fear could damage local businesses to the point where their survival may be threatened.

Mr Jafri suggested that a reduction in business rates could reasonably be sought if the phasing and construction methodology did in fact lead to a loss of business. Mr Jafri also suggested that the Council should assess the value of the increased Business Rates that would flow from the completed development in assessing the scheme's value and compensation to local businesses during construction.

### 3.5.9 **10 July 2009 – Public meeting with local residents and businesses at British Legion Club, Virginia Water**

In order to provide the best possible opportunity for local businesses to make representations, and also to provide an additional opportunity to meet local residents, an early evening meeting was arranged, with invitations hand delivered to every local shop and business. Letters were also delivered to all residential addresses in Station Parade, Station Approach and Imperial House, and a notice displayed in the Library.

Of those attending, only a very small number spoke, principally to object. The key issues arising from this meeting were –

- i) General opposition to any form of development';
- ii) Concern at traffic impacts;

- iii) Relationship between, and impact on, proposed development and existing residential uses.

In view of comments received at this end and other meetings, regarding what was seen as the potential adverse impact of the proposals on local businesses, it is significant that only one local trader attended the meeting and that from the point of view of subsequently strongly supporting the proposals. A significant local property owner also attended and also subsequently confirmed his support. Apart from these responses, no contact from any other local business has been initiated.

**3.5.10 13 July 2009 – Meeting with Thorpe Ward Residents Association Committee**

The key issues arising from this meeting were –

Meeting notes separately forwarded in draft – comments/confirmation awaited

**3.5.11 15 July 2009 – Meeting with Egham Chamber of Commerce Committee**

The key issues arising from this meeting were -

Meeting notes separately forwarded in draft – comments/confirmation awaited

**3.5.12 16 July 2009 – Meeting with Trotsworth Court Association**

The key issues arising from this meeting were –

Meeting notes separately forwarded in draft – comments/confirmation awaited

**Facebook site**

- 3.5.13 Comments were posted under "All those against developments in Virginia Water". The page was set up on 8 July and has 7 posts as of 24 July 2009.

**3.5.14 Meeting at British Legion, 8 – 10 July**

This was primarily arranged for the benefit of local businesses and residents in Station Parade, Station Approach, Imperial House and the flats above the Library.

Invitations were individually hand delivered to each address, and a notice was also displayed in the Library.

68 people were recorded as visiting the exhibition.

A total of 31 further comment cards were received in the course of this exhibition, and the public meeting on 10 July.

**4. Council Policy**

- 4.1 Officers consider the Public Consultation undertaken, demonstrates general conformity within the Council's Sustainable Community Strategy.

**5. Resource Implications**

- 5.1 None to report or likely to prove significant.

**6. Planning and Technical Considerations**

- 6.1 All implications will be reported upon in detail to this Committee and Planning Committee in the event of the Developers being invited to submit a planning application.

**7. Environmental Implications**

- 7.1 None to report unless and until a planning application is submitted.

**8. Other Issues**

- 8.1 If Members wish to proceed with the project, the Developers will require a further agreement with the Council on terms that will be reported upon separately.

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

- i) the results of local and Member consultation undertaken be accepted as satisfactory for the purpose of continuing with the project;**
- ii) the developers be invited to submit a planning application to test the technical viability of the scheme.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

Relevant papers on DAL property file (Exempt)

7. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

**the press and public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of the following reports under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the reports in question would be likely to involve disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

**PART II**

**Matters involving Exempt or Confidential Information in respect of which reports have not been made available for Public Inspection**

| <b>a)</b> | <b><u>Exempt Information</u></b>   | <b><u>Para</u></b> |
|-----------|--|--------------------|
| 8.        | VIRGINIA WATER CAR PARKS – POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT – DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT     | 3                  |
| 9.        | NEW LEASE OF 50-52 AND SURRENDER OF LEASE OF 56/56A STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE | 3                  |
| <b>b)</b> | <b><u>Confidential Information</u></b>                                       |                    |
|           | (No reports to be considered under this heading)                             |                    |