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0.0 Introduction

0.1 This statement has been prepared by DPDS Consulting Group (DPDS) on behalf of SMECH Management Company Ltd in respects of its property interest at the Longcross Estate, Runnymede. It sets out the response to the questions included in Matter 10 of the Hearings Programme. This matter is in relation to Infrastructure Provision.

0.2 DPDS has acted on behalf of SMECH Management Company Ltd since February 2013 in respect of its property interest at the Longcross Estate, Runnymede. DPDS has engaged in the development plan process since that date and has made various representations to Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) in respect of both the former Runnymede Core Strategy and, more recently, the Runnymede 2030 Draft Local Plan.

0.3 Our previous representations have demonstrated that the plan does not comply with the requirements identified at section 20(5)(a) and (c) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and that it is not sound.

0.4 This statement should be read in conjunction with our previous representations to the Draft Runnymede Local Plan, part one and two. Hearing Statements have also been submitted on behalf of SMECH Management Company Ltd for Matters 1 (Legal Requirements, the Duty to Cooperate and the Plan Period), 3 (Overall spatial strategy), 4 (Green belt boundaries and exceptional circumstances) and 5 (Longcross Garden Village) of the Local Plan Examination.

0.5 DPDS welcome the invitation to appear at the Hearing Session to expand on the comments included in this statement and confirm that representatives from DPDS and our clients legal team will be attending the Hearing Session.

0.6 The Runnymede 2030 Local Plan was submitted on 31 July 2018 and subsequently paragraph 214 of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) applies. References to the NPPF in this Hearing Statement refers to the 2012 version. The section of the PPG on Local Plans states: “Where plans are being prepared under the transitional arrangements set out in Annex 1 to the revised National Planning Policy Framework, the policies in the previous version of the framework published in 2012 will continue to apply, as will any previous guidance which has been superseded since the new framework was published in July 2018.” Unless otherwise indicated references to the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) are to guidance that was published prior to the publication of the revised NPPF in July 2018.
1.0 Response to Matter 10 (Infrastructure Provision)

Q10.1 Overall, does the Plan provide an evidence-based, integrated and effective policy framework for transport that will support the implementation of the spatial strategy and contribute to sustainable development?

10.1.1 No. There are presently many uncertainties and unknowns with respect to the evidence relating to transport infrastructure. In order to create a sustainable development at Longcross Garden Village (Policy SD10), the Plan is dependent upon:
- Improved rail transport infrastructure.
- New bus infrastructure.
- New off-site walking and cycling infrastructure.

10.1.2 First, with respect to improved rail infrastructure, the information at Appendix 1 which is from the National Rail website identifies that Longcross Station does not presently have:
  i. A ticket office or ticket machine.
  ii. The station is not staffed.
  iii. It does not have toilets or waiting rooms.
  iv. Wheelchair and step free access is not available, with a further note that there is presently no road or footpath access to the station (and therefore no parking is available).

10.1.3 In order to ensure that rail travel represents an attractive sustainable travel option, all of these missing facilities will need to be provided (at an early stage), but there is no evidence that either sufficient funding is available to secure these facilities, or that the rail operators will co-operate within an appropriate timescale to ensure delivery of such improved facilities. It is also not clear whether the existing platforms need to be extended to accommodate the new 10 car services which have recently been introduced (Sunningdale Station has recently had to be upgraded to accommodate the new trains).

10.1.4 It is noted that the Local Plan Policies Map (CD_001B, CD_001C, CD_001D) does not safeguard land in and around Longcross Station. As it is not safeguarded this does not provide planning policy certainty that required facilities/ extensions associated with the railway station operation could be provided.

10.1.5 The Longcross Garden Village Infrastructure and Viability Assessment (2017) (SD_007P) anticipates a peak usage of 548 passengers during the am peak. Such a level of usage cannot be accommodated without these improvements.

10.1.6 Second, with respect to bus services, again there is no evidence of the ability to provide bus services between the development and nearby centres, including connections to Longcross Rail Station.

10.1.7 Neither the bus operating or rail operating companies have confirmed their ability or willingness to provide the necessary public transport infrastructure to support a sustainable development, nor is there any evidence to identify what level of financial support may be required to provide new services.

10.1.8 Thirdly, significant off-site walking and cycling infrastructure will be required to integrate the development with other centres. Such infrastructure (segregated footways and cycleways) may
necessitate land acquisition and may impact upon areas with statutory designations or be of high ecological interest. There is no evidence to demonstrate that such linkages are either capable of being provided or can be provided in a timely manner.

10.1.9 The location of the proposed Longcross Garden Village allocation (policy SD10) is not such as to integrate with or provide new accessible and sustainable travel networks and routes to service and employment centres. Much travel associated with this development would inevitably be by private car (policy SD4 bullet 2).

10.1.10 The level of funding in the form of developer contributions likely to be required for mitigation schemes for the A320 and M25 mean that funding available for sustainable transport measures is likely to be reduced (policy SD4 bullets 3 and 4).

10.1.11 Policy SD4 is headed “Active & Sustainable Travel”. Bullets 5 and 6 refer respectively to safeguarding land at the A320 for transport related infrastructure, and to securing funding from sources including developer contributions for transport schemes and highway improvements. These two points appear out of place in this policy, and place an emphasis on vehicular rather than sustainable travel.

10.1.12 Overall, the Plan does not provide an evidence-based, integrated and effective policy framework for transport that will support the implementation of the spatial strategy and contribute to sustainable development.

10.1.13 It is therefore considered that the Plan is unsound as it is not justified and effective.

Q10.2 With regard to the Plan’s potential effects on the A320 and the strategic road network in particular, are there reasonable prospects that satisfactory mitigation can and will be provided in time, taking account of the proposed phasing of development sites? Are there effective mechanisms to ensure that any significant cross-boundary impacts are addressed and resolved?

10.2.1 No. The Plan’s potential effects on the A320 and the strategic road network (including the M25) are presently unknown. Until the work presently commissioned from Arcadis has been completed, it is not possible to identify:

(a) what mitigation is required to satisfactorily address the Plan’s effects; and accordingly
(b) whether there is a reasonable prospect that such mitigation can and will be provided in a timely manner.

10.2.2 We would like to once again express our fundamental concern and disappointment that the ongoing discussions and work between Runnymede Borough Council, Surrey County Council and Highways England regarding the A320 and Strategic Road Network have not yet been concluded.

10.2.3 Runnymede Borough Council have submitted a Local Plan which they believe is sound. It is abundantly clear that this is not the case as the evidence base ‘submitted’ does not adequately inform the Local Plan. The evidence base submitted is also, in our considered opinion, incomplete. We continue to consider that the submission Runnymede Local Plan is not sound as it is not justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

10.2.4 We reserve the right to comment further when additional information is provided.
Q10.3 Taking account of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and all the relevant policies of the Runnymede 2030 Plan, is there a reasonable basis for confidence that the other necessary infrastructure will be provided in a timely manner to implement the spatial strategy? How will any cumulative impacts of the proposed scale of development be mitigated?

10.3.1 No. Water supply and sewerage are critical infrastructure requirements to serve the Plan.

10.3.2 The council’s ‘Post Submission Outline Water Cycle Study (2018)’ (SD_007S) identifies in section 6.3.1 that TWUL has “serious concerns” regarding waste water services in relation to the Longcross Garden Village site (policy SD10), identifying specifically that sewage treatment capacity is unlikely to be able to support the Plan’s policies for Longcross.

10.3.3 Thames Water’s representation on the Runnymede Local Plan Part Two (Regulation 19) Consultation states the following with regards to proposed Longcross Garden Village allocation:

“Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: Sewage Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build. Implementing new technologies and the construction of a major treatment works extension or new treatment works could take up to ten years. The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Strategic drainage infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to discuss the scale and phasing of development and what wastewater infrastructure may be required to support it at the earliest opportunity.”

10.3.4 Section 6.3.1 of SD_007S adds the following:

“TWUL have been in discussions with the developer regarding the scale and phasing of development to understand the infrastructure requirements. TWUL are currently preparing their business plan for AMP7 which will cover the period from 1st April 2020 until the 31st March 2025. The business plan takes into account proposed growth in Runnymede and Thames Water are confident that necessary network and treatment works upgrades can be delivered alongside development. Continued dialogue between Thames Water, the LPA and the developer is required to ensure alignment of development and wastewater infrastructure requirements.”

10.3.5 The draft Thames Water Business Plan for 2020-2025 was published on 3rd September 2018. The Thames Water website outlines the next stages:

- 28 September 2018 – Thames Water present their Draft Business Plan to Ofwat
- End January 2019 – Ofwat provides a complete response to their draft plan
- End December 2019 – Ofwat publish final determination of their plan

---

10.3.6 It is unclear from the draft Business Plan whether it adequately takes into account proposed growth in the submission Local Plan. It is also unclear from SD_007S and the Thames Water representations to the Local Plan consultations what ‘significant infrastructure upgrades’ are required and when they are required. As noted in the Thames Water representation to the Runnymede Local Plan Part Two (Regulation 19) Consultation Sewage Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build. Implementing new technologies and the construction of a major treatment works extension or new treatment works could take up to ten years. It is therefore unclear whether the necessary upgrades will be delivered in a timely manner. There is currently no evidence to provide any certainty.

10.3.7 We are aware that Thames Water in their representations in their representation on the Runnymede Local Plan Part Two (Regulation 19) Consultation required the following wording to the added to Policy SD6:

“Development proposals which are dependent on the delivery of critical infrastructure projects will not be permitted prior to completion of that project or where appropriate, a phase of that project which has been identified as necessary for the development to proceed. In addition, where appropriate, phasing conditions may be used to ensure that development is not occupied until necessary infrastructure upgrades have been delivered.”

10.3.8 The borough council has included very similar wording to that suggested by Thames Water in policy SD6 as follows:

“Development proposals which are dependent on the delivery of critical infrastructure projects will not be permitted or where appropriate, a phase of that project which has been identified as necessary for the development to proceed. Dependent on the timing of critical infrastructure projects the Council may instead grant permission with conditions or planning obligations restricting occupation until completion of critical infrastructure projects or phases of projects.”

10.3.9 As stated in our response to Matter 5 question 5.2, paragraph 17 of the NPPF outlines the ‘Core Planning Principles’ and the first bullet point emphasises that planning should be genuinely plan-led. The Longcross Garden Village allocated site is the largest housing site allocation in the draft Runnymede Local Plan and this flexibility which enables the granting of permission with conditions restricting occupation until completion of critical infrastructure or phases is contrary to the plan-led approach. It emphasises the question marks over the deliverability of the Longcross Garden Village and our view that the site should not be allocated for housing.

10.3.10 The use of such conditions on the Longcross Garden Village site, if permission was granted, could also result in the delivery of housing completions on the site being significantly delayed and not in line with the Borough Council’s suggested trajectory for the site. Delays to the housing completions will affect the borough council’s 5 year housing land supply.

10.3.11 A Utilities and Waste Water Statement (attached as Appendix 2) produced for the outline application (RU.13/0856) for Longcross North includes confirmation from TWUL that the Longcross south site cannot be drained via the existing network and a new network will be required which may require land acquisition. There is no evidence to demonstrate that this critical infrastructure can be delivered in a timely manner and, without that evidence there is no reasonable basis for confidence.
In our response to Matter 5 question 5.2 we outlined are fundamental concerns with regards to the deliverability and the barriers to deliverability of the Longcross Garden Village site. The concerns over the waste water infrastructure outlined above continue to amplify our fundamental concerns.

We continue to consider that the submission Runnymede Local Plan is not sound as it is not justified and effective.

Q10.4 With regard to Policy EE10 (subject to the modifications put forward in CD_001A), the site-specific policies and the prospects for additional SANGs identified in RBCLP_09, are the Plan’s provisions for the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area sound?

10.4.1 No. It is considered that the Plan’s provisions for the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) are not sound.

10.4.2 Paragraph 8.23 of the Runnymede HRA (May 2018) (SD_017P) notes the following:

“Whilst there is SANG provision for much of the plan period, there is currently a shortfall of SANG provision for the later parts of the plan period. The Council acknowledges this fact in their Local Plan and recognises the need to secure additional SANG later in the plan period to ensure that their total housing requirement can be met.”

10.4.3 More specifically, in examination document RBCLP_09 the council notes that there is an identified shortfall in SANG provision of 624 dwellings to the end of the Plan period.

10.4.4 Natural England in their representation to the Runnymede Local Plan Part Two (Regulation 19) Consultation stated the following:

“Given that the plan does not identify sufficient SANG land for the quantum of housing proposed over the course of the plan period, this may affect its deliverability. In this context, it is important to clarify that no new housing can be occupied in advance of the completion of SANG infrastructure works.

As such, we strongly recommend that this is clarified within the policy. In this vein, we also recommend that the catchments and remaining capacity for each SANG is clearly displayed on a diagram within the plan.”

10.4.5 Given the recent European Court of Justice ruling on Habitats Regulation Assessment, certainty over mitigation must be considered. It is our view that the Plan lacks certainty on the provisions for the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.

10.4.6 It is noted that examination document RBCLP_09a defines on a map the approximate location of potential future SANG. RBCLP_09a then states the following:

“Purpose of map is to highlight the location of possible SANG solutions for delivery of the growth included in the Local Plan from 2025, which does not currently have avoidance in place. Associated table submitted as evidence RBCLP_09 has been sent to Natural England, who have responded as follows: Thank you - this gives us enough assurance on the availability of options for SANG. If you would like to discuss any of the options at any point, do let me know, and we would of course be happy to do site visits for any of the strategic options if these are progressed.
This shows that Natural England is happy with the Council’s approach to identifying and providing SANG across the Plan period to deliver the level of growth in the Plan.”

10.4.7 This does identify that there are options for SANG provision but this does not provide certainty that additional SANG provision can be delivered from 2025. As it currently stands, as the submission Local Plan cannot identify sufficient SANG provision the Plan is currently not deliverable over the whole Plan period.

10.4.8 In addition, the submission Runnymede Local Plan Policies Map (CD_001B, CD_001C, CD001D) makes reference to Potential SANG Sites (Policy: EE10) but policy EE10 makes no reference to the ‘Potential SANG site’ in the policy. The role of “Potential SANG” in Policy EE10 is not identified or defined within the draft Local Plan, and Policy EE10 does not make any reference to “Potential SANG”. It is therefore unclear what role “Potential SANG” has in Policy terms and how it interacts with draft allocations.

10.4.9 We have concerns with the following wording included in Policy EE10 which has been informed by the recommendations in paragraph 8.57 of the Runnymede HRA (May 2018) (SD_017P).

“Over the lifetime of the Local Plan, should the Council not be able to demonstrate there is sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces capacity for mitigation, the Local Plan will need to be reviewed.”

10.4.10 We consider that the ‘Local Plan Review’ mechanism in policy EE10 that could be used if there is not sufficient SANG included is not effective as the stages associated with such a review take a long period a time (production, examination and then adopted (if found sound)). In the case of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan, it has taken several years to get to examination.

10.4.11 This submission Runnymede 2030 Local Plan should, as per paragraph 17 bullet point 1 of the NPPF (2012), provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. The submission Runnymede 2030 Local Plan does not accord with this requirement.

10.4.12 We continue to consider that the submission Runnymede Local Plan is not sound as it is not justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Q10.5 In the light of the other relevant policies and proposals in the Plan, does Policy EE13 provide a justified, effective framework for the minimisation of flood risk and support for strategic flood relief measures?

10.5.1 No. Policy EE13 may represent a justifiable policy in its own right but is dependent upon the general spatial strategy being sound. In the event that the spatial strategy is not sound, strategic flood relief measures may need to be reconsidered
Appendix 1  Current facilities at Longcross Station
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Office</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket machines</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartcards</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartcards issued</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartcards validators</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staffing and general services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information available from staff</td>
<td>Monday - Friday Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information services - opening times</td>
<td>Saturday Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunday Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer help points</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help points are available on all platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Property</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Services</td>
<td>Please contact our Customer Service Centre on 0345 6000 650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket gates</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location for Rail Replacement Services</td>
<td>LONGCROSS IS NOT SERVED BY REPLACEMENT BUS SERVICES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATM Machine</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting Rooms</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accessibility and mobility access**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessible feature</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff help available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp for train access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step free access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By continuing to browse the site or clicking “Accept Cookies”, you agree to the storing of cookies on your device to enhance site navigation, analyse site usage, and assist in our marketing efforts. Or, to manage your cookies, click “cookie settings” and Read our Cookie Policy for more information.
Appendix 2 Utilities and Waste Water Statement produced for the Longcross North outline application (RU.13/0856)
Appendix B - Wastewater

From: jason.homer
Sent: 12 June 2012 15:13
To: "Timothy.Gale@thameswater.co.uk"
Cc: Wheeler, Martin; Tim Jones; Hugo Reeve
Subject: DERA Foul Drainage (TW/WYG Meeting 12 June)
Attachments: DERA_Sewerage Solution.doc

Tim,

Thanks for your time and that of your Chertsey Catchment Manager this morning, much appreciated (please forward this mail to your Catchment Manager).

Please find below a bulleted summary of our discussion:

- The existing foul water outfall from the North Site, via the M3 pipe subway into Longcross Road is now the preferred solution for DERA North because:
  - no downstream network reinforcement would be required (providing any net increase in foul flows from the DERA North site – which is quite likely because of the new residential component – is attenuated in the new adoptable onsite foul pumping station);
  - the scale of this pumping station would be minimised because there may be some additional storage in the piped gravity network between the outfall in Longcross Road and Trumpgreen Road [TECHNICAL NOTE: The flows from the DERA site – both North and South – will be conveyed to Lyne Sewage Treatment Works (STW) on the attached plan, at the M3/M25 junction. The critical pinch point between DERA and this treatment works is the Pumping Station next to the bridge on Trumpgreen Road (PS1) on the attached plan). Therefore TW would prefer to increase the pumping frequency of the Kitsmead Lane pumping station (PS1 on the attached plan) to limit the impact on the heavily constrained Trumpgreen Road bridge pumping station. If the DERA site were to convey flows directly to the gravity sewer on Trumpgreen Road – as previously specified - this would have a much more negative impact on the TW network].
  - this solution negates the need to access third party land and undertake a railway crossing;
  - this solution can likely be delivered from a single foul pumping station located between the commercial and residential sites, which will also reduce the depth of the new adoptable onsite gravity sewers and;
  - this solution should make it easier to intercept the existing flows from the film studio during the construction of the residential and data centre sites
- However, this option being the preferred option depends upon:
  - Crest Nicholson confirming that they are able to provide a right of access through DERA North, the M3 Pipe Subway, and DERA South and directly into Longcross Lane without passing through third party land;
  - There is a suitable location for a new pumping station between the main site access/data centre and the residential site, close to the M3 Motorway
- Effectively it is unlikely that any capital costs for network reinforcement will be required from Crest Nicholson, and there will be no programme risk in terms of Thames Water having to undertake network reinforcement prior to the occupations of the first few houses/commercial units. Crest Nicholson will deliver an onsite gravity network, an adoptable pumping station and a new rising main under S104 WIS1991, connecting into the exiting 225mm sewer in Longcross Road.
- Although the net increase in foul flows from DERA North site can be accommodated in the existing sewerage network between Longcross Road, Trumpgreen Road and the Sewage Treatment Works, the foul flows from the DERA South Site (circa 2000
new homes) can NOT be drained via the existing network and will be pumped directly to Lyne Sewage Treatment Works via a new cross-country rising main network to the north or south of Bog Wood. At this time the flows from DERA North may or may not be directed into the larger DERA South Pumping Station and pumped directly to the Sewage Treatment Works.

- In order to progress with the procurement of a suitable solution the following is required:
  - Thames Water will respond to the formal WYG capacity enquiry requesting that Crest Nicholson pay for an “Impact Assessment”. This will cost £400 and will allow Thames Water’s service providers to scope the works required to determine a detailed solution, which will likely include:
    - Flow monitoring of the existing Longcross Road Outfall (9 weeks flow monitoring) to understand the existing flows from the site in order to make an accurate assessment of the likely net increase in flows from the new residential and commercial development (c. £1900)
    - Detailed hydraulic modelling (a further 2 months) to understand the spare capacity in the downstream network (upstream of the critical pumping station) to determine the size of create attenuation required and the new onsite pumping regime (c. £5000)
  - Thames Water recommend that this is undertaken at the earliest opportunity but understand that Crest Nicholson may not want to pay for this prior to the new planning consent being granted.

I have attached a plan to help the rest of the project team understand today’s meeting. If you feel there are any errors or omissions please make the appropriate changes to this text. Otherwise I look forward to your formal response to my original letter dated 3 May 2012.

Kind regards

Jason Horner
Associate Director

WYG ENGINEERING LTD
Executive Park, Avalon Way, Anstey, Leicester, LE7 7SR
Tel: ++44 (0)116 234 6000
Fax: ++44 (0)116 234 8001