

## Open Space Study informal consultation responses

This table covers the informal consultation with Members and the Council's Open Spaces and Community Development Team that ran from 21 January until 21 February 2025. It also covers a previous ad-hoc response received in 2023 relation to the study as it was being developed. The responses received are set out below.

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
Cllr Whyte	Page 24 – I think figure 4.2 is labelled incorrectly – should this be frequency not reason?	Agreed and amended as suggested.
	Page 43 – Query re size of allotments. Being an allotment holder in Runnymede we rent the plot in allocations of 5 rods which is 150sq yards or 300sq yards for 10 rods, which slightly less than within the document. I believe this is the standard size that is rented out across the borough.	Having re-checked the ratio of sqm to square yards, 250sqm is 298.998 square yards (rounded to 300 for simplicity). Text changed in the first bullet point under 6.3.1 from 330 square yards to 300 square yards. The remaining text as is left as is in terms of recommendations as those are all in sqm.
	Page 53 – suggests there are allotments in Longcross, Lyne & Chertsey South – I am not aware of any in the ward.	On p.53, table 7.2 refers to ' <i>Open space requirement (ha) at Ward level based on the quantity standards</i> ' and thus although there are currently no allotments in this ward, this table is setting out that based on the population that is currently in the ward, there should therefore be X amount of each type of space. In the case of allotments, there should be 0.84ha in the ward based on the (2021) population of 4,014 people. A footnote has been added to this table to explain this.
	Page 58 – Figure 7.1 needs a key to explain the colours.	A revised map with a key has been included in the document.
Newlands Property Developments LLP	Site 38 (Thorpe Lea Road) in the Open Space Study needs to have its boundaries amended to reflect the fact that most of it is not publicly accessible and thus should not be included in the Study.	The site area has been amended as suggested as the Study only includes areas that are publicly accessible.

Informal public consultation was also held with the Council's Community Planning Panel which include the resident's Associations and Neighbourhood Fora. This took place between 20<sup>th</sup> March and 20<sup>th</sup> April 2025.

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum	Need at add in 'buffers' and 'catchment' into the Glossary	Definitions added to provide clarity.
	Section 3 of the document talks about population scaling over the period of the next plan and references "local" needs. Local in the borough context is ward level. There do not appear to be any assumptions or calculations which are set to drive out the distribution of the population growth across the borough at this level as this will have a significant effect upon open space requirements. Without this information the study will not reach solid conclusions.	As the amount and distribution of potential development in the next iteration of the Local Plan has not yet been determined, it is not possible for (nor is it in the remit of) this study to set this out. This study is (partially) developed to set out the current baseline situation in the Borough, so that the Local Plan can look at the information it provides and then make decisions about future distributions of open space needs etc and plan accordingly.
	Buffers and catchments - the general feeling is that you cannot have one size for a category as the variance in area of the sites is very significant in many cases.	Whilst there are variations in site sizes in the different categories of open spaces, having different buffers for different sized sites would make the study overly complex as buffers are there to give an indication, not be an absolute rule in terms of the area they serve.
	The document and annexes score accessibility for the public. We are scoring the quality of the assets. If this is the case, why are we docking points off for no public access. Perhaps this needs to be made clearer throughout.	Is a site had no public access then it would not be included in the study at all. For example, in the previous 2017 study, school playing fields and private sports facilities (e.g. golf courses) were included. These have been removed from this study as they are not accessible to the public writ large. The score is based on the extent to which the open space is accessible, or extent to which accessibility could be improved.
	Fig 4.1 shows only 10 wards. There are 14 in Runnymede. This needs at least to be explained.	Explanatory text added. The survey was conducted based on settlement areas as opposed to wards, as these reflect entire settlement areas as opposed to the political Ward boundaries. Ward boundaries were used for the OSS as accurate population data is available by ward but not by settlement areas from the ONS.

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
	<p>It would be interesting to see statistics and percentage of residents in each ward responding also as this would give a more accurate idea of response levels e.g. at present say 2% in Longcross might be low but it could equate to most of the population in that area.</p>	<p>This is not possible as the questionnaire was based on settlement areas (e.g. the whole of Addlestone, Chertsey etc.) which reflect the actual geography of an entire settlement as opposed to Wards (e.g. Addlestone North, Addlestone South, Chertsey St Anns, Chertsey Riverside etc.) which reflect the political divisions which are split in attempt to be broadly even in terms of population to ensure more even representation on the Council for democratic purposes. This division has been used for this study as this was the level at which detailed population data is available.</p> <p>The settlements are also more familiar to people who would be more likely to relate to living in in single place e.g. Addlestone as opposed to which Ward in Addlestone etc.</p>
	<p>Para 4.2.7. Of the 4 highest priority areas shown here, the first 3 overlap significantly and it is not clear to us how these might then be treated. It would seem sensible if these were more mutually exclusive. Was more open space an option? They are not really functions either.</p>	<p>This question was related to question 5 of the survey which was: 'What environmental elements do you think are most important to open spaces? (Please re-order in terms of priority with the highest / first being the most important, and the lowest being the least).'</p> <p>As this survey was run in 2023 using funding from Government, it will not be possible to re-run this survey again, particularly within the timeframe of producing the OSS. Therefore, we will not be able to make the answers more mutually exclusive. Also, whilst there may be some overlap, habitat creation, more planting &amp; biodiversity, climate change mitigation and areas for food production are still different aims which can be pursued in isolation / as the primary aim whilst also inadvertently assisting with the other aims.</p> <p>The word 'functions' in the text of the paragraph has been changed to 'environmental elements' to match more closely the question asked.</p>
	<p>Para 5.2.2-5.2.5 Should this make reference to the Statuary designations which are included within such as SANG.</p>	<p>Additional text added to paragraph 5.2.2 referring to SANGs and a footnote linking to the RBC website offering more information about them. However, it should be noted that the ANG</p>

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
		designation in the OSS is solely / overly focused on SANGs specifically. SANGs may fall within ANG for the OSS, but that happens to be coincidental for the purposes of this study as it looks at open spaces regardless of whether they have a formal designation on them or not.
	Para 5.2.12 It is not clear what this precisely relates to e.g. in Ottershaw we have Queenwood Golf Club a private members club where public could play as an invited member and a polo club which provides fee paid training.	Additional text has been added to the paragraph to provide additional clarity. In the examples given here for Ottershaw, in both instances access would require being a paid/invited member of a private club. As noted in the previous paragraph 5.2.11, to qualify as a Park and recreation ground it would need to be available for 'spontaneous and free informal recreational activities'. This would not apply to either of the examples given for Ottershaw.
	Para 5.2.14 Mentions "youth" but the category is "teenagers" for clarity use just one.	Text changed to 'teenagers' for consistency.
	Table 5.3 (this will also affect Table 5.2). Add Broxborough SANG to ANG. This is due to be operational in a few months. Add Broxborough play areas to Play. It is delivering a LAP in the housing, a LEAP in the SANG and a trim trail. It provides a greatly improved coverage of this category of facility across the ward. Note that Broxborough SANG is to have a community orchard. Should this be added under allotments?	As this SANG is not yet complete it has not been possible to include or score it as part of this iteration of the study, and the various types of space that it may contain (e.g. the greenspaces and play areas parts that may make up the whole). In addition, to assess a site's condition prior to it being completed would not be a fair or accurate assessment of it and what it offers to the public prior to it being made available for the public to use. However, an assessment can be included in the next iteration of the OSS assuming the site is completed. A community orchard (once completed) would fall under the allotment category.
	AGS should be 0.97 (ID281 wrongly categorised). Table 5.4 Recalculate for Ottershaw using 5.3 information.	It is unclear as to how site 281 (Murray House Open Space play area) would qualify as an Amenity Green Space (if that is what is being sought here?) as it is a play area that contains play equipment. Is this actually referring to the surrounding open space under ID 169 (Murray House Open Space)? If that is the case, there is a lack of a justification as to why this area should be considered an Amenity Green Space as opposed to a park

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
		and recreation ground. If this is provided, then the Council could re-consider this categorisation.
	Runnymede is one of only a few boroughs to have SANG and we have a fairly large proportion of SANG. SANG uses overlap several of the other OSS categories. Have other boroughs with SANG been considered when looking at categorisation and buffers etc to ensure a consistent approach.	SANG uses may have / contain other uses within them. Officers have sought to separate these out where possible, hence in many cases (e.g. Franklands Park and Franklands Drive SANG in Rowtown), there are multiple designations over the wider SANG area. This does not, however, apply to all SANGs. Other boroughs with SANG have not been considered as this study is Runnymede-specific and looks at the Runnymede context when making these judgements. In addition, there is no standardised approach of an OSS – not all councils undertake them and if they so, they may not take the same approach, as open space tends to be looked at on a more area-by-area basis.
	Para 6.2.5. It is reasonable to assume that more private land will be released as SANG for new developments and a prediction based upon past trends would be useful. This would show we are significantly overprovisioned for SANG. Are SPA catchment areas/zones solid or could they change? Do they have a limit in terms of delivering space as opposed to CIL funds?	The amount of land that would need to be released for SANG would be based upon the number of new dwellings (and thus people arising from them) are planned for in the next iteration of the Local Plan. Considering past trends is useful, however Natural England sets out how new provision should be calculated to meet development needs. It should be noted that the rate of SANG that needs to be released is 1,000 per person / dwelling arising from new development is based on the information contained under paragraph 4.1.3 of the <u>Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area SPD</u> . In terms of the catchment areas for SANGs, these are set out under paragraph 4.2.1 of the adopted aforementioned SPD. A larger SANG leads to larger capacity to meet development needs. SANG is provided on-site, or via developer contributions collected by S106 monies. CIL is not currently used to secure SANG.
	6.2.8. It would be useful however to state what the deficiency is.	Additional text added into the paragraph to clarify this.

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
	<p>6.3.2 To arrive at 0.21ha/1,000 people should be explained, possibly in a footnote. (i.e. persons per household standard). We assume the ONS standard of 2.3pph has been used but it is not clear.</p>	<p>This standard was calculated based on the 0.5ha / 1,000 households, and as there is an average of 2.53 people per household in Runnymede according to the 2021 census, this comes to a (now revised) 0.2ha / 1,000 people. This lower figure has been reflected in the document alongside explanatory text at paragraph 6.3.2.</p>
	<p>Allotments justification. We do not understand why a long term significant under provision of this type of space results in a standard being acceptable which is also well below the NSALG recommendation. There are no solid arguments to support this, especially when there may be more opportunity through developments to improve it. It would seem that for the term of this plan we should be setting the bar higher not lower to “catch up”. A number of our wards, including ours have no allotments at all.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Whilst this is slightly below the NSALG recommended standard, it is considered to be a realistic quantity standard going forward given the level of existing provision across the study area.</i></li> </ul> <p>We do not think this is a viable justification and under the new plan SL26 parameters can change.</p>	<p>Originally, the OSS took a view that it would be unrealistic to achieve recommended standards. However, officers have reviewed this feedback and having discussed it internally, take the view that the Council should require the higher level of 0.25ha/1,000 people level recommended by the NSALG. This would (potentially) help future development help uplift the current borough-wide level of provision of 0.13ha/1,000 people towards the 0.25ha recommended standard. The calculations for future needs etc. for allotments in the document have been revised upwards to reflect this updated figure.</p>
	<p>6.3.4 The arguments are not solid here as they relate to the limited number in the borough which is the problem itself. Spare land should not be a consideration either as this could be delivered e.g. in lieu of SANG portions. The access standard should relate to the considered acceptable distance to travel and the assumptions for accessing without a vehicle. We can see the logic</p>	<p>Allotments (or other types of open space for that matter) cannot be delivered in lieu of SANG as SANG is a legally required form of open space that new developments that are within the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) catchment areas. Details of this can be found in Appendix 5 of the Councils <u>TBH SPA SPD</u> which discusses Natural England’s Guidelines for SANGs which includes the requirement that ‘SANGS must be perceived as semi-natural spaces with little intrusion of artificial</p>

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
	<p>of linking this with a lower figure for AGS given the likelihood that materials and tools etc are likely to be carried to and from the site.</p>	<p>structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks'. In addition, as sated in the OSS, the 800m distance is in line with what is considered to be a readily achievable walking distance in the Council's Sustainable Places Paper part 2, which will underpin the new Local Plan and is approximately 16-17 minutes walking time (see table 3.1 in the OSS).</p>
	<p>6.4 AGS has minimal value other than aesthetic when it is very small (e.g. The Glen in Rowtown 0.06ha). If this is the case, why should these register at all or perhaps there should be a scaling of the catchment/buffer size according to its size. This would give a more realistic representation. For The Glen e.g. with one access point from Spinney Hill only the residents living there will use so the buffer is only really about 100 metres. This would give a more realistic picture for this category.</p>	<p>This suggestion has been considered in detail and the Fields in Trust Guidance has been revisited. Subsequently additional text has been added to 6.4.1 and 6.4.4 to clarify that the 480m standard is being retained and why. Although there are a number of small areas that are often too small to be 'used' for much more than an aesthetic purposes, this is part of it being an Amenity Green Space in that it helps contribute towards the local amenity of the area. This includes how it looks, based on the definition of the Cambridge Dictionary which described amenity as meaning: 'something intended to make life more pleasant or comfortable for people'. In addition, the two new areas suggested by the Forum (Land opposite Summerfields Close – to be known as Land fronting 34-48 Spinney Hill, Ottershaw) comes to 0.08ha, and the other suggestion (submitted as Land opposite Otter Close – to be known as Land fronting 44-74 Chobham Road, Ottershaw) comes to 0.13ha. If there are concerns about small areas of AGS being included then it is possible one or both may not make it into the OSS, despite they being put forward by the Forum for inclusion.</p>
	<p>6.4.3 Whilst this talks about new development it does not mention how existing under 0.15ha will be treated. In our mind they should be covered. See note about very small parcels (up to c0.08ha). Is this a fact or a study assumption. We are not sure if this requirement can be met as for some more irregular shaped sited AGS may well be broken up.</p>	<p>The reason that this is only discussing new spaces and not existing ones is because this and the previous paragraph are discussing the provision of new spaces through development. The word 'new' has been added into this paragraph at two points to provide clarity on this issue.</p>

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
	<p>6.4.4 See 6.4 above. 480m way too large for some AGS and will skew the picture and not show true gaps in provision.</p> <p>6.5. Similar to AGS there are areas below which perhaps they should either have a very local buffer of c 200m. The former is perhaps the best. Murray House is only 0.35ha but has same buffer as Memorial Fields (6.13ha). We think this skews the results.</p>	<p>Although there are a number of small areas that are often too small to be 'used' for much more than an aesthetic purposes, this is part of it being an Amenity Green Space in that it helps contribute towards the local amenity of the area. This includes how it looks, based on the definition of the Cambridge Dictionary which described amenity as meaning: 'something intended to make life more pleasant or comfortable for people'.</p> <p>This suggestion for different size buffers has been considered in detail and the Fields in Trust Guidance has been revisited. Subsequently additional text has been added to 6.4.1 and 6.4.4 to clarify that the 480m standard is being retained and why.</p> <p>In addition, the two new areas suggested by the Forum (Land opposite Summerfields Close – to be known as Land fronting 34-48 Spinney Hill, Ottershaw) comes to 0.08ha, and the other suggestion (submitted as Land opposite Otter Close – to be known as Land fronting 44-74 Chobham Road, Ottershaw) comes to 0.13ha. If there are concerns about small areas of AGS being included then it is possible one or both may not make it into the OSS, despite they being put forward by the Forum for inclusion.</p>
	<p>7.2.2 ...meet <b>or exceed</b> the quantity standard...</p> <p>Table 7.1 &amp; 7.2 Recalculate to take in Broxborough and ?Chertsey South? Ditto earlier comments about the categorisation for Runnymede given the existence of SANG. We would say the intent should be to include all LP2030 committed developments regardless of their status. If this is not done it will not provide a valid baseline for the new plan. The parameters for the table should be specified. For early state developments information should be gleaned from masterplans.</p>	<p>Agree with this change. Additional text added into the paragraph.</p> <p>As noted above, we cannot take account of the Broxborough and Chertsey South open spaces as these have not yet been completed and thus an accurate and fair qualitative assessment of them cannot be done. In addition, until they are completed, and exact measurement (in terms of area) cannot be done either. The above applies to other sites allocated in the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan, particularly if they have not been developed / completed yet, as early-stage masterplans do not show the final form that open spaces will take (with certainty), the exact area they cover and the facilities etc they will end up containing. However, if the OSS were to be updated as part of the reparation of the new Local Plan, then any recently completed sites could be included in it.</p>



Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
	<p>What table 7.1 shows is a massive overprovision of ANG due to the TBH SPA requirement. This surely suggests that as a minimum, more effort should be employed to deliver other typologies through SANG in future (e.g. allotments, orchards and play spaces). Although these are not typical SANG features, they are deliverables against the Natural England requirements. Broxborough is an example of this.</p>	<p>This suggestion is noted. Although the primary function of the SANG is to divert potential visitors away from the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, this does not preclude other functions from being incorporated into such space. Consideration will be given to this when reviewing the Thames Basin Heaths SPA policy in the new Local Plan.</p>
	<p>Table 7.3. Are the ANG entries N/A or are they graduated by the different scales/buffers chosen for the area. These add up to the overprovision under existing supply. The parameters for the table should be specified. See comment for table 7.1 above regarding other typologies. PRG is also overprovisioned, but 4 wards are not. What can be done to get these up to standard.</p>	<p>ANG is N/A as there is such a high level of over-provision in the Borough that there is no need for new open development to provide this type of open space. The justification for this is set out above paragraph 6.2.11. As other forms of open space are below (in many cases far below) the required standard, this non-inclusion of ANG in the new open space requirements will direct developments towards providing those types of open space that are needed instead. In addition to this, through the provision of new SANGs (that are legally required as part of mitigating impacts on the TBH SPA), the quantum of ANG is likely to go up in future regardless.</p> <p>For Parks and recreation grounds, again, as there is an overall surplus there is no new space requirement standard being sought through a new Local Plan policy. However, as noted in the section justifying this (above paragraph 6.5.3) it states that: 'Although there are some areas that do not meet the standard required, it is determined that it is not justifiable to have a set standard as the current level of provision per 1,000 people is notably above the standard set out the by the FIT guidance. This also enables there to be flexibility to seek additional space as and when it may be required, as opposed to having a blanket requirement.'</p> <p>Additional text has been added to clarify what Table 7.3 shows.</p>

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
	7.2.6 Should there be an assumed distribution of the housing increase by ward. This could then drive out the new LP open space assumptions. It is clear that there will be a significant variance across the wards and for the new plan some indication of this would be sensible.	It is not possible to do this as the new Local Plan is at a very early stage of preparation and the spatial strategy has not yet been determined. Without knowing what this strategy might look like it is not possible to assume a distribution.
	Table 7.4 Again shows N/A for SANG but the reality is this will grow more than anything else. See earlier comments RE categorisation and typologies.	N/A is shown for ANG because we will not be seeking additional provision of this type of open space through new developments. This part of the OSS is looking at developing potential open space standards for a policy in the new Local Plan, hence why, as there is a significant over provision of ANG already, there is no need to seek more of it through a policy requirement, thus it is N/A in a table which discusses requirements for a type of open space of which there is already a large surplus in the Borough. ANG, is however, likely to continue to grow as a category in terms of overall space, as there is likely to be a requirement for the further provision of SANG, but this is not through a specific open space policy in the Local Plan, but because this is a legal requirement to offset the impacts on the TBH SPA. These are separate issues: one is a legal requirement relating to habitat protection (SANG), whereas the other is seeking new open spaces to be provided as part of additional residential developments to meet the needs of local residents.
	7.3.4 We disagree with the scoring and it is no surprise there are very few poor sites as it would be very hard to score a site 4 x 2 and a 1 to get into the poor category threshold. We would recommend this is looked at. 12-13 would seem about right for an upper poor threshold. 13/14-19 for Average and 20-25 for Good.	Agreed, we have reverted to the previous 'score bands' from the 2017 study to ensure consistency and a degree of comparison between the two studies (considering whilst doing this that they both contain a different selection of sites so a direct comparison is not possible). The scoring ranges for the 2017 study were as follows: Poor: 0-14 Average: 15-19 Good: 20-25

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
	7.3 General. Is there any national target that should be aimed for or quoted here?	As noted at paragraph 7.3.3, the quality assessments have been based on <a href="#">Green Flag Award</a> but adjusted for the Runnymede context. This is also noted (and linked) at paragraph 3.3.2.
	Table 7.4. Note there is a 7.4 in previous section, numbering needs tidying up.	Noted and corrected.
	<p>Quality of Open Space. Were the scoring ranges the same for the previous OSS. If they were not this should be stated and some recalculation given the new scoring applied to give a fair comparison. It could be that all the differences are driven by changed scoring ranges. We do not accept the statement in 7.3.9 that this is not possible. At present the comparison is meaningless.</p> <p>For those sites not yet delivered or in the process of being delivered a scoring regime would need to be set across the typologies affected. Whilst coverage can usefully be applied the other elements perhaps should just accord a standard rating and be flagged as such. This would at least allow all the LP2030 sites to be represented in some way.</p>	<p>Agreed, we have reverted to the previous 'score bands' from the 2017 study to ensure consistency and a degree of comparison between the two studies (considering whilst doing this that they both contain a different selection of sites so a direct comparison is not possible). The scoring ranges for the 2017 study were as follows:  Poor: 0-14  Average: 15-19  Good: 20-25  It is not possible to do a direct comparison to the scores in the 2017 study as stated in paragraph 7.3.9, primarily due to the 'wholly different selection of sites being assess between the two studies'.</p> <p>As noted above, the Council will not score sites before they are finished and thus a new methodology will not be developed for these. Sites need to be completed before they can be fairly and accurately assessed, rather than based on how they might hypothetically be.</p>
	Para 8.11. Requires redrafting in line with our revised assessments and additional areas.	These have been adjusted in light of the suggestions (where accepted) made by the Forum.
	9.0.1. This could also take account of providing other typology deficiencies from within existing ones.	There is scope for this but it is not considered necessary to provide further clarity in this section of the OSS.

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
	Para 9.1.1. Should cover protected <b>or released</b> e.g. for other purposes.	Paragraph 9.2.1 goes into more detail about the circumstances in which existing provision will be lost/displaced (or released) to other uses, so it is not considered necessary to change 9.1.1.
	Para 9.1.4. Does this mean the OSS does not consider any of the three made plans in the borough? Why not.	This paragraph just highlights how there is an opportunity in Neighbourhood Plans to address open space provision. What is meant by 'define their own priorities' could, for example, include having a focus on open spaces via urban design through a Neighbourhood Plan Design Code, as opposed to setting out specific open space requirements. Or these priorities could be pursued by other approaches that do not involve Neighbourhood Plans at all.
	<p>9.2.1 SANG should be mentioned as protected for perpetuity e.g. 125 years.</p> <p>Note that SL25 states: <i>The Council will not permit the loss or displacement of existing open space to other uses unless it can be demonstrated, through up-to-date and robust evidence, that: There is a proven surplus of provision</i></p> <p>This is what we have for SANGS. Note that SL25 is we think lacking in not providing the vehicle for making up deficiencies in typologies.</p>	<p>Policy SL25 as it stands does not preclude the enhancement of existing SANG for other, complementary uses (e.g. natural play space) and thus could provide an opportunity to address deficiencies in other typologies if that was considered necessary. Any enhancements/works would need to accord with the bespoke policy for SANG provision (policy EE10) and other relevant planning requirements/guidance.</p> <p>SL25 Existing Open Space is not designed to make up for deficiencies in typologies, as this is what Policy SL26 New Open Space is better suited to do as this as is states:</p> <p>'As a minimum, development should not increase existing deficiencies of open space in the Borough as informed by the most up-to-date Open Space Study.</p> <p>Development proposals, including sites allocated in this Plan, should aim to incorporate the required amount of open space as set out in this Policy, however the Council will negotiate on a site-by-site basis the type of Open Space provision where other typologies may be more appropriate or desirable having regard to the most up to date Open Space Study.'</p>

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
	9.5 NCIL should be referenced.	A new paragraph 9.5.18 has been added in to discuss NCIL and how those monies can be used to provide / improve open spaces.
	9.5.6. The 20-100ha category employed for ANG significantly skews the picture. Most of these areas are 20-30ha and we think only one in excess of this. To make the results more realistic we think consideration should be given to using 4 categories a 20-30ha and 30-50ha with reduced catchments. This would improve and make more realistic the picture for the borough.	There are 4 sites that are 20-30ha, 2 sites that are 30-50ha and four sites that are over 50ha in the entirety of the OSS. Therefore, having separate categories for this small number of sites does not seem sensible.
	Query why there is an Overall Quality section. This seems to just repeat or summarise what the others above it say. Apart from comments like its value to the community. Should it be Community Benefit/Usage? Suggest for Accessible Natural Greenspace, under quality there should be “up to date management plan” as a criteria. Also “managed in accordance with management plan”. Suggest “local community warden” is added also as this clearly enhances quality as the words for Hare Hill bear evidence to.	This was adopted in the previous 2017 OSS and our internal Open Space team has found it a useful summary.  Indicators have been chosen which apply to all open spaces - not all (in, fact, in most cases) open spaces have a management plan at all, and this has not been the case / is unlikely to be the case, so including a criterion that mainly applies to SANGs is not considered to be appropriate, although the suggestion is understood. This also applies to having a local community warden as most of them have / will not have one of these and have no realistic prospect of having one. Whilst Hare Hill benefits from having one, and this helps feed into it obtaining a high score, it would be an unfairly high bar to set for other sites which will be highly unlikely to ever benefit from this.
	Suggestions for changes to the criteria for assessing open spaces (pp.5-6 of the ONF response)	Many of these look as though they may be useful and will be considered at the time of the next full review of the OSS, which is likely to take place as part of the responses received to the formal rounds of consultation on the Local Plan as it progresses. This is because the changes proposed would result in significant changes to the criteria would necessitate the review of all the sites in the Borough, which would unreasonably delay the preparation of the OSS ahead of the first formal scoping consultation timetabled for Autumn 2025. In addition, the meaning

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
		of 'short' and 'moderate' in relation to the distance of sites to the population(s) they serve would need to be defined.
	<p>Appendix 6 &amp; 23: The following Sites in Ottershaw have been omitted from the study and the maps;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broxborough SANG...</li> </ul>	As noted above this site cannot be completely or fairly assessed until it is finished. It may be included in a future iteration of the OSS if it is completed at that time.
	<p>The Windsor Park &amp; Chobham map mentions radius but does not describe for what in the title or key. If this is SPA catchment/buffer should the 5km be shown.</p>	<p>Additional information added onto the tile of the map for clarity. This is not related to the status of the TBH SPA, but simply that these are Accessible Natural Greenspaces.</p>
	<p><b>APPENDIX 6 – ACCESSIBILITY BUFFERS</b></p> <p>Broxborough SANG addition will affect two of the catchment maps in this appendix.</p> <p>The playspace maps should clearly state which is young children and which teenagers. Note the Murray house space only has two pieces of equipment. We would not see this area as useful to ages above 6 years.</p> <p>Are there any LAP/LEAP and AGS in the new Chertsey South developments or in Longcross?</p> <p>The ANG Maps have various buffer sizes. Where have these been drawn from. They do not equate</p>	<p>As noted above Broxborough SANG is not completed yet and thus will not be included in the OSS until it is fully open.</p> <p>There is no differentiation between children and teenagers play facilities as this would lead to there being too many different categories, buffers, maps etc. in the OSS. Although Murray House may only have a small number of pieces of equipment that only serve young children, this does not stop it being a play space. However, differentiation between LAPs, LEAPs, NEAPs and MUGAs will be considered as part of the next iteration of the OSS.</p> <p>Yes, there is in Longcross north - Firefly Road play area (children and teenagers play space - site 304). In the southern part of Longcross there is also Albury Close Play Area (children and teenagers play space - site 317). The developments in Chertsey have not yet been permitted / completed yet so any sites arising from these have not yet been included in the OSS.</p> <p>Not all ANGs are SANGs and thus the buffers used are not the same and not those used for SANGs as they are different</p>

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
	to the SANG catchment sizes which are anything from 100m to 4km.	designations which cover different things for different purposes. This is set out clearly in the description of ANGs in paragraph 6.2.1-6.2.3 of the OSS.
	ID21 – Timber Hill proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Score changed from 18 to 16 out of 25.
	ID22 – Chaworth Copse proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores accepted. Score remains at 16 out of 25.
	ID80 – Christ Church proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Score changed from 20 to 19 out of 25.
	ID95 – Ottershaw Chase proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores accepted. Score changed from 17 to 13 out of 25.
	ID96 – Homewood Park proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Comments generally accepted and incorporated into the assessment though some elements not agreed with and thus not included. Score revised down from 17 to 13 out of 25.
	ID103 – Clarendon Gate proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Score changed from 20 to 21 out of 25.
	ID146 – Queenwood proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Score changed from 15 to 13 out of 25.
	ID169 – Murray House Open Space proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Score changed from 16 to 17 out of 25.
	ID175 – Hare Hill Open Space proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Scores adjusted between categories but overall, it remains as 18 out of 25.
	ID178 – Ledger Drive Open Space proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Score changed from 20 to 16 out of 25.
	ID193 – Ottershaw Memorial Fields Play Area proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Score changed from 20 to 17 out of 25.
	ID194 – Ottershaw Memorial Fields proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Score changed from 20 to 15 out of 25.
	ID219 – Ether Hill proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Score changed from 15 to 17 out of 25.

Name	Comments	Actions / amendments made to the Open Space Study document
	ID258 – Sandy Road Open Space proposed qualitative assessment revisions.	Proposed amended text accepted. Score is unchanged as no amendments it were suggested.
	ID281 – Murray House Open Space Play Area proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Score changed from 14 to 17 out of 25.
	ID302 – The Glen proposed qualitative assessment and score revisions.	Proposed amended text and revised scores generally accepted. Score changed from 16 to 18 out of 25.
	New site suggestion (Land opposite Summerfields Close – to be known as Land fronting 34-48 Spinney Hill, Ottershaw) as Amenity Green Space measuring 0.08ha.	Site will be assessed as added into the OSS as site 336- Land fronting 34-48 Spinney Hill, Ottershaw.
	New site suggestion (Land opposite Otter Close – to be known as Land fronting 44-74 Chobham Road, Ottershaw) as Amenity Green Space measuring 0.13ha.	Site will be assessed as added into the OSS as site 337- Land fronting 44-74 Chobham Road, Ottershaw.