TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Notice:</th>
<th>GRANT PERMISSION (subject to conditions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Application Number:** RU.17/1815

**Proposal:**
A) Redevelopment of west site (including demolition of all existing buildings) to provide 212 x 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses and flats and 116 x 1 and 2 bedroom retirement apartments in two, three and four storey buildings served by new access onto Stonehill Road (outline planning application, all matters reserved)
(B) Construction of three storey acute care wing connected to existing hospital (outline planning application, all matters reserved)
(C) Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 66 1,2 and 4 bedroom key worker dwellings and nine 1 and 2 bedroom general needs affordable dwellings in 6 x three storey buildings served by new access onto Holloway Hill
(D) Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 72 x 1, 2 and 4 bedroom key worker dwellings in 8 x three storey buildings
(E) Erection of single storey building and infilling at basement level to provide new staff restaurant and 1,500 square metres of retail floorspace
(F) Redevelopment of car park to provide three storey/six deck multi-storey car park together with alterations to internal road layout
(G) Erection of detached two storey workshop building together with alterations to car park
(Revised Description 16/08/18)

**Location:**
ST PETERS HOSPITAL
Guildford Road
Chertsey
Surrey
KT16 0PZ

Runnymede Borough Council in pursuance of their powers under the above mentioned Act and Order GRANT permission for the above development in accordance with the details given on the application form and approved plans. Permission is given subject to the following CONDITIONS:
1 The development for which full planning permission is hereby granted (within areas C, D, E, F and G as shown on plan A100130SPHDA PO1 Rev F), must be commenced not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 51 of Part 4 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 In respect of that part of the application for which outline planning permission is granted (for Areas A and B as shown on plan A100130SPHDA PO1 Rev F)

(a) Applications for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

(b) The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.


3 Approval of the details of the appearance, layout and scale of the building(s), the access and the landscaping of the site within Areas A and B (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced in each of the areas, and shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To comply with Section 51 of Part 4 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

4 Before the above ground construction of development hereby permitted within areas, A, B, C, D, E and G is commenced, samples of the materials to be used in the external elevations shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority and no variations in such materials when approved shall be made without the prior approval, in writing, of the Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order that the development harmonises with the surroundings in the interests of visual amenity and to comply with saved Policy GB10 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

5 No development including demolition shall take place and no trees shall be felled within areas A, C, D and F until a further bat and badger survey has been conducted within each of the relevant areas and the findings of the survey, and any recommended mitigation, submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not commence within the relevant area until all the measures approved in accordance with this condition have been implemented.

Reason: To protect the habitat of the bats and to comply with saved Policy NE20 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and guidance in the NPPF.
Prior to first occupation/first use of development in areas A, C, D and F, full details of biodiversity enhancements to be incorporated within the area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied/first used until all the measures approved in accordance with this condition have been implemented.

Reason: To protect the flora, fauna and ecological value of the site and to comply with saved Policy NE20 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and guidance in the NPPF.

No development including demolition shall take place within each area of the site until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To allow archaeological information to be recorded and to comply with saved Policy BE15 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and guidance in the NPPF.

Potentially contaminated Land

Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development (including demolition) other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until Conditions (i) and (ii) or otherwise agreed remedial measures have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the local planning authority in writing until Condition (iv) has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

(i) Site Characterisation

No development must take place until an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination on the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and shall assess any contamination on the site whether or not it originates on the site. The report of the findings must include:

(a) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
(b) an assessment of the potential risks to:
   " human health
   " property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes
   " adjoining land
   " ground waters and surface waters
   " ecological systems
   " archaeological sites and ancient monuments

(ii) Submission of Remediation Scheme

If found to be required no development shall take place until a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, an appraisal and remedial options, proposal of the preferred option(s), a timetable of works and site management.
Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with the guidance in the NPPF.
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(a) Prior to commencement of construction of development in each of the areas A, C, D, F and G, full details of both hard and soft landscaping works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved prior to the first occupation of the development. This scheme shall include indications of all changes to levels, hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, minor structure, the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out, and details of the measures to be taken to protect existing features during the construction of the development.

(b) All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Arboricultural work to existing trees shall be carried out prior to the commencement of any other development, otherwise all remaining landscaping work and new planting shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance to the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants, which within a period of five years of the commencement of any works in pursuance of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of similar size and species, following consultation with the Local Planning Authority, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area and to comply with saved Policies NE14, NE15 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and guidance in the NPPF.
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The existing trees which are to be retained shall be adequately protected from damage during site clearance and works within each of the areas, in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any site clearance or works commence within each of the areas; such details to include, inter alia, precise positions of temporary hoardings or fencing around retained trees, siting of drain runs and trenches, arrangements for burning of materials from site clearance, measures to be taken to ensure that retained trees and their roots are not damaged by the removal of adjacent trees, siting of routes to be used by heavy vehicles during site clearance and site works, and changes of ground level around retained trees. Furthermore, no materials or plant shall be stored and buildings erected with the protective fencing without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the trees to be retained and enhance the appearance of the surrounding area, to ensure that replacement trees, shrubs and plants are provided and to protect the appearance of the surrounding area and to comply with and saved Policies NE14 and NE15 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and guidance in the NPPF.
Any reserved matters submission relating to development (excluding demolition of existing buildings) in area A shall include a scheme of mitigation, which may include additional detailed modelling, to demonstrate that the residential occupiers in this area would not be adversely impacted by emissions from the existing hospital boiler house.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the occupants of future residential properties from smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit which may be emitted from the boiler and to comply with saved Policy HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and guidance in the NPPF.

Prior to installation, details of any external lighting to be installed within any of the areas A, C D and F, including floodlighting, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting as shall be approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect any protected species within the site and to comply with saved Policy NE20 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and guidance in the NPPF.

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved plans:
- Design & Access Statement (Greenlands & Silverlands)
- Design & Access Statement (West Site) 150593_REPORT_DAS Rev.1
- Development Areas Schedule A100130-SPH-DA-P02 Rev.A
- Building Identification Schedule A100130-SPH-CBI-P02
- Framework Travel Plan
- Phase II Contaminated Land Assessment Report 722872/R1 Rev.1
- Remediation Strategy & Verification Plan (Development Zone 1) 722872/R3
- Flood Risk Assessment Rev.A
- Surface Water Management Strategy
- Arboricultural Survey & Impact Assessment AR/3649 Rev.03/17
- Ecological Appraisal: Additional Land Ecological Survey
- Bat Roost Survey & Interim Bat Activity Survey Report
- Great Crested Newt Survey Report
- Reptile Survey Report
- Desk Based Archaeological Assessment
- Attenuation Car Park
- Greenfield Run-off, 618499-MLM-ZZ-RP-C-0150, 618499-CALC-CIV-

Reason: To ensure an acceptable scheme and to comply with saved Policy GB10 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until 
"(a) Insofar as it relates to development areas A or C (whichever occurs first); the proposed modified access to Holloway Hill 
"(b) Insofar as it relates to development area A; the access to Stonehill Road 
"(c) Insofar as it relates to development area A; the cycle/pedestrian access to Holloway Hill 
"(d) Insofar as it relates to development areas E or F (whichever occurs first) the cycle/pedestrian access to Guildford Road 

have been constructed and in accordance with a scheme or schemes to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme or schemes shall be generally in accordance with the layout shown on plans A101454-35-18-007-C and A101454-35-18-011.

For the avoidance of doubt, 'development areas' referred to in this condition are those shown on plan A100130SPHDAP01 revision F.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to satisfy the Runnymede Borough Local Plan (2001) Saved Policies MV4 (Access and circulation arrangements), MV5 (Access to public transport) & MV9 (Parking standards).

The dwellings in development area A shall not be occupied unless and until space has been laid out for each individual dwelling for vehicles and cycles to park in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall allow for vehicles and cycles to be parked so that they may enter and leave the application site in a forward gear. The dwellings in areas C and D shall not be occupied until space has been laid out for each individual dwelling in accordance with the details shown on plans 5320-P101B and 5320-P102. All cycle parking shall be secure, covered and lit. Thereafter the parking / loading and unloading / turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.

For the avoidance of doubt, 'development areas' referred to in this condition are those shown on plan A100130SPHDAP01 revision F.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to satisfy the Runnymede Borough Local Plan (2001) Saved Policies MV4 (Access and circulation arrangements), MV5 (Access to public transport) & MV9 (Parking standards).
For each area of the development hereby approved, no development including demolition shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan relating to development in that area, to include details of:

(a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
(b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
(c) storage of plant and materials
(d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
(e) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
(f) HGV deliveries and hours of operation
(g) vehicle routing
(h) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
(i) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused
(j) on-site turning for construction vehicles

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to satisfy the Runnymede Borough Local Plan (2001) Saved Policies MV4 (Access and circulation arrangements), MV5 (Access to public transport) & MV9 (Parking standards).

The dwellings in development area A hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the following facilities have been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for:

(a) The improvement of the St Peters Hospital main bus stop located south of the main entrance to include real time information displays along with the potential enhancement of shelters, seating, timetable information and raised kerbs for ease of access
(b) Information to be provided to residents regarding the availability of and whereabouts of local public transport / walking / cycling. Thereafter the said approved facilities shall be provided and retained.

For the avoidance of doubt, 'development areas' referred to in this condition are those shown on plan A100130SPHDAP01 revision F.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to satisfy the Runnymede Borough Local Plan (2001) Saved Policies MV4 (Access and circulation arrangements), MV5 (Access to public transport) & MV9 (Parking standards).

Any hospital extension in development area B, and the new retail extension in development area E hereby permitted, shall not be occupied until the following facilities have been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for:

(a) The secure parking of bicycles within the hospital site,
(b) Facilities within the hospital site for cyclists to change into and out of cyclist
equipment / shower,
(c) Facilities within the hospital site for cyclists to store cyclist equipment,
(f) Information to be provided staff / visitors regarding the availability of
and whereabouts of local public transport / walking / cycling.

Thereafter the said approved facilities shall be provided and retained.

For the avoidance of doubt, 'development areas' referred to in this condition
are those shown on plan A100130SPHDPAP01 revision F; for the avoidance
of doubt and for the purposes of this condition, the hospital site refers to the
application site with the exception of development areas A, C and D.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety
nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to satisfy the
Runnymede Borough Local Plan (2001) Saved Policies MV4 (Access and
circulation arrangements), MV5 (Access to public transport) & MV9 (Parking
standards).

19

Prior to the first occupation of the development within development areas
B, E, F or G, a Car Parking Management Plan for the hospital site shall be
submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority and then
the approved Car Parking Management Plan shall be implemented on
occupation and for each and every subsequent occupation of the
development, thereafter maintaining and developing the Car Parking
Management Plan. The Management Plan shall include but not exclusively,
provide measures to ensure that vehicle parking associated with
development areas B, E, F or G are maintained and retained for the purposes
of the relevant staff, patients and visitors, and measures to ensure that
patients, staff, and visitors are prevented form parking within development
area A.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety
nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to satisfy the
Runnymede Borough Local Plan (2001) Saved Policies MV4 (Access and
circulation arrangements), MV5 (Access to public transport) & MV9 (Parking
standards).
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Notwithstanding the details submitted on plan no 5320-P101 Rev C, prior to
the commencement of construction of the development in development area
C, further details of the siting of refuse areas within development area C in
relation to trees to be retained as shown on plan no 5320-P101Rev C shall
be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Such details shall include a revised layout plan which includes tree numbers
to provide clarity on which tree is which and shall include T149, T150 or
T144, and a scheme for replanting to compensate for trees removed.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities and biodiversity of the area
and to comply with saved Policies NE14, NE15 and NE20 of the Runnymede
Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and guidance in the NPPF.
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Construction shall not commence in any development area until an
overarching drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage
works, has been submitted to and approved by, the local planning authority
in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface
water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the
drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed in each
development area. Infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground
should not be assumed until the contaminative status of the aquifer has
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been established. The strategy shall include a further assessment of potential flooding risk from the ordinary watercourse which runs through the site, and an assessment of the potential for an ecological buffer to be provided around the watercourse.

Reason: The development may lead to sewage flooding; to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community, and to ensure the design meets the technical stands for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site and to ensure the development complies with saved Policy SV2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and guidance in the NPPF.

Construction in each development area shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme for the respective area have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these details shall be in accordance with the approved overarching drainage strategy for the site. These details shall include:

a) A design that satisfies the SuDS Hierarchy and that is compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS.

b) Evidence that the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+CC%) allowance for climate change storm events, during all stages of the development (Pre, Post and during), associated discharge rates and storages volumes shall be provided using a Greenfield discharge rates of 12.9 l/s for the residential site and 8 l/s for the car park site on plot F. (or otherwise as agreed by the LPA).

c) Detailed drawings to include: a finalised drainage layout and any phased, sequential layouts; detailing the location of SuDS elements, watercourses, pipe diameters, levels, details of how SuDS elements will be protected from root damage and long and cross sections of each SuDS element including details of any flow restrictions and how they will be protected from blockage.

d) Details of Management and Maintenance regimes and responsibilities

e) Plans showing exceedance flows and how property on and off site will be protected for the final and any phased construction of the development, including final floor levels and external works finished levels.

f) Details of construction phasing, i.e., how drainage will be dealt with during the works, including pollution prevention and dealing with silt, described within a construction and environmental management plan (CEMP).

Reason: To ensure the design meets the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS

and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site.

Prior to construction of the development in each of the areas hereby approved, details of the proposed maintenance regimes for each of the SuDS elements within that development area must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the drainage system is maintained throughout its life time to an acceptable standard.

Before the commencement of the construction of the development hereby approved within each of the development areas, details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with those approved details.
Reason: To ensure that the construction works do not compromise the functioning of the agreed Sustainable Drainage System.
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Before the commencement of the construction of the development hereby approved in each of the development areas, details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will cater for system failure or exceedance events, both on and offsite, must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal has fully considered system failure
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Prior to the first occupation of the development or each development area, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the Drainage System has been constructed as per the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure the Drainage System is designed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS.
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Prior to the commencement of any demolition and construction within each of the development areas of the development hereby approved, a detailed construction and environmental management plan (CEMP) which shall include how dust generation will be minimised and mitigated against including assessment of impacts on air quality from demolition/construction works, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in respect of the relevant development area. The agreed CEMP(s) shall be fully implemented for the lifetime of the construction period for each development area.

Reason: In the interests of air quality and to comply with the NPPF.
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Prior to the commencement construction of development in development areas A, C and D, an air quality impact assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning authority. Such details shall include any required mitigation measures, and the development within each of the areas shall be implemented fully in accordance with approved details.

Reason: In the interests of air quality of the site and its environs given the proximity of the site to the M25 Air Quality Management Area and to comply with the NPPF.
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No construction of development within areas A, C and D shall take place until a scheme for the mitigation of the effects of the development within development areas A, C and D on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall make provision for the delivery of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). In the event that the proposal is for the physical provision of SANG, the SANG shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme before any dwelling is occupied.

Reason: To ensure that the development, either on its own or in combination with other plans or projects, does not have a significant adverse effect on a European site within the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.
No development approved by this planning permission shall commence in a development area until a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall take place fully in accordance with the approved remediation strategy. This strategy will include the following components:

1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
   - all previous uses;
   - potential contaminants associated with those uses;
   - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and
   - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

2. A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.

3. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Note: The Environment Agency has reviewed the MLM Phase II Contaminated Land Assessment Report for St Peter's Healthcare Campus, Chertsey dated July 2010 and the Remediation Strategy and Verification Plans for Development Zones 1 to 6 dated October 2010 and is satisfied that part 1 of this condition has been fulfilled. Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: This site is underlain by the Bagshot Formation (Secondary Aquifer) and groundwater from this aquifer feeds into the streams around the site. The use of this site as a hospital means that fuels, chemicals and solvents have been used and stored on site and there is therefore the potential for contamination to be within soils and made ground and also possibly to have migrated into the aquifer. We need to protect the Aquifer and the streams from any current or historic contamination that could be mobilised during development of this site.

Prior to any part of a development area being occupied a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

Reason: This site is underlain by the Bagshot Formation (Secondary Aquifer) and groundwater from this aquifer feeds into the streams around the site. The use of this site as a hospital means that fuels, chemicals and solvents have been used and stored on site and there is therefore the potential for contamination to be within soils and made ground and also to have migrated.
into the aquifer. We need to protect the Aquifer and the streams from any current or historic contamination that could be mobilised during development of this site.

The above ground development hereby permitted may not commence until a foul water drainage scheme for each development area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved and completed prior to the development within each development area being brought into use. To protect the quality of the underlying aquifer the preference is for foul sewerage to discharge to the main sewer and copies of any agreements with the local sewerage provider to adopt the site shall be submitted with each foul water drainage scheme.

Reason: This development site is underlain by the Bagshot Formation (Secondary Aquifer) and groundwater from this aquifer feeds into the streams around the site. The Planning Application states that the provision for foul sewage is unknown and there is no mapped foul sewer on site, therefore plans should be submitted for sewerage provision for the whole site Development Areas A-G.

No development (excluding demolition) in any of development areas B, E, F or G (whichever occurs first), shown on plan A100130SPHDAP01, shall take place before an up to date Hospital Travel Plan has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (who shall inform Highways England of the submission and invite comments). The Hospital Travel Plan shall be implemented prior to occupation of of the development areas B, E or F (whichever occurs first) hereby approved and in line with provisions and timescales set out within the Hospital Travel Plan. The Travel Plan shall include a Public Transport Strategy and methods and measures to reduce trips at M25 Junction 11, for example removal of staff car parking permits.

Reason: To provide sustainable transport measures for visitors and staff and to ensure that the impact of the proposal on the free and safe flow of traffic on the local and strategic highway network is kept to a minimum in accordance with section 10 of the Highways Act 1989.

No above ground development in any of development areas A, C or D (whichever occurs first) shown on plan A100130SPHDAP01, shall take place before an up to date Residential Travel Plan for that respective area has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (who shall inform Highways England of the submission and invite comments). The Residential Travel Plan shall be implemented prior to occupation of the first dwelling hereby approved and in line with provisions and timescales set out within the Residential Travel Plan. This document should be in consensus with the Public Transport Strategy as referred to in condition 33 above.

Reason: To provide sustainable transport measures for visitors and staff and to ensure that the impact of the proposal on the free and safe flow of traffic on the local and strategic highway network is kept to a minimum in accordance with section 10 of the Highways Act 1989.

The dwellings in development area A shall not be occupied unless the works for the improvements to the St Peters Hospital access/Guildford Road/Bittams Lane roundabout junction have been delivered, and/or an amount of occupation has been approved in writing by the LPA as acceptable based on an updated Transport Assessment which itself has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority
that demonstrates that the impacts on the A320 arising from the relevant development the subject of this permission are not severe in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.

Reason: In order that the development should not impact on the capacity of the highway network, prejudice highway safety or cause inconvenience to other highway users and to satisfy saved Policies MV4 and MV5 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and guidance in the NPPF.

Informatives

1. The decision has been taken in compliance with the requirement in the NPPF to foster the delivery of sustainable development in a positive and proactive manner.

2. The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposed development, subject to the above conditions but, if it is the applicant's intention to offer any of the roadworks included in the application for adoption as maintainable highways, permission under the Town and Country Planning Act should not be construed as approval to the highway engineering details necessary for inclusion in an Agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. Further details about the post-planning adoption of roads may be obtained from the Transportation Development Planning Division of Surrey County Council.

3. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a permit and, potentially, a Section 278 agreement must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. All works on the highway will require a permit and an application will need to submitted to the County Council's Street Works Team up to 3 months in advance of the intended start date, depending on the scale of the works proposed and the classification of the road. Please see http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/the-traffic-management-permit-scheme . The applicant is also advised that Consent may be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice.

4. Notwithstanding any permission granted under the Planning Acts, no signs, devices or other apparatus may be erected within the limits of the highway without the express approval of the Highway Authority. It is not the policy of the Highway Authority to approve the erection of signs or other devices of a non-statutory nature within the limits of the highway.

5. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).

6. The developer is advised that a standard fee may be charged for input to, and future monitoring of, any Travel Plan.

7. The developer is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above condition(s), the County Highway Authority may require
necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.

8. The developer would be expected to instruct an independent transportation data collection company to undertake the monitoring survey. This survey should conform to a TRICS Multi-Modal Survey format consistent with the UK Standard for Measuring Travel Plan Impacts as approved by the Highway Authority. To ensure that the survey represents typical travel patterns, the organisation taking ownership of the travel plan will need to agree to being surveyed only within a specified annual quarter period but with no further notice of the precise survey dates. The Developer would be expected to fund the survey validation and data entry costs.

9. Section 59 of the Highways Act permits the Highway Authority to charge developers for damage caused by excessive weight and movements of vehicles to and from a site. The Highway Authority will pass on the cost of any excess repairs compared to normal maintenance costs to the applicant/organisation responsible for the damage.

10. The applicant is advised to have due regard to achieving the full Secured by Design (SbD) award. An early meeting with the developers would ensure that a final assessment for a SbD award can be achieved on all matters.

11. The applicant is advised that the development proposed under the application is likely to result in considerable quantities of construction waste and due regard should be had to the Mineral & Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) standing advice on sustainable construction: https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/93516/2016-04-07-Sustainable-Cons-Standing-Advice-Final-.pdf Use of sustainable construction techniques can significantly reduce waste production, reduce reliance on landfill, increase the production of recycled aggregates and reduce the demand for primary land won aggregate.

12. The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

- 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday
- 8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday
- and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

13. The applicant is advised that to satisfy the above condition in respect of SANG there are likely to be two options.

- The first is to provide, lay out and ensure the maintenance of, in perpetuity, of a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). The physical provision of SANG is likely only to be suitable for schemes of in excess of 60 dwellings due to the need to meet Natural England's guidelines for SANGs. The achievement of this is likely to be through the mechanism of a Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

- The second is to enter into a land transaction, for an appropriate financial sum, with the Council to obtain a licence to utilise part of one of the Council's SANGs in mitigation. If the applicant wishes to pursue this option they should contact the planning case officer for further advice.

The applicant is further advised that the above arrangements will be in addition to the payment of any applicable Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) payment through the Planning Obligation process.
14. The applicant is advised that the reserved matters submissions are expected to have regard to any changes in the development plan or the NPPF, with particular regard to the emerging policies in the Runnymede Local Plan 2030.

15. The applicant should consider the upstream catchment to the north of Longcross Rd and Holloway Hill falls to a low spot at the junction with Stonehill Road. On the south side of the road adjacent to Ivy Cottage, there is a spring of an OWC that runs across the site. The public highway is not considered as a barrier to overland flow from the north and downward across the site. As the proposed site works affects Ordinary Watercourses, Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority should be contacted to obtain prior written Consent. More details are available on our website. Consent for these works is required under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. An application can be made at https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-andcommunity/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice/more-aboutflooding/ordinary-watercourse-consents.

16. It is noted that various illustrative plans were submitted which do not form part of the determination of this application including 150593-STL-XX-00-DR-A-XXXX-PL-10- Rev B, PL_11 Rev E, PL-12- Rev B PL-13- Rev B PL-14- Rev B, PL-15- Rev B PL-16- Rev D.

Signed: Date of decision: 7 February 2019

Ian Maguire
Head of Planning

Your attention is drawn to the following notes:

Appeals to the Secretary of State
If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with the following timescales:

Householder Applications
If you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 12 weeks of the date of this notice.

Minor Commercial
If you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 12 weeks of the date of this notice.

Full Applications
If you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 6 months of the date of this notice.

Enforcement Applications (land already the subject of an enforcement notice)
A planning application relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as is already the subject of an enforcement notice, if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision on your application, then you must do so within 28 days of the date of this notice.
**Enforcement Applications (land which has an enforcement notice served)**

If an enforcement notice is served relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as in your application and if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision on your application, then you must do so within: 28 days of the date of service of the enforcement notice, or within 6 months [12 weeks in the case of a householder appeal] of the date of this notice, whichever period expires earlier.

Appeals must be made using a form which you can get from the Secretary of State online at [https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate](https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate). If you are unable to access the online appeal form, please contact the Planning Inspectorate to obtain a paper copy of the appeal form on tel: 0303 444 5000.

A copy of the appeal form and any accompanying details should be sent to the Head of Planning at planning@runnymede.gov.uk.

The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal, but will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.

The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to the Secretary of State that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.

In practice, the Secretary of State does not refuse to consider appeals solely because the local planning authority based their decision on a direction given by the Secretary of State.

**Purchase Notices**

If either the local planning authority or the Secretary of State refuses permission to develop land or grants it subject to conditions, the owner may claim that the owner can neither put the land to a reasonably beneficial use in its existing state nor render the land capable of a reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted.

In these circumstances, the owner may serve a purchase notice on the Council (that is, where the land is situated in a National Park, the National Park authority for that Park, or in any other case the district council (or county council which is exercising the functions of a district council in relation to an area for which there is no district council), London borough council or Common Council of the City of London in whose area the land is situated). This notice will require the Council to purchase the owner's interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Chapter I of Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

**Further Advice**

Further correspondence regarding this application should bear the application number quoted on the attached decision notice.

**Other consents**

The applicant is advised that the attached decision notice refers only to the application made and does not convey any other consent or permission.

Applicants should satisfy themselves that any other relevant permissions are obtained before any work commences. This might include approval under the Building Regulations, consent under the Environment Agency Byelaws (in areas of floodplain) the release of any restrictive covenants on the land or permission of any landowners.

If the property is or was a council owned property; you are required to contact the Borough
Housing Manager at the Civic Centre address to ascertain consent for any alterations or works. Consents should be sought prior to any works starting.

Applications for the change of use of land
Permission in these cases is given for the change of the use of the land only. It does not give consent for building or engineering operations, or to any layout or to any other matter, and it will be necessary to submit a further planning application for permission to carry out such building or engineering operations which might either be an application in ‘outline’ or a detailed application containing, as appropriate, particulars of any buildings to be constructed and other relevant matters.

Fire Brigade Access
Attention is drawn to Section 20 of the Surrey Act 1985 together with Approved Document B to the Building Regulations which require that when a building is erected or extended proper provision shall be made for the Fire Brigade to have means of access to the building and any neighbouring building.

Surrey Act 1985 – Section 20
Building Plans: Access for Fire Brigade
1. Except as provided in subsection (2) below, where plans for the erection or extension of a building are deposited with a district council in accordance with building regulations, the district council shall reject the plans unless, after consultation with the fire authority, they are satisfied that the plans show:
   a. that there will be adequate means of access for the fire brigade to the building or, as the case may be, to the building as extended; and
   b. that the building or, as the case may be, the extension of the building, will not render inadequate existing means of access for the fire brigade to a neighbouring building.

2. No requirement concerning means of access to a building or to a neighbouring building shall be made under this section in the case of a building to be erected or extended in pursuance of a planning permission granted upon an application made under the Act of 1971 unless notice of the provisions of this section is endorsed on or accompanies the planning permission.

3. Section 16 (6) and (7) of the Building Act 1984 shall apply to plans mentioned in subsection (1) above as they apply to plans mentioned in those subsections and section 36(2) to (6) of the Act shall apply as if this section were a section of Part I of that Act.

4. A person aggrieved by the action of the district council in rejecting plans under this section may appeal to a magistrates’ court.

5. In this section references to the adequacy or inadequacy of means of access for the fire brigade shall be construed as references to means of access adequate or, as the case may be, inadequate for use for fire-fighting purposes by members of one or more fire brigades and their appliances.

Please note should this Planning Permission contain any conditions that need to be discharged then you should submit an –“Application for approval of details by reserved condition” together with the appropriate fee.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 General background

1.1.1 WYG are instructed by Ashford and St Peters Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (ASPH), Surrey and Borders Partnership Trust (SABP) and Optivo to progress a planning application for the redevelopment of the St Peters Hospital west site. This proposal comprises a hybrid (part outline, part full) planning application for the redevelopment of the west site for residential use together with a masterplanned component setting out the projected development of the remainder of the site over the next 20 years.

1.1.2 The Government has directed all NHS Trusts to release surplus land and invest the resulting capital back into healthcare. ASPH and SABP need to do this. It is also becoming increasingly necessary to provide affordable homes for hospital staff in Runnymede - an area of very high housing costs, with a shortage of all types of housing.

1.1.3 Large portions of St Peters Hospital are redundant, particularly over the west of the site. This is due to a planned programme of reducing land which is no longer operationally needed and phasing out buildings which are no longer fit for modern medical purposes. This programme forms part of a plan which will ensure that the hospital retains sufficient space to grow to meet increasing demand in the future whilst also limiting the liability associated with maintaining an overly large campus.

1.1.4 This report is the main planning statement to support St Peters Hospital redevelopment proposals. It is accompanied by various technical documents which focus on particular issues. The technical reports include:

- Transport and traffic impact assessment
- Design and access statements
- Ecology reports
- Tree survey
- Site drainage plan and flood risk assessment
- Contaminated land assessment and remediation strategy
- Statement of community involvement
- Emissions survey
- Archaeological assessment
1.2 Description of development

1.2.1 The submission to Runnymede Council is formed of two planning applications. These are described as follows:

**Application 1** - Hybrid application (full planning application unless otherwise stated) comprising:

(A) Redevelopment of west site (including demolition of all existing buildings) to provide 212 x 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses and flats and 116 x 1 and 2 bedroom retirement apartments in two, three and four storey buildings served by new access onto Stonehill Road (outline planning application, all matters reserved)

(B) Construction of three storey acute care wing connected to existing hospital (outline planning application, all matters reserved)

(C) Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 72 x 1, 2 and 4 bedroom key worker dwellings in 6 x three storey buildings served by new access onto Holloway Hill

(D) Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 72 x 1, 2 and 4 bedroom key worker dwellings in 8 x three storey buildings

(E) Erection of single storey building and infilling at basement level to provide new staff restaurant and 1,500 square metres of retail floorspace

(F) Redevelopment of car park to provide three storey/six deck multi-storey car park together with alterations to internal road layout

(G) Erection of detached two storey workshop building together with alterations to car park

**Application 2** - Deletion of condition 1 of reserved matter approval RU.10/0527 in order to allow the retention of the following in perpetuity:

(H) Chertsey House

(I) Maple Ward decked car park

(J) Abbey Wing decked car park
1.3 St Peter’s Hospital and Project Background

1.3.1 St Peter’s Hospital evolved out of Botleys Park Mansion (now next door in Homewood Park). This grand building was used as mental institution in the 19th and into the 20th century. It was purchased by London County Council who continued to run the facility until the inception of the National Health Service in 1948.

1.3.2 St. Peter’s Hospital expanded using huts originally built to house war casualties, and over time more huts were added until they reached the top of the slope. These were arranged around a central corridor that sloped up the hill. Parts of this remain today with the central corridor now known as “The Ramp”.

1.3.3 The hospital continued to grow over the later half of the 20th century with an A & E unit being added in 1962 and maternity unit in 1970. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s further expansion was needed to meet the growing demand and changes in medical practice and treatment. In the early 1990s Botleys Park closed and the remaining patients were transferred to the new Abraham Cowley Unit.

Image 1: Historical photo of hospital from circa 1990.

1.3.4 The Blanche Heriot Unit opened in 1991; a new ward block was added in 1992; the orthopaedic centre opened in 1998 along with the intensive care unit which was built in 1998. In the same year St Peter’s merged with nearby Ashford Hospital to form an NHS Trust.
1.3.5 Over time the hospital has continued to provide staff accommodation for student, nurses and other medical professionals in three dedicated housing areas across the campus. These comprise the residential areas of Silverlands, Greenlands and Parklands. Greenlands remains a relatively modern addition to the housing stock however Silverlands and Parklands are now 40-50 years old and are in need of replacement in order to provide adequate staff accommodation.

1.3.6 Today the hospital continues to serve large parts of Surrey, being the general hospital for all of the Boroughs of Woking and Spelthorne, most of Runnymede and parts of Elmbridge and Surrey Heath. It presently provides healthcare services for a population base of around 350,000 people. Due to expected population growth in Surrey, this figure is set to increase significantly over the next 20 years with current projections indicating that there will be an additional 70,000 people in the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) area by 2035.

1.3.7 St Peter’s Hospital has to plan for this future growth in terms of both population and healthcare requirements. This involves a strategic approach that sees parts of the campus being sold - partly to release funds and partly to reduce the maintenance burden of occupying such a large site. However, this must clearly be done carefully so as not to dispose of all land that may be required for future development. Indeed, this can prove a difficult balancing act without knowing exactly what the future population will be and what their requirements are in light of evolving socio-economic, political and technological changes.

1.4 Summary of scheme

1.4.1 The proposals hinge upon the western part of the St Peter’s Healthcare Campus - an approximately 12 hectare parcel of land which is jointly owned by both ASPH and SABP.

1.4.2 This area currently houses a range of services for people of all ages. It includes mental health services and a drug and alcohol detox unit. These functions will relocate within the local area, and as far as possible people who use these services will be involved in deciding where best suits the services’ needs. It may be that the nature of these services are best suited to an off-site location where the particular profile of these users can be met more appropriately.

1.4.3 The west site also houses old administrative and service buildings, housing for staff and a number of vacant or derelict areas. Administrative and service buildings are likely to be re-integrated within under-utilised areas of the remainder of the hospital and/or may be off site temporarily. Certain
services will be relocated to more suitable purpose built warehouse style accommodation

1.4.4 The main components of the scheme comprise (these are explored in greater detail further on in this statement):

- The west site - an approximately 12 hectare area which is to be disposed of to a private residential developer. The current plans for this area show the provision of around 300 houses and flats as a mix of one and two bedroom apartments, two, three, four and five bedroom homes. This element has been submitted as a masterplanned outline planning application in order to enable any subsequent developer to define the precise layout and mix more particularly.

Image 2: Extract of plan for west site (area A)
• Greenlands and Parklands - presently provide key worker housing for hospital staff at affordable rents. Greenlands is to be extended towards the west and eventually merge with the redeveloped Parklands site. In all, this area is set to accommodate 72 new one, two and four bedroom flats. These will principally be for hospital workers, unless there is insufficient demand in which case the units will be let to other key workers (fire, police, etc.) and then to those on the general housing register.

1.5 Objectives

1.5.1 There are multiple objectives to the redevelopment and future of the site. These are interrelated and all link back to the continuing and sustainable future for the hospital. Many of these drivers are influenced by the government mandate that requires all NHS hospitals to:

• Reduce excess land holdings in the interest of costs savings
• To deliver more housing land
• Support the enhancement of NHS services including through releasing under-utilised assets
• Ensure the types of services provided on hospital campuses are appropriate for their location

1.5.2 For St Peter’s this hinges on the following issues;

• Releasing the under-utilised parts of the site (predominantly the west site) through a considered programme of land disposal
• Obtaining planning permission for residential development of the west site and dispose of it to the open market
• Re-investing proceeds from this capital receipt into hospital improvements
• Providing more, and better quality, key worker housing for hospital staff to aid recruitment and retention

1.5.3 The west part of the site features the oldest accommodation that has been determined to no longer be of a standard of accommodation that is suitable for modern hospital purposes. Much of the site is already redundant (A100130SPHCBI02) or in the late stages of being phased out. Older pars of
the remainder of the site are also to be phased out (most notably the last parts of the ramp and associated buildings) and replaced with more modern buildings.

1.5.4 The west site is a clearly identifiable parcel and may be released for other purposes - in this case predominantly residential development.

1.5.5 St Peters Hospital suffers from a shortage of skilled staff, due to difficulties in recruitment and long term retention. There are presently around 460 unfilled vacant posts at the hospital. A significant factor in this is the comparatively low pay for hospital staff relative to the very high cost of living in the area. This is combined with the relatively remote location of the hospital, distant from shops, services and nightlife which acts as a further disincentive to younger doctors and nurses to located here.

1.5.6 In line with the objectives to enhance services it is also desired to improve the standard of accommodation on the site and give additional options to current and prospective residents. It is also hoped that this will give additional incentives for longer term staff retention which may see residents to progress from a room in a four bedroom flat, to en-suite accommodation and ultimately a home of their own. This would all be at affordable rents hopefully giving residents the option to progress home ownership in the longer term.

1.5.7 However the most significant aspect of the development is the release of funds which will be raised through the disposal of the west site. The sale of the site would be used to fund the expansion and upgrade to the hospital. The main direction of these funds would be for the provision of a new acute care unit to be formed as an extension to the accident and emergency wing. Funds would also be directed to a comprehensive refurbishment of the Abraham Cowley Unit which has not seen substantial improvements since its original construction around 30 years ago.

1.6 The Proposal

1.6.1 The development proposed comprises the redevelopement of part of the site (the west site) to provide a residential development. Part of this area includes the existing Parklands area of key worker housing which would also be redeveloped to provide additional and improved key worker housing. To the east, another area of key worker accommodation (Silverlands) would provide the same.
1.6.2 To the hospital a new accident and emergency wing would be funded by the sale of the west site to the open market. The balance of parking lost over the west site would be made available in a new multi-storey car park over the site of an existing car park. This would link into the main hospital with an improved front entrance. A new workshop building to replace facilities on the west site would be constructed adjacent to the existing boiler house.

1.6.3 In addition to this two other decked car parks are proposed for retention along with a temporary building (Chertsey House). An already permitted element involving the demolition of older buildings (the ramp) would be made good and formed into additional parking.
2.0 Site location and description

2.1 Context

2.1.1 St Peter’s Hospital is located towards the centre of Runnymede Borough, one mile to the south-west of Chertsey town centre. Chertsey itself is centred eighteen miles southwest of Central London and is well connected to the capital via the M25 and M3 as well as regular train links. 2011 Census Data records the town has having a total population of 13,095. There is an average household size of 2.25 with two and three bedroom properties comprising the majority of the real estate for the area. Nearly 16% of the community defined as having a long-term illness or disability which limits their day-to-day activities.

Image 3: General area map around St Peters Hospital

2.1.2 The site is bounded along the northern edge by B386 Holloway Hill/Stonehill Road, two single carriageway roads sparsely lined with residential dwellings and three commercial properties (Squires Garden Centre, Silverland Stone and World of Water Aquatic Centre). There are four Grade II listed buildings along Holloway Hill/Stonehill Road; Arbon Cottage, Anchor House, Ivy Cottage and
Silverlands (not to be confused with the key worker housing area with the same name). Additionally, the White Lodge Centre which provides support for disabled persons is located to the north-east of the site where Holloway Hill and Guildford Road meet.

2.1.3 The south-eastern edge of the site is bordered by the A320 Guildford Road dual carriageway which provides an arterial route between Chertsey and Woking. The west of the site is enclosed by Homewood Park which comprises 23 hectares of publicly accessible parkland which is classified as a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS). Homewood Park surrounds the Grade II listed Botley Manor Mansion which now comprises an exclusive use wedding venue.

2.1.4 The site can be accessed via three entrances; the main entrance is located along Guildford Road towards the south-west of the site, the secondary access is positioned along the centre of Holloway Hill, the third small access track is situated in the north-western corner of the site off Stonehill Road. The site is within close proximity to the Junction 11 of the M25 which runs through the centre of the Borough providing good vehicular accessibility for patients and staff.

2.1.5 The site is linked internally by a variety of unadopted access roads. Parking provision is spread across the site, the majority is surface level although two single deck car parks are also provided. There is a total of 2,309 parking spaces split between staff (1,426), visitors/patients (611) and residents (272).

2.1.6 Public transport to the site is provided via three bus routes (446, 459, 557) and the Dial-A-Ride service for hospital users from more remote locations. The bus routes provide connectivity between the hospital and the main surrounding settlements of Chertsey, Ottershaw, Woking, Addlestone, Weybridge, Shepperton and Sunbury, with each service having an average frequency of every 60 minutes. Chertsey train station is also within a reasonable walking distance (1.4 miles, approximately 25 minutes).

2.1.7 The site slopes broadly downhill from east to west with some undulation towards the centre. The highest point is to the north-east around the Silverlands residential area at approximately 35 metres AOD. It drops to around 25 metres AOD near the junction with Chertsey Road before rising again to the west with the boundary with Homewood Park being set at around 30 metres AOD.

2.1.8 The Campus measures approximately 32 hectares in total and largely consists of a built environment, albeit somewhat denser to the east of the site than the west. There are fifty-one buildings across the site, comprising a mix of clinical, residential and administrative blocks. These are shown on the buildings identification plan (Ref: A100130SPHBBIP01) of the 51 buildings, 39
are currently operational with the remainder being either derelict (7) or vacant (5). The combined footprint of the buildings is 53,631m² providing 101,734m² of floor space in total. The status and floorspace of each individual building can be found within the Building Identification Schedule (Ref: A100130SPHCBIP02).

2.2 The application areas

2.2.1 The application site is divided into ten application areas as defined on the Development Areas Plan (Ref: A100130SPHDAP01D). The characteristics of each area are defined below.

2.2.2 Area A is the largest of the areas measuring 9.9 hectares, it comprises the area of land entitled ‘the west site’ which is planned for residential disposal. The Area is largely covered by derelict or defunct hospital buildings, with areas of untended grassland (including the walled gardens) mainly towards the north-western corner of the site. To the north-east is Parklands key worker accommodation complex, which is formed of 1960s terrace style blocks of three to four bedroom houses, that are not suitable for modern requirements.

2.2.3 Area B is an area of hardstanding made up of fifty-two patient and visitor car parking spaces and a bike shelter are which is just under 0.2 hectares in size.

2.2.4 The current use of Area C is limited to; a small number of car parking spaces, the hospital restaurant and considerable vegetation/vacant land, spanning across 1.4 hectares. The hospital restaurant building is not considered to be of a high standard or in a suitable location, as many of the staff need to cross the site from the main clinical care buildings which increases their interaction with non-sanitized space and reduces the time they have for breaks.

2.2.5 The vegetation within Area C has been surveyed, the details of which can be found within the Tree Survey. In summary, the woodland which directly abuts Holloway Hills includes a number of good quality English and Turkey oaks, moving further south into the Area, the vegetation is of very little importance and value with very few good quality specimens.

2.2.6 Area D is located in the north easterly corner of the site and comprises forty-four key worker dwellings known as Silverlands. The units are a mix of one to four bedroom houses or flats alongside a hall of residence style block. Akin to Parklands within Area A the dwellings are tired and unappealing and require updating in order to appeal to potential staff members. Significant level
changes are present across the Area, along the D border with Runnymede Hospital (BMI) there is a retaining wall in situ due to the steep drop. Fairly dense vegetation surrounds the Area to the north and east, providing buffers between the residences and Holloway Hill/adjointing uses.

2.2.7 The main entrance to St Peter’s Hospital is sited within Area E, in itself the entrance way comprises no more than a small foyer before opening out to the single retail unit and café located further within the premises. A vehicular circulation and set down area is directly adjacent to the entrance building, this facilitates the dropping off of patients who have travelled via non-emergency ambulance and disabled access. Immediately adjacent to Area E is Area F which is formed of 292 patient and visitor car parking spaces. Additionally, a bus stop is located to the south of the Area.

2.2.8 Situated within Area G, ‘The Ramp’ structures which are similar to Nissen huts, comprise the oldest buildings still in clinical use at St Peter’s Hospital. The demolition of most of these units has already been approved by Runnymede Council earlier this year. The remainder of Area G is presently covered by 354 staff parking spaces, once demolition has taken place, a further 154 spaces will be provided within this Area.

2.2.9 Area H is limited to Chertsey House only, which is a modern two storey steel framed office building. Areas I and J both relate to single deck car parks located adjacent to the Maple Ward and Abbey Wing respectively. All three of these Areas (H, I and J) were all constructed as part of the implementation of the previous masterplan granted approval in 2010. Under condition one of this approval these three structures they were deemed temporary and required to be removed from the site on or before the expiry of fifteen years from the date of the decision.

2.2.10 Elements of the site that are within the red line boundary but are not included within the development areas are to remain largely unaffected by the proposed works this includes;

- Main clinical buildings which form St Peter’s Hospital itself,
- Abraham Cowley mental health unit (although internal works are also proposed)
- Stephanie Marks diabetes centre
- Greenlands key worker accommodation units (totalling 90 two bedroom flats)
- Runnymede hospital (BMI)
3.0 Planning history and the proposed development

3.1 History

3.1.1 The site has an extensive planning history dating back over many years. The majority of the planning applications are for extension, alterations or other minor works to existing hospital buildings together with alterations to car parking arrangements and the like. However, the most pertinent applications are detailed below (most recent listed first).

3.1.2 A prior notification application under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order was submitted for the demolition of some of the ramp buildings in July 2017. The Council did not determine the application in time and deemed approval was therefore granted for these works. A subsequent decision notice indicated that the Council had no objections to these works.

3.1.3 Two screening opinions were submitted to the Council towards the beginning of 2017 (to determine whether the proposal was EIA development) for varying scales of development at the site. Both schemes were concluded not to be EIA development.

3.1.4 A masterplan scheme for rationalisation including partial redevelopment and infilling of the existing healthcare campus to include up to 130,407m² of existing and proposed C2, D1 and ancillary floorspace, 2,518 parking spaces and retention of existing points of access was permitted in 2010 (RU.09/1093). Multiple reserve matters applications implemented elements of this scheme.

3.1.5 A subsequent reserved matters application granted approval for the creation of two new decked car parks and Chertsey House (RU.10/0527). This decision was approved subject to a limited period consent for the retention of these buildings under condition 1.

3.2 The proposed development

3.2.1 In line with the current site description, the proposed development is described in the following paragraphs having regard to the ten application areas as defined on the Development Areas Plan (Ref: A100130SPHDAP01D).
Area A

3.2.2 All current buildings within Area A are to be demolished although the locally listed ice house will remain in situ. The demolition will allow the construction of 212 market homes and a 116 bedroom retirement apartment complex, alongside appropriate landscaping and access provisions.

3.2.3 A combination of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses and flats will be included within the total market homes distributed effectively across the site area enabling community cohesion. The retirement apartment block comprises a mixed 2, 3 and 4 storey structure, with the taller elements of the design used to add an element of grandeur and create a sense of arrival. Additionally, the retirement apartments are to be developed around the pattern of the historic walled gardens providing a pleasant sense of enclosure.

3.2.4 Many landscaping features have been created around the site. Near what is proposed to be the main site entrance there will be a landscaped space with a fountain in the centre, developing the natural synergy between the new development and Homewood Park. Immediately to the south of the retirement accommodation, another larger landscaped area is to be created, it incorporates some of the best mature trees on the site, which will become centrepieces in a new ‘parkland’ area within the residential scheme.

3.2.5 Another main green space identified is a ‘village green’ which would incorporate some of the other significant mature trees. This would be the green heart of the development, to which most routes would lead, including the other principal entrance, from the north-east. The new homes would be arranged in urban blocks that would ‘flow’ to this space, routes terminated visually by the mature trees within the village green. Their geometry was conceived as soft, organic and ‘village-like’ rather than rectangular and urban, in fitting with the natural setting.

Area B

3.2.6 As part of the continued growth of St Peter’s Hospital and the reinvestment of capital generated by the sale of Area A, a new acute care wing is proposed within this application. The wing would three-storeys and connect to the existing Accident and Emergency centre. Parking from this area will be displaced and re-provided within the proposed multi-storey car park in Area F.
Area C

3.2.7 The development proposed at Area C forms half of the key worker affordable housing to be provided on site totalling 72 units. In similar style to the current Greenlands housing to the east of the Area, 6 x three storey blocks will be erected containing a mixture of 1, 2 and 4 bedroom dwellings.

3.2.8 A U-shaped block to the west of the area is the largest building within the design, purposefully created to reflect the style of the retirement village and limit segregation of housing types. Elevation plans for all the blocks show how difference in roof heights, window shapes and materials are used to create variance across the relatively large facades.

3.2.9 The topography of the site allows for a peaceful flow of the buildings’ roofscape that creates a sufficiently natural degree of interest without needing to design it in.

3.2.10 Ninety parking spaces will be provided with cycle storage also demonstrated on the layout plans. The use of parking courts with no-through routes is employed as a design method to each end of the access road/turning heads to allow the street environment to benefit from a greater sense of calm. Refuse stores and a communal laundry room also provided within the development.

3.2.11 The design includes a landscaped area to the south of the Area, which will make use of retained tress and provide a pleasant outlook for the residents. To the north of the blocks the woodland buffer will be largely retained protecting the views from/to Holloway Hill.

Area D

3.2.12 This Area known as Silverlands which is currently populated by outdated key worker housing stock is to be rejuvenated by the proposed development to provide 72 new key worker dwellings containing a mixture of 1, 2 and 4 bedroom dwellings. The types of dwelling mix are deliberately interspersed amongst each other in order to create a degree of vibrancy in the scale and massing of the building blocks.

3.2.13 The positioning of the 8 new three storey buildings is not overly dissimilar to the pattern of development currently in situ, however the buildings themselves will be more fit for modern purposes. The orientation of all the apartment blocks to face into the central space of the Area reduces the dominance of the adjoining car park and increases the sense of community.

3.2.14 Both internal and external design of the buildings remains consistent with the current Greenlands accommodation and the new units to be provided in Area C, providing a greater sense of fluidity
and community cohesion between the key worker complexes.

3.2.15 As with Area C, the site benefits from a level of privacy afforded by its location behind woodland which is all to be retained, some additional planting is also proposed across the site.

Area E

3.2.16 The main entrance of the hospital is proposed for extension within Area E, the intention is to erect a single storey building and infill the basement level to create a replacement hospital staff restaurant and 1,500 square metres of retail floorspace.

3.2.17 These proposals reflect the ongoing desire of St Peter’s Hospital to improve facilities for its staff and visitors alike. The new restaurant will be larger and is much more conveniently located particularly for clinical staff members. Additional retail offering will provide a greater offering of convenience goods for those residing within the key worker accommodation as well as visitors.

Area F

3.2.18 In relation to the extended entrance to the main hospital building, a new multi-storey car park is proposed where the current surface level car park is located. A small element of surface level parking is to be reconfigured to the west, this alongside the six deck (three storey) multi-storey car park will provide 702 parking spaces to be split between staff and visitor use.

3.2.19 To enable safe movement of all varieties of vehicles which need to access both the car park, main entrance and Runnymede Hospital, the plans illustrate how the current access arrangements would be reconfigured.

Area G

3.2.20 As aforementioned, the demolition of most of these buildings within Area G has already been approved by Runnymede Council earlier this year allowing for a further 154 parking spaces to be provided within this Area.

3.2.21 The masterplan now proposes that a new two storey workshop building will be located along the eastern boundary of the current car park. Therefore, reconfiguration of the car park is now required including a loss of approximately 72 parking spaces as detailed within this submission.
Area’s H, I and J

3.2.22 The three structures in Areas (H, I and J) were deemed temporary within the previous masterplan and are required to be removed from the site on or before the expiry of fifteen years from the date of the decision. This refreshed masterplan seeks the deletion of condition one from this permission to allow the retention of Chertsey House, Maple Ward deck car park and Abbey Wing deck car park in perpetuity.
4.0 Planning policy

4.1 Relevant policy documents

4.1.1 The starting point for considering development proposals is the Development Plan. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that if regard is to be had to the Development Plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

4.1.2 The sole development plan document for this area comprises, presently, the “saved” policies of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2001. However other emerging plan documents are also of relevance in addition to other studies and Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). Other material considerations include national planning policy publications. The documents evaluated in this review are listed below;

- Runnymede Local Plan 2001 (saved policies 2007)
- Emerging Runnymede 2035 Local Plan (not yet produced)
- Site Capacity Analysis Study (2017)
- Green Belt Review Part One (2014)
• Green Belt Review Part Two (2017)
• Open Space Study (2016)
• Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area Supplementary Planning Guidance (Adopted 2007, Amended 2009)
• Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space Survey SANGS (2012)
• Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows SPG (2003)
• Employment Land Review (2016)
• Interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment (2016)
• Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2015)
• Affordable Housing SPG (2007)
• Car Parking Standards SPG (2001)
• Surrey County Council Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (2012)
• Infrastructure Needs Assessment (2017)

4.2 National Planning Policy Framework

4.2.1 Although the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not form part of the Development Plan, it nevertheless represents a significant material consideration in the determination of any planning application. The NPPF sets out the government’s planning policies for England. National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) has also been published to provide further guidance in relation to core topics within the NPPF; any relevant subsidiary information from these has been included throughout this section.

4.2.2 Paragraph 14 identifies the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, then planning permission should be granted unless adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits or specific policies of the NPPF indicate otherwise.

4.2.3 Paragraph 17 sets out twelve core planning principles relating to the promotion of sustainable development, the most relevant to this proposal are;

- promoting sustainable transport
- delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- requiring good design
- promoting health communities
- protecting green belt land
- meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change, and
- conserving and enhancing both the natural and historic environment

4.2.4 Taking each of these elements of sustainable development in turn, the numerous paragraphs relating to the development are summarised below.

**Promoting sustainable transport**

4.2.5 Paragraphs 29 to 41 relate to the promotion of sustainable transport, encouraging Local Planning Authorities (LPA) and developers to maximise solutions to current transportation issues such as greenhouse emissions and congestion.

4.2.6 Developments which will generate significant amounts of movement are required to provide a Transport Statement or Assessment and Travel Plan in support of the scheme (paragraphs 32 and 36). Particular consideration should be given to; creation of safe and suitable access to the development site, improvements to the surrounding transport network and integration of sustainable transport modes.

4.2.7 Paragraph 38 requires that larger scale residential developments should incorporate "a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site”.

4.2.8 Parking standards are the focus of paragraph 39, stating that LPAs should take into account the accessibility, type, mix and use of the development when formulating their standards. Additional considerations include the availability of public transport, local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.

**Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes**

4.2.9 The need to boost housing delivery is an established priority of the government, with section 6 (paragraphs 47 to 55) of the NPPF outlining the method for achieving this. The first three paragraphs relate to the requirement for LPA’s to identify five year’s worth of deliverable housing sites.

4.2.10 More specifically paragraph 47 states that LPA’s should "use their evidence base to ensure that their Local plan meets the full Objectively Assessed Need for market and affordable housing in the housing market area”. Providing for five years’ worth of deliverable housing with an additional buffer
of 5% or 20% for those LPAs will a persistent record of under delivery. Additionally, paragraph 48 allows the use of a windfall allowance for those authorities that can provide a history of windfall supplies coming forward.

4.2.11 Accordingly, with the requirement to provide a five year housing land supply, paragraph 49 determines that for those authorities which cannot demonstrate this, the relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date.

4.2.12 The requirement to provide a wide choice of homes relates to the size, type and tenure of the dwellings, based upon local demographic and market trends including specific needs of the local community (paragraph 50). Inclusion affordable housing on site is the stated preference for the new development schemes, although robust justification for off-site provision or financial contributions of broadly equivalent value may be acceptable. Paragraph 50 also states the need for some flexibility of affordable housing policies in order to take account of changing market conditions.

**Requiring good design**

4.2.13 The importance of good design is highlighted in chapter 7, asserting that “good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people” (paragraph 56).

4.2.14 The NPPF aims to ensure that developments will; function well and add to the overall quality of the area, establish a strong sense of place, optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, respond to local character and history, create safe and accessible environments, and be visually attractive. Consequently, positive use of design codes is encouraged by the NPPF, although “policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes” (paragraphs 59 and 60).

4.2.15 Paragraph 66 illustrates the expectation that applications will demonstrate close engagement with those directly affected by the development proposals, and that their opinions be taken into account. Thus, proposals that can demonstrate this will be looked upon more favourably.

**Promoting healthy communities**

4.2.16 The facilitation of social interaction via creation of social, recreation, cultural facilities and high quality open spaces is encouraged in chapter 8. It is advocated that authorities take a positive planning approach for use of shared space and guard against the unnecessary loss of valued
facilities and services (paragraph 70). Paragraph 72 “attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available” while paragraph 75 relates to the protection and enhancement of public rights of way and accesses.

Protecting green belt land

4.2.17 Chapter 9 is directly relevant to the proposed development, as the section relates to protecting green belt land. “The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open” as such, the “essential characteristics of green belts are their openness and their permanence” (paragraph 79).

4.2.18 The five purposes of green belts relate to; restriction of urban sprawl of large built-up areas, prevention of coalescence of settlements, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, preserving the setting and special character of historic towns, and assisting urban regeneration (paragraph 80).

4.2.19 The general extent of the green belt boundaries are already established, local planning authorities are tasked with enhancing the beneficial use of the land including increasing accessibility and improving damaged or derelict land (paragraph 81 and 82). The alteration of green belt boundaries should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan.

4.2.20 Paragraph 87 establishes that “inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the green belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”. Construction of new buildings in the green belt are considered to be inappropriate. There are some exceptions including; “the replacement of a building provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces” and “limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites, whether redundant or in continuing use which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the green belt” (paragraph 89).

Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

4.2.21 The majority of the development site is considered to be within Flood Zone 1, although some small parcels of land are included in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Considering this, paragraph 100 states that “inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere”.
4.2.22 Development proposals should be informed by the LPA’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment where one has been prepared and a site specific flood risk assessment may be required in support of the proposed development (paragraphs 102 and 103).

4.2.23 Site specific assessments should be able to demonstrate that “the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; and development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant” (paragraph 103).

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

4.2.24 Conservation and enhancement of the natural environment relates to; geological conservation, recognition of ecosystem benefits, prevention of pollution and land instability risks, remediation of damaged land, and minimising impacts on and creating net gains for biodiversity (paragraph 109). In line with this agenda, paragraph 111 promotes re-using brownfield land of low environmental value.

4.2.25 Furthermore, paragraph 118 requires planning authorities to apply six principles in the determination of planning applications in order to conserve and enhance biodiversity, the most relevant of which are listed here. Firstly, if avoidance, mitigation or compensation of significant harm to biodiversity cannot be provided, then planning permission should be refused. Additionally, development which would result in the loss of irreplaceable habitats should not be permitted unless the benefits of the development location clearly outweigh the loss.

4.2.26 Special Protection Areas (SPA) and those sites identified as compensatory measures for adverse effects on the SPA are to be given the same protection as European sites (paragraph 118).

4.2.27 Noise pollution is also considered in this chapter of the NPPF, paragraph 123 dictates that planning authorities should aim to; avoid or mitigate and reduce adverse health impacts created by noise from new developments and identify, and protect areas of tranquillity which are prized for their recreational and amenity value.

Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

4.2.28 Recognition that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource where conservation is vital is the focus of paragraphs 126 to 141. For new developments, applicants are expected to as a minimum requirement “describe the significance of any heritage assets affected including any contribution made by their setting” in order to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. A desk assessment or field evaluation may also be requested by the LPA dependent
upon the potential risks to conservation of the heritage asset.

4.2.29 When determining applications, the LPA should take account of; the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, the positive contribution to sustainable communities’ which conservation can have, and the potential for enhanced local character and distinctiveness by the new development (paragraph 131).

4.2.30 Should the proposed development “lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset” LPA’s should refuse consent unless the substantial public benefits outweigh the loss. The other exception where development may be permitted is if all four of the following criterion apply; the nature of the asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site, no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term, conservation funding is demonstrably not possible, the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use (paragraph 133).

4.2.31 Comparably, “where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use” (paragraph 134).

4.2.32 Non-designated heritage assets should also be taken into account when determining application, “a balanced judgement is required with regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset” (paragraph 135).

4.3 National Planning Practice Guidance

4.3.1 The NPPG acts as supportive text to the NPPF and comprises online publications relating to specific planning categories, to provide additional clarity or information. The topics relevant to this planning application include;

- Design
- Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space
- Planning obligations
- Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements
- Viability
- Vacant building credit
Design

4.3.2 The design guidance presented in the NPPG reaffirms the connection between good design and sustainable development, discussing how good design can achieve several planning objectives such as; reflecting local character, creating safe and efficient streets, integrating a network of green and public spaces, and promotion of cohesive and vibrant neighbourhoods.

4.3.3 The guidance also defines what is envisaged as a ‘well designed space’ whereby the space is; functional, adaptable and resilient, supports mixed uses and tenures, includes lively and successful public spaces, promotes ease of movement and is distinctive and attractive. When decision taking five key aspects should be considered by LPA’s; layout, form, scale, detailing and materials.

4.3.4 In planning applications, it is noted that good design can be achieved through a variety of processes such as pre-application discussions, design and access statements and the use of planning conditions and agreements.

4.3.5 Advice upon good masterplanning and design is also provided with; mix of uses, requirements for open space or transport infrastructure, the amount, scale and quality of the buildings being the most important parameters to consider. Indicative layouts are expected to demonstrate the shape and positions of buildings, streets and parks, and care should be taken to ensure the plan is understandable and graphical impressions will not mislead the public by showing details not yet confirmed.

4.3.6 Relating specifically to determination of decisions, the NPPG states that “decisions on planning applications should clearly support the design objectives in the Development Plan. If a local authority decides that an application should be refused on design grounds, there should be clear explanation of the decision”.

4.3.7 Housing design issues are also considered in this guidance, with four key points explored. Firstly, houses should be “functional, attractive, sustainable” and adaptable. Affordable housing should be integrated into plans, so’s not to be distinguishable from private housing or banished to the least attractive part of the site. Bin and bike storage should be carefully planned to minimize damage to the visual amenity of the area. Residential parking can be approached in many fashions as suitable to the individual scheme, however the design should promote natural surveillance.

4.3.8 The guidance defines successful streets as “those where traffic and other activities have been integrated successfully, and where buildings and spaces, and the needs of people, not just of their
vehicles, shape the area”.

**Open space, sports and recreational facilities, public rights of way and local green space**

4.3.9 The first sentence of the guidance clearly states that “open space should be taken into account in planning for new development and considering proposals that may affect existing open space”, due to the health, recreation and ecological benefits of such spaces. LPA’s have the responsibility of determining the need for open space and opportunities for new provision in their areas.

4.3.10 The need for sports and recreation facilities is also determined by authorities relating back to the Sport England guidance. LPA’s are required to consult Sport England when a development relates to playing fields and are advised to consult with them upon other sporting developments, as well as residential developments of 300 dwellings or more.

**Planning obligations**

4.3.11 Planning obligations are sought by LPA’s to “assist in mitigating the impact of unacceptable development to make it acceptable in planning terms”, they must be “directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind”.

4.3.12 The relevant contributions can be provided via a variety of methods such as Community Infrastructure Levy, Section 106 contributions agreements and Section 278 highways agreements. In all cases, the LPA must ensure the obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Site specific obligations may only have limited negotiability whereas LPA’s are required to be more flexible in their approach to affordable housing obligations or tariff style contributions to infrastructure.

4.3.13 Planning obligations should be negotiated to enable planning decisions to made within the statutory time limits, or a longer period where agreed in writing by the LPA and the applicant. Renegotiation of planning obligations can occur at any point if both parties are agreeable. However, where there is no agreement to voluntarily renegotiate and the obligation is over 5 years old, an application can be made to request a change under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

4.3.14 Agreements should be made upon when and how the funds from planning obligations will be used by and allow for their return after an agreed period of time, where they are unused.
4.3.15 The NPPG gives further clarity on the importance of travel plans and assessments/statements and when they are required. The production of these documents is said to positively contribute to; encouragement of sustainable travel, lessening of traffic generation and carbon emissions, creation of accessible and connected communities, improvement of health outcomes and road safety, and reduction in the need for new development to increase existing road capacity or provide new roads.

4.3.16 The necessity to produce a travel plan is determined by the LPA and should be considered during the pre-application stage. This requirement is applied on a case-by-case basis, dependent upon the likely quantities of movements to be produced by the scheme, the existing intensity of transport use and the cumulative impacts of multiple developments within a particular area.

4.3.17 Other considerations include; proximity to nearby environmental designations, availability of public transport and relevant national policies such as the decision to abolish maximum parking standards (Planning Update; Written Ministerial Statement 25th March 2015).

4.3.18 Travel plans should include; benchmark data, forecast level of trips, information on existing travel habits, proposals for reduction of need to travel and provision of improved public transport services.

4.3.19 The criteria for determining the need for a transport assessment or statements is largely the same as that for the travel plan. In addition, it is stated that LPA’s should consider what types of impacts should be focussed upon with the report, such as assessing traffic generated at peak times.

4.3.20 The scope for transport assessments/statements is larger than that of travel plans. Some of the main information requirements include; site layouts and proposed transport access plans, details of the functional classification of nearby road network, a qualitative and quantitative description of the travel characteristics of the proposed development, and a description of parking facilities in the area and the parking strategy for the development.

**Viability**

4.3.21 The NPPG states the importance of considering viability in both plan-making and decision-taking. Accordingly, “decisions must be underpinned by an understanding of viability, ensuring realistic decisions are made to support development and promoted economic growth”. LPA’s are required to be flexible in applying policy requirements where the viability of a development is in question.

4.3.22 The underlying principles for understanding viability in planning are established, the crux of which
is outlined here. Requirement for the use of a relevant evidence base including costs, value and market operation details, will allow for an informed judgement. “Understanding of past performance, such as in relation to build rates and the scale of historic planning obligations” is also considered to be useful information. A collaborative and consistent approach is advocated, in order to include and gain technical information from all the relevant public bodies and additional interested parties.

4.3.23 Where “the value generated by its development exceeds the costs of developing it and also provides sufficient incentive for the land to come forward and the development to be undertaken” a site can be defined as viable.

4.3.24 When considering the viability of brown-field sites LPA’s are encouraged to “take a flexible approach in seeking levels of planning obligations and other contributions to ensure that the combined total impact does not make a site uneconomic”.

**Vacant building credit**

4.3.25 Vacant building credit is a form of incentive for brownfield development on sites containing vacant buildings, where the building has not been abandoned or vacated for the sole purposes of re-development.

4.3.26 Where applicable, “the developer should be offered a financial credit equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of relevant vacant buildings with the LPA calculates any affordable housing contribution which will be sought”.

### 4.4 Runnymede Local Plan 2001 (saved policies 2007)

4.4.1 The current development plan for Runnymede Borough Council comprises the saved policies of the Runnymede Local Plan 2001. Although the Borough are working towards the production of a new local plan, ‘Runnymede 2035’, the 2001 plan remains the only adopted development plan document. The 2001 plan is now considerably out of date and may not be regarded as having full weight due to potential inconsistencies with more up-to-date government guidance.

4.4.2 A number of policies of the 2001 plan were saved by way of the direction of the Secretary of State in 2007. Each of the saved policies relevant to the proposed development are detailed below.
There is only one ‘general’ policy saved by under the Local Plan 2001, it relates to the pace of development stating that “where appropriate, major development proposals will proceed on a phased basis” this is to ensure that any harm to the local economy, environment and amenity is minimised (policy GEN 1). Additionally, the Council will seek to ensure that growth and development are environmentally sustainable”.

Policy GB1 states that “within the green belt, except for the area within the settlement of Thorpe, there will be a strong presumption against development that would conflict with the purposes of the green belt or adversely affect its open character”. In general, agricultural, forestry and change of use for rural buildings are considered acceptable uses within the green belt, with new buildings and “infilling” not normally being allowed. The policy description considers the development potential and imposes restrictions on certain settlements, Chertsey is not mentioned here.

Relating more specifically to the application site, policy GB10 details the major developed sites in the green belt and the Council’s approach to these, eight sites are identified of which St Peter’s Healthcare Campus is one. In relation to these specified sites “limited infilling and redevelopment will be permitted in accordance with a comprehensive scheme”.

Redevelopment schemes should reflect seven criteria;

- have no greater impact on the purposes of the green belt land than the existing development,
- contribute to meeting the objectives of green belt uses
- not exceed the general height of the existing buildings
- “not occupy a larger area of the site than the existing buildings (unless this would achieve a reduction in height which would benefit visual amenity)”
- new buildings are located having regarding to existing openness of the green belt, other landscape features, and integration into the surroundings
- be part of a comprehensive scheme
- not give rise to off-site infrastructure problems

St Peter’s Healthcare Campus is described within the supporting text for policy GB10. The description cites that the buildings occupy 80% of the site are of varying standards “including some sub-standard, single storey buildings and a recent large scale construction built as part of the redevelopment programme”.

4.4.7
4.4.8 The various housing policies contained with the Local Plan saved policies aimed to provide a supply of housing of sufficient range to meet the needs of all types of households, whilst ensuring these are built in urban areas and are of good quality and design. In line with these aims:

- Policy HO1 relates to maximising housing potential across the borough and supports effective re-use of vacant and derelict land, although the preference is for that land to be within urban areas.
- “The Council require a range of dwelling types and sizes provided within new housing developments on appropriate sites over 0.4ha to ensure that the housing needs of different types of households can be met” within policy HO3.
- Affordable housing provision is required by policy HO4.
- Notably policy HO8 states that “development on unallocated (windfall) sites greater than 1ha will be refused as premature where it is established that the five year supply exceeds by 20% or more the five year housing provision requirement and/or the overall Structure Plan requirement.”
- Policy H09 considers specific design requirements for new housing developments.

4.4.9 The provision of retail facilities is the focus of policies SHO1 to SHO7 which include aims to; encourage the improvement of shopping facilities and the shopping environment and protect the Green Belt from shopping development.

4.4.10 Although the movement policies were devised in line with the outdated PPG13, the essence of sustainability and accessibility (stressed by the NPPF) runs throughout and as such many of them are saved. The most relevant policies are listed below;

- Policy MV3 relates to the transport infrastructure contributions which may be sought in relation to the impact of new developments.
- Compliance with current highway design standards and provision of adequate access and circulation arrangements is outlined in policy MV4.
- “The layout and design of new housing developments should seek to facilitate convenient bus operation and services where possible” (policy MV5).
- The requirement to adhere to parking standards set out in the Supplementary Planning Guidance is established in policy MV9.
- Policy MV12 states “the Borough Council will require provision for loading, unloading and turning of service vehicles within the curtilage of a proposed development. Where
appropriate, servicing or provision for future servicing will be expected to be from the rear of the premises.”

- Provision for cyclists and pedestrians are discussed in policies MV13 and MV14 respectively.

4.4.11 The natural environment policies encompass a variety of aims including; preventing all unnecessary building in the Green Belt, protecting the appearance of the countryside and protecting and enhancing wildlife and nature habitats.

4.4.12 “The built environment policies aim to secure a high standard of design for new development and to protect and enhance the Borough’s heritage of listed buildings, conservation areas, archaeological sites and historic parks and gardens.” Policy BE13 is of most relevance to the proposal, it states; “the Council will maintain a list of buildings of local architectural or historic interest and ensure the preservation and ensure the preservation and enhancement of their character. Proposals that detrimentally affect the character or appearance of a locally listed building, or its setting, will not normally be acceptable”.

4.4.13 Provision of recreational facilities is addressed in policies R1 to R16. Policy R3 details the need for play areas in new developments requiring;

- 800 sq.m/0.2 acres of play spaces for under-fives per 1,000 people (minimum size of play space 100 sq.m/0.02 acres)
- 2,000 sq.m/0.5 acres of equipped playgrounds for six to eleven year olds per 1,000 people (minimum size of playground 1,000 sq.m/0.25 acres)
- 0.50 ha/1.3 acres of casual kickabout areas especially for children twelve and over per 1,000 people (minimum size of kickabout area, that of a small football pitch, 0.40 ha/1 acre)

4.4.14 Additionally, policy R16 requires “the provision of amenity space in new housing development to the standard of 0.4ha/1acre per 1,000 people.

4.4.15 The final chapter saved from the Local Plan 2001 relates to services including; land drainage systems, flood management, water quality protection and telecommunications.
4.5 **Emerging Runnymede 2035 Local Plan**

4.5.1 The Runnymede 2035 Local Plan will set out all the policies and land use allocations to guide development in Runnymede up to 2035. This will be based on an agreed vision for the Borough and a general strategy for its achievement.

4.5.2 The Council carried out its first consultation on the Local Plan in summer 2016. This was known as the Issues, Options and Preferred Approaches (IOPA) consultation. Considering the representations made during this consultation and following the collation of additional evidence, a further round of public consultation took place entitled the Additional Sites and Options (ASO) consultation.

4.5.3 All representations received during the ASO consultation have now been registered and it is anticipated that publication of the representations will be in late September 2017. Subsequently, a document summarising the representations made and providing officer responses is expected to be published in early autumn.

4.5.4 The current status of the Local Plan preparations is significantly delayed from the timetable published in the Local Development Scheme document dated December 2016. This predicted that the compilation of the pre-submission plan would be completed by Autumn 2017, this is now highly unlikely to be achievable.

4.6 **Site Capacity Analysis Study (May 2017 – Version 1)**

4.6.1 In tandem with the preparations for the Runnymede 2035 Local Plan, the Council are preparing a variety of documents to form the evidence base. In May 2017, a ‘Site Capacity Analysis’ study was published for the borough, although this is still in draft form it provides detailed analysis upon the land at St Peters Hospital (Site 231). The document assesses the capacity of both the west site and Silverlands to accommodate residential redevelopment, taking into account the retention of the main hospital complex.

4.6.2 Retention of vegetation and trees is considered first in the analysis, stating that retention or partial retention would be beneficial especially for those which form a buffer around the site. Retention of the tree’s covered by TPO 244 is considered to contribute to the green infrastructure requirements that would arise from redevelopment.
4.6.3 The creation of an on-site Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) is not required for Special Protection Area (SPA) mitigation as; “whilst the site is large enough to provide its own SANG, there is already a SANG to the west of the site at Homewood Park. As such, given the proximity of an existing SANG to the site, SANG provision will be met off-site around the edge of the site”.

4.6.4 When assessing the potential uses of the developable land the study asserts that “the site is large enough to provide C2 accommodation and sheltered/extra care units … [and] to accommodate Gypsy/Traveller pitches”. However, the analysis continues to state that “the development of the site for housing is to enable funding for further development and improvement of the existing health services and facilities at St Peter’s Hospital. As such, the development of the site will need to maximise its returns to enable investment in public services and therefore Gypsy/Traveller pitches have not been included.”

4.6.5 Potential density of the development is determined by assessing that of the surrounding area. Paragraph 3.53 establishes that the “surrounding net residential density within the Chertsey Bittams area is low at around 15-29dph. However, the hospital complex adjacent to the site is an intensive use formed from a mix of buildings, parking areas and incidental areas of amenity. As such, given the existing intense use of the site and the need to make the most efficient use of land, it is considered that the site could be developed with a density higher than that at Chertsey Bittams. Therefore net densities lower than 35dph have not been considered”.

4.6.6 Three capacity options are posed in Table 3-8, with the total capacity being determined as “400 (minimum) C3 residential dwellings, 70 bed C2 unit, 20 Sheltered/Extra Care Units”.

4.7 **Green Belt Reviews Parts One and Two**

4.7.1 As part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan, a two part Green Belt Review was conducted by Arup between 2014 and 2017.

**Part One**

4.7.2 In December 2014 Arup completed its independent review of the green belt in Runnymede Borough. The review considered whether the green belt in Runnymede still meets in purposes and/or whether alterations to green belt boundaries could be made.

4.7.3 The green belt was divided into large land parcels and then assessed: how well each land parcel
performs against the purposes of the green belt as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework and whether the land parcels are subject to any other planning/development constraints before arriving at their recommendations.

4.7.4 St Peter’s Hospital was included in General Area 26 (GA26), where it is identified that there are constraints such as flood zone 3a, grade I/II* listed buildings, minerals safeguarded area, open space and steep topography covering some of the refined land parcel. However, the remainder of the area is not subject to such constraints and therefore may be more preferential for development.

4.7.5 The recommendation was that further ‘resultant land parcels’ could be identified for potential release, which could include the hospital campus as it lies outside of the heavily constrained part of GA26.

**Part Two**

4.7.6 The Green Belt Review part two complements and seeks to elaborate on part one. The review has considered only a relatively small part of the Green Belt in Runnymede, focussing on the areas of land within a specific buffer around the Borough’s settlements. The majority of the St Peter’s Hospital site is included within the 400 metre buffer around Chertsey, therefore the whole site was identified as Sub-Area 38 (SA38).

4.7.7 Each sub-area was assessed for how well it satisfied purposes 1 to 3 of the five purposes of the green belt set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF;

i. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
ii. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
iii. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
iv. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
v. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

4.7.8 A set of criteria for each of the first three purposes was set out by Arup in Chapter 2 of the Review.

4.7.9 The review established that SA38 meets purposes two and three weakly, but scores moderately against purpose one. Despite GA26 as a whole performing strongly against purpose three in the previous study, as a result of SA38’s semi-urban character and particularly high proportion of built-form, it is judged that it makes a limited contribution to this purpose.
4.7.10 Overall, it was judged “that this area plays a limited role with respect to the wider strategic Green Belt and its loss would not harm the integrity of surrounding Green Belt.” Therefore, it was recommended that SA38 “performs moderately against the NPPF purposes, but makes a lesser contribution to the overall integrity of the wider strategic Green Belt and could be considered further”.

4.8 **Open Space Study (2016)**

4.8.1 The executive summary of this study provides a useful summary of its purpose “this study defines the nature and distribution of open spaces in the Borough of Runnymede and identifies the classifications and broad locations where there is under provision, or where the quality could be improved... and makes recommendations to address trends of deficits and cater for sustainable growth.”

4.8.2 Across the borough, a total of 2570.14 hectares of open space is identified. Of the 2,570.14 hectares, 1,644.18 hectares is deemed accessible equating to over 20 hectares of open space per 1,000 population. Although, a shortfall in the Outdoor Sport Provision, Provision for Children and Teenagers and Allotments categories of open space has been identified. The provision of open space in the Borough is generally of medium to high quality, assessed against categories of accessibility; cleanliness; facilities; safety; and overall quality criteria.

4.8.3 In assessing the overall quality “across all categories of open space in the Chertsey ‘superward’ they are of a medium to high quality”. Respondents to the user questionnaire undertaken as part of this study showed that local residents use a range of each classification of open space but in particular use Natural and Semi Natural Spaces. Natural and Semi Natural Spaces in the Chertsey area are one of the classifications with a lower quality than the rest.

4.9 **Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area Supplementary Planning Guidance (Adopted 2007, Amended 2009)**

4.9.1 This document acts as a material consideration in determining planning applications. It sets out what contribution to SANGS will be required and provides a template unilateral obligation.
4.9.2 The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) was designated as an Special Protection Area (SPA) on 9 March 2005. The SPA comprises a network of thirteen Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) of predominantly lowland heathland and woodland.

4.9.3 From 1 April 2007, a contribution has been required from developers who wish to build additional properties within the zone of influence of TBH SPA (the zone of influence is a 5km straight line distance from the SPA). Specifically, since 1 May 2010, a contribution of £2,630 per net additional dwelling has been required. This money goes towards mitigation of recreational impacts from new residents on the SPA.

4.9.4 £2,000 of the collected money goes towards the establishment, improvement, maintenance and upkeep of SANGS (Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces) within the Borough. The remaining £630 per additional dwelling goes towards access management of the SPA and towards monitoring this and the effectiveness of SANGS.

4.10 Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space Survey SANGs (2012)

4.10.1 This evidence document describes the local SANGs and explores the data collected through the Council’s visitor survey. An existing SANGS is located adjacent to the main site; Homewood Park.

4.10.2 Some of the key information found in relation to this SANGS is that;

- Most visitors to Homewood Park are from the surrounding area of Chertsey, dog walkers and walkers come from nearby residential, as well as visitors from St Peters Hospital and offices within the site.
- A nature trail starts and finishes at the main car park, with the potential to extend this to link into a wider network of paths within the site.
- There is some remaining capacity within Homewood Park SANGS to accept approximately 75 people.


4.11.1 The guidance in this document is used by Runnymede Borough Council to help decide whether planning permission should be granted and if any conditions relating to trees should be attached to
any consent. It will also be used to help determine applications for permission to carry out works to protected trees.

4.11.2 In relation to decision taking it is stated that “the retention, enhancement and management of the Borough’s stock of attractive trees, woodlands and hedges will be promoted through the planning and development process”.

4.11.3 The SPG also provides advice upon acceptable designs for the integration of trees into new developments. Proposing that new developments should; “be designed to preserve trees that have amenity and/or nature conservation value, ... not place buildings close to retained trees where they may cause them damage or result in significant loss of daylight, ... [and] avoid placing large trees in small gardens where there is likely to be sustained pressure for their removal”.

4.12 Employment Land Review (2016)

4.12.1 This 2016 Employment Land Review was produced to provide a robust assessment of economic development needs across the Borough of Runnymede. The document doesn’t consider the St Peter’s Hospital site in much detail however, it does identify the Hospital as a “major non-B class employment site within the green belt” which makes a significant contribution to the local economy.

4.13 Interim Strategic Land Availability Assessment (2016)

4.13.1 The purpose of the SLAA is to help the Council identify specific sites that may be suitable for allocation for housing and/or employment development within the administrative area of Runnymede. The SLAA is a key part of the evidence base that will be used to inform the Council’s future Local Plan but does not in itself constitute planning policy.

4.13.2 148 sites were considered as part of this process including; 77 existing SLAA sites, 53 new sites following the annual call for sites exercise, 6 reserve housing sites and 12 Resultant Land Parcels (identified by independent Green Belt Review consultants for further consideration as urban developments). 42 sites are considered to meet the SLAA site criteria and are deemed suitable, available and achievable for development within the first five years of the Local Plan.

4.13.3 St Peter’s Hospital site is identified as Site 231 of the study. It was identified as a potentially suitable
site for housing delivery with the ability to deliver between 180 and 280 dwellings based upon a notional 20% release of land due to the rationalisation of the hospital site. This is based upon a minimum density of 20-29 dwellings per hectare and maximum of 45 dwellings per hectare. It is noted that “at the current time the site is occupied, albeit somewhat inefficiently by a Hospital. It is expected to come forward within one to five years of the SLAA publication.


4.14.1 The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) defines the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing, as well as considering the need for different types of housing and the housing needs of different groups within the community but does not set any housing targets.

4.14.2 The Housing Market Area (HMA) covers both Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) and Spelthorne Borough Council (SBC). The overall HMA has a housing need for 1,292 homes per annum, when divided between the local authorities; RBC requires between 465 and 535 homes per annum with the remaining 552 to 757 homes per annum needed within SBC.

4.14.3 In terms of size mix, the SHMA concludes that the table below represents an appropriate indicative mix of affordable and market homes at a HMA-wide level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>1 bed</th>
<th>2 bed</th>
<th>3 bed</th>
<th>4+ bed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>05-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.14.4 Assessment of affordable housing needs indicates that, in delivering affordable units, a HMA-wide mix target of 23% intermediate and 77% social or affordable rented homes would be appropriate.

4.15 Affordable Housing SPG (2007)

4.15.1 Although the Affordable Housing SPG is now considered to be out of date, as it was adopted a decade ago preceding the NPPF, it remains the most recent publication on this matter.
4.15.2 The document defines affordable housing as including “social rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market.”

4.15.3 Furthermore, it is established that affordable housing should: “meet the needs of eligible households including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford, determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices; and include provision for:

i. the home to be retained for future eligible households; or

ii. if these restrictions are lifted, for any subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.”

4.15.4 The expectation for the developer to work with an organisation that is registered to receive funding from the Housing Corporation is set out within the SPG.

4.15.5 On-site affordable housing provision will be required on all sites which are 0.5 hectare or larger and/or have a net gain of 15 or more residential units, on these sites at least 40% of new housing should be affordable.

4.15.6 The process for sites which are proposing less than the required on-site affordable housing the planning application needs to be ”supported by a written justification including financial records to explain the reasons why 40% cannot be achieved”. Where no written justification is provided ”it will first be made invalid, if the applicant/developer insists that such an application is made valid and registered without any justification, it is likely that such an application will be refused planning permission because the applicant/developer has failed to demonstrate that 40% on-site affordable housing cannot be provided.”

4.15.7 With regard to the layout and positioning of the affordable housing units it is suggested that they “should be ‘pepper-potted’ across the development site but with the affordable housing units sited together in groups rather than ‘pepper-potted’ as individual units across the development site”.

4.16 Car Parking Standards SPG (2001)

4.16.1 Once again, this SPG is now significantly out of date however it remains the most RBC publication regarding car parking standards. The standards define the normal maximum requirements for car parking spaces acceptable to RBC. It is stated that “only in special circumstances at the discretion
of Borough Council may they be exceeded. It is however not considered that this would be applicable on many occasions”.

4.16.2 The St Peter’s Hospital redevelopment comprises a mix of uses each with their own applicable standards, in this scenario it is established RBC agree that the maximum parking provision for each land use should be assessed separately.

4.16.3 The defined standards which relate to each of the proposed uses on the St Peter’s site are summarised here;

- The standard provision expected for residential parking is detailed in the table below,

- Hospital parking standards are defined as one car park space per four members of staff, plus one car park space per three daily visitors. Additionally, a minimum of one cycle space per 100m² is required.

- The retail and café parking standards for small scale developments equate to one car park space per 30m² floor space.

*Figure 2: District parking standards*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>Standard Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Bedroom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Bedroom</td>
<td>1.5-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or More Bedroom</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plus, for flat development (except for the elderly and sheltered housing) a minimum of 1 cycle space per 150 sq m gross floorspace

4.16.4 General guidance such as requirements for disabled parking bays, motorcycle parking and cycle parking is also provided.

4.17 **Surrey County Council Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (2012)**

4.17.1 In addition to the RBC Car Parking Standards SPG, Surrey County Council (SCC) has its own guidance which although still a little out of date, having only considered the draft version of the NPPF, is still much more in line with current national policy.

4.17.2 The standards provided in this document remain like that of the RBC SPG however, crucially for
hospital uses “individual assessment/justification” is given as an alternative option to should the maximum standards not be an accurate representation of the demand.

4.17.3 Additional guidance for use class C3 elderly accommodation is illustrated as “1 car space per 1 or 2 bed self-contained unit or 0.5 per communal unit or individual assessment”.

4.17.4 More detailed recommendations for residential units is provided in Figure 1 of the document which is inserted below.

Figure 3: County parking standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Characteristics</th>
<th>Town Centre</th>
<th>Edge of Centre</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Suburban edge/ Village/Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2 bed flats</td>
<td>1 space per unit</td>
<td>1 space per unit</td>
<td>1 space per unit</td>
<td>1 space per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2 bed houses</td>
<td>1 space per unit</td>
<td>1 space per unit</td>
<td>1.5 + spaces per unit (note 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed houses</td>
<td>1 space per unit</td>
<td>1 + space per unit (note 1)</td>
<td>2 + spaces per unit (note 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 + bed houses</td>
<td>1 space per unit</td>
<td>2 + spaces per unit (note 1)</td>
<td>2 + spaces per unit (note 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.18 Infrastructure Needs Assessment Stage 1A and 1B Report (2017)

4.18.1 To inform the development of the renewed Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which forms part of the Emerging Local Plan evidence base, an initial Infrastructure Needs Assessment (INA) was produced in February 2017.

4.18.2 The INA summarises the current position of healthcare provision in the borough; “hospital care in Runnymede is provided by the Ashford and St Peter's Hospital NHS Foundation Trust. St Peter’s Hospital (near Chertsey) is situated in the Borough. A masterplan for the redevelopment of parts of the St Peter’s hospital is currently in place and works will be undertaken over the Plan period.”

4.18.3 In reference to the previously approved masterplan for the hospital site, the INA states that “the cost of the works at St Peter’s Hospital are unknown, however it is understood that funding would be by the Hospital Trust. There are no other projects for new or expanded acute physical healthcare provision or acute mental healthcare in the current pipeline.”
4.18.4 The future demand for hospital provision is RBC is modelled within this document and “indicates that demand for hospital floorspace over the Local Plan period is estimated as 4,576 m² to 6,442 m² (£22.4M to £31.6M) depending on the growth option”. Mental healthcare demand is modelled separate as “is estimated to be 2,431 m² to 3,422 m² (£7.8M to £11.0M) depending on the growth option”.
5.0 Regulatory Compliance

5.1 Consultation

5.1.1 Section 61W of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by virtue of S122 of the Localism Act 2011) requires consultation to be carried out if it is so specified in a development order. The only applicable order is the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 which only relates to wind turbines. No local development order has been made which requires consultation to be carried out.

5.1.2 Nevertheless, the Council still encourages this practice. In this case, a voluntary consultation exercise was undertaken in April 2017 with public drop-in events held on 26 and 27 April. The full results of this are detailed in the Statement of Community Involvement.

5.2 Environmental Impact Assessment

5.2.1 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is the process for establishing the environmental effects where direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed development on the following factors;

- population and human health
- biodiversity, with particular attention to species and habitats
- land, soil, water, air and climate
- material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape
- the interaction between the factors referred to above

5.2.2 The proposed development was screened under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. This set of Regulations have since been replaced by the 2017 Regulations of the same name. However, the old Regulations continue to have effect where the screening opinion was made within the relevant period.

5.2.3 The proposed development was confirmed as not being EIA development by way of letter of 17 May 2017.
6.0 Analysis

6.1 Principle

6.1.1 The application site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt and is additionally identified as a major developed site in the green belt under the provisions of Local Plan policies GB1 and GB10. Most forms of development are regarded as inappropriate in the green belt and are generally be resisted unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Some limited forms of development may be regarded as acceptable - these include the redevelopment of existing major developed sites that have been allocated in the development plan.

6.1.2 Policy GB10 of the plan provides specific criteria. Namely:

- have no greater impact on the purposes of the green belt land than the existing development,
- contribute to meeting the objectives of green belt uses
- not exceed the general height of the existing buildings
- “not occupy a larger area of the site than the existing buildings (unless this would achieve a reduction in height which would benefit visual amenity)”
- new buildings are located having regarding to existing openness of the green belt, other landscape features, and integration into the surroundings
- be part of a comprehensive scheme
- not give rise to off-site infrastructure problems

6.1.3 As has been noted, the Runnymede Local Plan is now substantially out of date and certain policies may not be regarded as being completely in-line with NPPF provisions. The wording of the current green belt policy is not significantly at variance with the current thrust of the NPPF although it contains significantly more detail than in this national policy document. The precise wording is more in line with the since rescinded PPG2 (Green Belts) under which the 2001 plan was made.

6.1.4 Runnymede is continuing to progress its replacement Local Plan. Significant documents related to this planning application include Parts 1 and 2 of the Green Belt Review (2014 and 2017 respectively) and Additional Sites and Options Consultation. In conjunction, these three documents considered the continuing relevance of the green belt designation insofar as it related (inter alia) to
the St Peters Hospital site.

6.1.5 To all intents and purposes these documents are recommending that the green belt notation relating to St Peters Hospital be removed. However, these all constitute evidence base documents and in order for the site to be formally regarding as being excluded from the green belt, this would have to be tested through the impending Local Plan and review process. This has not occurred yet, nevertheless these evidence base documents are a sound indication of the policy landscape affecting St Peters Hospital in years to come. They remain an important material consideration particularly given the technically expired status of the only adopted development plan document.

6.1.6 Nevertheless, it cannot be disregarded that the site remains within the green belt and any development proposed that does not comply with the provisions of Local Plan policies GB1 and GB10 will have to demonstrate very special circumstances in order for it to be considered acceptable.

6.1.7 In this case, it is considered that very special circumstances do exist. These are explored in more detail below however can be summarised as:

- Disposal of the west site is essential to ensure re-investment in St Peters Hospital such that it may continue to provide exceptional levels of care to local residents
- Failure to dispose of the west site in good time would result in the potential loss of this significant source of funding therefore undermining the hospitals ability to cater for its patients in the longer terms
- It would enable the provision of additional key worker accommodation which further enhances the hospitals functionality and goes some way to address the considerable staff shortfalls experienced at St Peters and the country as a whole
- The current direction of policy travel is to release areas of ‘under-performing’ green belt land that do not contribute to the purposes of this designation
- To provide new homes in an area with a substantial shortfall in housing provision
- Similarities between this scheme and the extant (and part implemented) 2010 masterplan which has already approved development over much of the site

6.2 Hospital need

6.2.1 St Peters Hospital occupies an approximately 31 hectare site. It presently employs around 3,993 people (including vacant positions and Runnymede BMI) and serves a population of around 344,670 people. This population base falling within the CCG is spread across substantial parts of northern
and western Surrey and takes in the entirety of the population Woking and Spelthorne Boroughs, the majority of Runnymede, half of Elmbridge and a small part of Surrey Heath.

6.2.2 By 2035 the population of the CCG area is projected to rise by 68,215 people to 412,975. This is based upon current housing led population projections which are largely being reflected in current and emerging development plan documents across the County.

6.2.3 This level of growth needs to be accommodated at the hospital. Under current standards, an additional GP is required per 1,800 population plus 1.96 acute beds and 1.96 mental health beds per 1,000 population. This results in a need for 38 additional GPs and 134 of each type of bed to 2035.

6.2.4 This additional accommodation will need to be provided for through the creation of new hospital floorspace. Based on current floorspace use it infers a requirement for an additional 30,000 square metres (net) to 2035. Due to hospital constraints and build requirements, all clinical hospital accommodation must be provided for within a single interconnected building. That is to say all patients and staff must be able to access all areas of the hospital internally to maintain clinical integrity. Some of this area has already been identified - specifically the new acute care unit (area B) and upgrades and refurbishment to the Abraham Cowley Unit (note, this is not shown on the masterplan as the works will be internal only and therefore not require planning permission). Further expansion is allowed for and will likely either occur over the site of temporary buildings (buildings 43 and 44) and/or as extensions into the current ramp car park partly over the present site of buildings 40 and 41.

6.2.5 Although it is expected that the funding for this expansion can partly be secured though S106 or CIL contributions from housing growth; this may not be able to fully fund all the required improvements.

6.2.6 As noted, the St Peters Hospital campus is very large. Current government guidance encourages individual NHS Trusts to divest themselves of under-used land holdings. This is in the interest of minimising maintenance burdens and to recover capital value from surplus land. This provision is caveated however as such disposals should not undermine the ongoing viability of hospitals nor reduce their ability to provide adequate healthcare in future.

6.2.7 Meanwhile, other non-clinical hospital outpatient care should be provided for in the most appropriate locations. Examples of this include drug and alcohol rehabilitation, mental health and wellbeing centres. These types of service are often more appropriately dealt with in high street
locations which are more easily accessed by their users, particularly where this may occur on a weekly (or more frequent) basis. This is especially true of St Peters Hospital which is not positioned in an optimum location for frequent repeat trips particularly given the relatively infrequent provision of public transport links.

6.2.8 St Peters Hospital is also located in a very expensive area of the country in which to live. An average two bedroom house in Runnymede Borough would cost approximately £1,500 per month in mortgage repayments (assuming a £20,000 deposit). This is well out of the reach of most nurses and healthcare assistants.

6.2.9 In addition to this, the NHS is presently suffering recruitment difficulties. St Peters Hospital has an ongoing shortfall of some 460 staff (covering administration and all levels of clinical care). The hospital works to overcome this issue, often by recruiting foreign healthcare workers and nurses from places such as eastern Europe and Asia. These foreign born professionals will frequently be unable to afford reasonable rented accommodation in the area and in any case, will often be unfamiliar with the area to which they are relocating.

6.2.10 To overcome this issue, the hospital presently provides a variety of staff accommodation on the site. These comprise:

- Parklands - a complex of 23 three and four bedroom shared houses
- Silverlands - a complex of 44 one, two, three and four bedroom houses and flats and one hall of residence
- Greenlands - a complex of 90 two bedroom flats

6.2.11 This accommodation is presently provided by the registered social landlord - Optivo and is split across three parts of the hospital (as can be seen on the building identification plan (areas 20, 32 and 34)). Greenlands is a relatively new and modern complex of purpose built flats. However, Parklands and Silverlands date from the 1960s and do not offer high quality accommodation.

6.2.12 As part of the package of measures to enhance the hospital’s attractiveness and promote staff recruitment and retention it is intended to enhance, upgrade and expand this staff accommodation. This will result in the redevelopment of the Silverlands and Parklands complex with the latter being expand to link in with the existing modern accommodation at Greenlands.

6.2.13 All clinical elements of hospital care are presently provided within the main hospital complex which is set towards the eastern and central sections of the site. This can be seen on the buildings
identification plan. Much of the west site is presently comprised of older, detached buildings which predominantly deliver non-clinical care (Hayworth House, the CAMHS Base Building and Lake House), provide administrative services (such as archives, the estates office, transport depot and supplies) or are otherwise derelict and unused. These buildings are not suited for modern clinical care, occupy a large area of under-utilised land and in many cases are in a poor state or repair or completely derelict.

6.2.14 As such, it is intended to dispose of this area ‘the west site’ and to promote its development for open market residential purposes. The capital receipt from this disposal will then be re-invested into upgrades of the current hospital accommodation in addition to providing funding for the development of the new Accident and Emergency unit within an extended Prince Edward Wing.

6.3 Green belt

6.3.1 The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt and is also annotated as a major developed site within the green belt. There is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the green belt although these controls are moderately less restrictive in the context of the major developed site.

6.3.2 Under the provisions of the Runnymede Local Plan limited infilling and redevelopment will be permitted in accordance with a comprehensive scheme. This is generally subject to the following criteria. Schemes, in summary, should:

   a) have no greater impact on the green belt land than the existing development,
   b) contribute to meeting the objectives of green belt uses
   c) not exceed the general height of the existing buildings
   d) not occupy a larger area of the site than the existing buildings
   e) new buildings are located having regard to existing openness of the green belt
   f) be part of a comprehensive scheme
   g) not give rise to off-site infrastructure problems

6.3.3 The St Peters hospital site presently contains around 101,734 square metres of floorspace. This is accommodated in building which are typical one or two storeys in height however some structures reach four floors. Existing buildings on the west site and Silverlands which are to be demolished
extend to 22,961 square metres. These buildings are predominantly a mixture of single storey and two storey structures with heights generally not exceeding around 8 metres. A full breakdown of the floorspace areas are given as part of the buildings identification plan schedule.

6.3.4 The proposed development of the west site and Silverlands is projected to create a floorspace of around 55,000 square metres. The new acute care wing, car park, workshop will create around 17,000 square metres of additional floorspace. Buildings would predominantly have two storeys however some elements of some buildings may reach three or four storeys in height. It is therefore apparent that the resultant development will have a greater impact on the openness of the green belt than the existing development.

6.3.5 The site is presently a largely developed piece of land featuring a wide variety of building types and forms. Current buildings to be removed over the west site have a floorspace of around 25,000 square metres (with a further 4,000 to be lost at Silverlands). Buildings to be demolished range from relatively modern purpose built hospital buildings such as Hayworth House to early 20th century buildings such as Lake House and the Parklands development from the 1960s. Not all of the site is developed with noteworthy areas being left to natural regrowth particularly towards the west and north.

6.3.6 The proposed scheme would lead to an increased prominence of the built form across the site. The floorspace, footprint and height of buildings would increase across parts of the site. However, as is illustrated on plan (Ref: 150593_STL_XX_00_DR_A_XXXX_PL_16), the general pattern of new buildings are broadly in accordance with the siting of existing buildings on the site. The retirement village does appear to be a new element projecting into the open countryside however this has been deliberately modelled around the present siting of the walled garden so as to not provide completely new built form in this area.

6.3.7 This general approach ensures that the envelope of new buildings does not significantly extend the overall built form into the green belt. The re-use of the siting of existing buildings also allows for substantial screening vegetation to remain and further screen the new buildings from wider ranging views across the countryside.

6.3.8 Indeed, it is unlikely that there will be any significant views into or across the site from anywhere outside the application site. This is with the limited exception of areas which must be cleared to provide the new accesses and from some limited areas of higher ground within Homewood Park.
6.4 Relationship to Masterplan

6.4.1 A comprehensive masterplanned scheme was permitted in 2010 which envisioned the complete redevelopment of the west site together with substantial extensions to the existing hospital complex. The permission has been part implemented through the submission of various reserve matters applications. These include Chertsey House and the two deck car parks at the Abbey Wing and Maple Ward.

6.4.2 It is no longer intended to implement this planning permission in full - indeed it would be impossible to do so given that a significant proportion of the masterplanned scheme would occupy the same site area. However, this planning permission does indicate the willingness of the Council to grant permission for works to enhance the viability and operational effectiveness of the hospital. The masterplanned scheme incorporated an extension to the accident and emergency unit together with the provision of additional key worker accommodation. These elements remain similar to those that are presently proposed.

6.5 Very special circumstances summary

6.5.1 As has been covered in section above, St Peters Hospital provides medical care to a significant proportion of the population of north and west Surrey. It is the major healthcare provider for the area and is duty bound to provide additional facilities and services as a consequence of population growth over the next 20 years. It is essential that the hospital can fund these services.

6.5.2 The capital receipt from the disposal of the west site would be used almost exclusively to fund the construction of an acute care wing as an extension to the accident and emergency unit together with the refurbishment of the Abraham Cowley Unit. The former is shown on the masterplan. Any residual funding would be reserved for further expansion of the hospital.

6.5.3 Without this funding it remains uncertain where the additional funds for the acute care unit wing would be sourced from. The implications are that in the medium to longer term, that the hospital would not be able to offer an adequate standard of care to cater for the residents within its area.

6.5.4 The hospital presently suffers from difficulties in recruiting and retaining staff. Although this is not an uncommon phenomenon for an NHS Trust, this is more acute for St Peters due to its location within an exceptionally expensive part of the country in which to live. The hospital runs on a
permanent basis with staff shortages and is consistently striving for ways in which to fill this recruitment gap.

6.5.5 One manner which has been employed for many years is to provide staff with accommodation at a reduced rate on the site. This assists in encouraging healthcare assistants, nurses, junior doctors and administrations staff to relocate here. The present offering of accommodation is of varying quality with Silverlands and Parklands now being around 50 years old and no longer fit for modern purposes. Part of the development of the west site will enhance this offering by extending the recently completed Greenlands part of the site and providing 156 new bed spaces in 72 purpose built flats. The Silverlands part of the site would be completely redeveloped to provide a total of 180 bedrooms within 72 flats.

6.5.6 This provision of an increased number of more modern dwellings would greatly assist the hospital in maintaining staffing levels by providing a wider choice of accommodation.

6.6 Housing land supply and green belt policy status

6.6.1 Runnymede Borough’s most recent Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN) suggests that between 466 and 535 new dwellings are required per annum in order to address overall housing need. This is taken from the November 2016 Strategic Housing Market Assessment and covers the period 2013-2033. It also shows a slightly greater number of dwellings need to be provided within the neighbouring Borough of Spelthorne. This trend is similar to other neighbouring authorities within the sub-region. Most particularly this affects other comparable Boroughs who have limited land remaining that is not already nearly fully developed within the existing built-up limits or otherwise designated as being part of the metropolitan green belt.

6.6.2 The NPPF requires local planning authorities to identify sufficient land to meet their housing requirements unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

6.6.3 The most recent annual monitoring report indicates that the Council has been unable to meet, or indeed, often even approach these figures, primarily due to the constraints imposed by substantial parts of the Borough being designated as green belt. The table below shows the number of completions per annum over the past eight years. As can be seen, even using the most recent and
highest figures, this still falls well short of the required dwelling provision to meet OAN needs.

6.6.4 The Borough has not made an assessment of its own housing land supply situation and has not developed its plan to a point where housing projections can be confidently modelled moving forward. However based upon past performance and future requirements it is estimated the Borough has between 1.8 and 2.1 years worth of housing land available.

6.6.5 The St Peters Hospital site offers the opportunity to provide 402 (net) new dwellings representing around 5% of the expected dwelling requirement for the Borough over the entire plan period. Given the significant shortfall in housing land supply exhibited by the Council it is submitted that the opportunity to provide these additional dwellings on an existing major developed brownfield site represents an important very special circumstance that the authority needs to take account of.

6.6.6 Indeed, the Council has already been making progress in this direction. The recent Parts one and two of the Green Belt Study for the Borough assessed a multitude of sites within the green belt and assessed their potential contribution to the five purposes of including land within the green belt. The culmination of this was a comprehensive assessment of multiple key sites across the Borough that presently fall within the green belt and whether they could be released in order to deliver additional housing land.

6.6.7 Part two of the Green Belt Study observed that the sites Peter’s Hospital site meets Purposes 2 and 3 (to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment) weakly, but scores moderately against Purpose 1 (to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas).

6.6.8 The wider parcel was identified as “performing strongly against Purpose 3, preventing encroachment into a broader area of open, unspoilt countryside. However, as a result of its semi-urban character and particularly high proportion of built-form, it was judged that it makes a limited contribution to this purpose, both locally and in terms of the wider strategic Green Belt (given its relatively high level of self-containment). Additionally, while the sub-area makes up a sizeable part of the wider gap between Chertsey (Chertsey South) and Lyne, it is judged that it makes a lesser
contribution in strategic terms as a result of its lack of openness and strong functional alignment with the wider settlement of Chertsey. The highly developed and self contained feel of the sub-area also diminish its overall contribution to Purpose 1 at the strategic scale.”

6.6.9 The study concluded that “overall, it is judged that this area plays a limited role with respect to the wider strategic Green Belt and its loss would not harm the integrity of surrounding Green Belt.”

6.6.10 These results were reflected in the 2017 Additional Sites and Options Consultation (ASOC) which introduced the St Peters Hospital site as one with potential for deletion from the green belt. Although this remains a consultation document it is expected to be taken through into the Local Plan review and formally proposed for deletion from the green belt.

6.6.11 This would change any future assessment of development of the site. If adopted, it would no longer require very special circumstances to be demonstrated in order to justify development.

6.7 Housing provision

6.7.1 The proposed scheme incorporates a variety of dwelling types and tenures. These range from one bedroom apartments to four and five bedroom houses. The full specification of dwelling types is listed in the table below.
Figure 5: Schedule of accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed apartments</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed apartments</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed houses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed houses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ bed houses</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total open market</strong></td>
<td><strong>212</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed retirement apartments</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed retirement apartments</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total retirement</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable (key worker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed apartments</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed apartments</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed apartments</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total affordable</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>472</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figure does not take into account net loss of existing affordable units

6.7.2 The affordable housing provision being offered in this case is not ‘normal’ affordable housing. The affordable housing provision in this case is inextricably linked to the case the hospital are making for the redevelopment of the site. The housing would be offered at an affordable rate (approximately 80% of market cost) for rent and would primarily aimed at employees who work at the hospital. The accommodation would for rental only and would come in a variety of options depending on individual tenant preference.

6.7.3 Three types of accommodation would be provided. One bedroom units would be available for singles or couples to occupy as an independent unit. Two bedroom en-suite units would be available for occupation by singles or couples sharing whilst four bedroom en-suite units would be available for multiple people to share. All the units would be offered at affordable rents in accordance with the NPPF definition i.e. subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80% of the local market rent.
6.7.4 The accommodation would be let primarily to on site employees but would operate a cascade system whereby first priority would go to hospital staff. If the accommodation remained unfilled this would then cascade down through varying levels with other key workers being on the 'second tier' before reaching the general nominations list at the lowest level as is detailed below:

**Priority 1:** Healthcare Worker – any person employed by any health service body and / or a self employed person working in the National Health Service; and / or any person working for a public / private organisation providing services to the National Health Service; and / or any student nurse or midwife or any other medical or healthcare student.

**Priority 2:** Keyworkers – means any person working or engaged in work with a public sector body or similar organisation (other than a Healthcare Worker) and who provides services that are essential for the continuing sustainability of the local community and local economy and such organisation or person shall include:

- The social services
- The fire service
- The police service
- The teaching / education services
- The prison service and the probation service
- Publicly funded transport
- Any other organisation or body operating in the public sector previously approved in writing by the NHS Trust (such approval not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed) or:
- Any organisation or body (whether or not operating in the public sector) previously approved in writing by the NHS Trust (such approval not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed);

**Priority 3:** Other – means any potential tenant who is not a Healthcare worker or a Keyworker and may be a referral (not a nomination) or a direct applicant. Such applications to be dealt with in the following priority order:

- from another Registered Provider or similar organisation
- from the local housing authority, not a nomination but, for example, someone signposted to the scheme by the local authority
- any person requiring rented accommodation in the locality

6.7.5 It is accepted that this type of affordable accommodation does not fit with current national or local
guidance insofar as it is restricted to rental only and is largely ring-fenced to key workers, especially those connected with the hospital.

6.7.6 The NPPF defines affordable housing as “social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.”

6.7.7 Local Plan policy defines affordable housing as “encompassing both low cost market and subsidised housing (irrespective of tenure, ownership - whether exclusive or shared - or financial arrangements) that will be available to people who cannot afford to occupy houses generally available on the open market.”

6.7.8 However in this particular instance, it remains a fundamental component of long term hospital viability as ensuring sufficient staffing levels is essential, especially in this extremely high demand and expensive area.

6.7.9 A significant proportion of hospital staff would be unable to afford suitable accommodation in the vicinity and new staff may well be strongly discouraged from relocating to this area without the offer of some affordable accommodation. Moreover, any person already in the area and seeking accommodation would otherwise have to go onto the general needs housing register. By providing homes on site, the scheme is actually offering a more sustainable alternative as new residents will be guaranteed to be located in very close proximity to their place of work. This would almost certainly guarantee that these residents would walk to work which reduces the need to travel and reliance on cars or public transport.

6.7.10 To all intents and purposes the affordable accommodation being provided at this site is de facto providing additional affordable housing from the general needs list. This is by reducing demand from hospital staff who would otherwise have to obtain affordable accommodation via this route.

6.7.11 There would be no other limits placed on the type of person who may occupy the affordable homes (subject to compliance with the categories listed above). Residents may remain in homes for the duration of their careers. Alternatively, the below market rents would hopefully allow for residents to save for a deposit on a home in the local area. This type of approach would be fully supported by the Trusts as it would encourage long term staff retention at the hospital which remains a core objective of this scheme.
6.7.12 In terms of overall percentage provision of affordable housing, this figure varies depending on the interpretation and method of calculation. Runnymede’s current requirement (under the 2007 Affordable Housing SPD) is for 40% provision of affordable housing. This scheme comprises:

- 30.5% affordable accommodation (ignoring the loss of existing affordable accommodation through redevelopment)
- 40.5% affordable (ignoring the loss of existing affordable accommodation through redevelopment and excluding retirement accommodation)
- 19% affordable (accounting for loss of existing affordable accommodation)
- 26.6% affordable (accounting for loss of existing affordable accommodation and excluding retirement accommodation)

6.7.13 Clearly, in this case, the scheme only complies with the 40% requirement when calculated as a gross figure and excluding retirement accommodation. However, the purpose of the whole St Peters scheme is to ensure the ongoing future viability and adequate funding for the hospital. Additional affordable accommodation could be provided on the site. However this would reduce the amount of funding available to go back into the upgrade and enhancement of the hospital.

6.7.14 Depending on the level of affordable accommodation desired by the planning authority, this would have a knock-on effect on future healthcare provision. Therefore, whilst parts of the west site could be given over to affordable housing provision of a more varied nature (i.e. including low cost market housing and social rented for general needs), this would impact upon the amount of funding to put back into the hospital. In turn this would impact upon healthcare provision across the CCG area.

6.7.15 As has been mentioned, the fundamental purposes of this planning application is to enable development of the hospital to meet the needs of current and future residents of the Borough. Indeed, it is an essential component of the applicant’s case that this represents a significant argument in the very special circumstances to justify this scale of development in the green belt.

6.7.16 In terms of the type of accommodation to be provided across the whole site, the Runnymede Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2015) details the optimum mix of dwelling types to fulfil local demand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>1 bed</th>
<th>2 bed</th>
<th>3 bed</th>
<th>4+ bed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>05-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: SHMA estimated housing need by dwelling size (%)
6.7.17 The dwelling mix provided across the site broadly complies with the optimum dwelling mix specified in the SHMA. This is with the exception of three bedroom units (both market and affordable). It also does not factor in the provision of retirement accommodation.

6.7.18 The lack of three bedroom affordable dwelling types is due to the unique nature of the accommodation being provided in this instance. This has been selected based on the ‘typical’ type of tenant who is expected to occupy the homes. Most commonly these types of people are expected to be younger singles and/or couples who are likely to prefer one and two bedroom flats. There are also expected to be a high proportion of foreign born workers; predominantly single people who are liable to prefer the four bedroom flats. Some of these residents may also be likely to be starting young families and therefore having the option to move into a 2 bedroom flat that would be suitable for one or two young children is also an option.

6.7.19 Although it is recognised that three bedroom affordable dwellings are in demand across the Borough, the demographics of this scheme have been tailored for the needs of the specific residents. Therefore there is an increased prevalence of two and four bedroom units that would not normally be proposed. It is considered that given the nature of the scheme. This balance is appropriate.

6.7.20 The open market dwellings also feature less than the optimum level of three bedroom homes. This is in part due to the provision of retirement accommodation which do not have a demand for this number of bedrooms. However it is also due to the necessity to make the development highly viable and deliver the best possible financial return such that the proceeds can be reinvested in the hospital. This remains a cornerstone of this planning application insofar as the redevelopment of the west site is an essential component of ongoing hospital viability argument. Reducing the number of the higher yielding four and five bedroom units has a significant impact on the overall scheme performance and therefore reducing this type of accommodation impacts future healthcare provision.
6.8 **Design and layout**

6.8.1 The scheme has been designed so as to deliver a high quality living environment to all new residents across the site at the same time as minimising the impact on flora and fauna on the site.

**Area A - West site market housing and retirement village**

6.8.2 This area features a mixture of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses and flats together with a retirement village. This element has been deliberately separated from the remainder of the hospital complex. It does not feature any direct access to the hospital (with the exception of pedestrian and cycle routes). It is segregated from the hospital by retained trees and landscaping with substantial elements having a green backdrop onto Homewood Park, new and improved public green spaces internally.

6.8.3 The market homes centre around a village green with many key internal circulation routes leading to this area. The village green is located win this position to retain a number of important protected trees which will enhance the amenity value of the area.

6.8.4 The retirement village is to be constructed on the site of the present walled garden and will follow its general line and pattern. If elements of the walled garden can be retained they will be however given the condition of this wall this may be unlikely. Between the retirement village and the remainder of the market housing an ecological balancing area would be provided to mitigate habitat loss elsewhere on the site. This are would also double as informal outdoor amenity space.

6.8.5 The majority of buildings across the west site would be two or three storeys in height with a few small limited elements rising to four storeys in order to provide articulation and interest. The height of buildings within the existing and retained elements of the complex are shown on (Robs plan).

**Area B - Acute care wing**

6.8.6 The acute care wing would be constructed as an extension to the existing accident and emergency wing. This scheme remains in outline however it occupies the same location as parts of the approved masterplan scheme. The building would be three storeys in height in order to link in to adjoining buildings. This would cover an area presently used as a car parking area.

**Area C - Greenlands 2**

6.8.7 Greenlands 2 would be formed as an extension of the existing Greenlands development to the east
and would ultimately replace the siting housing at Parklands. This area would form the first phase of the development of the site, initially providing replacement accommodation for Parklands and eventually Silverlands. It would comprise of 72 flats and would be split:

- 24 one bedroom flats (24 bedrooms)
- 30 two bedroom flats (60 bedrooms)
- 18 four bedroom flats (72 bedrooms)

6.8.8 The buildings themselves would be constructed over three storeys and feature a mixture of gabled and hipped ends to the blocks. The frontages would be constructed of a mixture of blue/grey and red brick with feature panels around the windows. The roofs would be grey tiled.

6.8.9 This element of the development is located directly off Holloway Hill and the principal access to the site passes through this area. The entrance would be formed by an approximately 9 metre wide entrance road (with a road width of 5.4 metres). A U-shaped block would close off the far west of this area with five further blocks broadly arranged round a retained area of mixed vegetation. The density of this area stands at 86 dwellings per hectare.

6.8.10 A total of 90 parking spaces plus 5 disabled bays and 90 cycle storage bays would be made available for this area. This level of provision equates to one parking and one cycle space per one or two bedroom flat and two parking/cycle spaces per two bedroom flat.

6.8.11 This element does require the removal of a number of trees and other undergrowth. Although there are few significant trees in this area, this dense cluster does provide a rich habitat which is proposed to be mitigated elsewhere on the site. It also allows for a pleasing outlook from the new homes whilst retaining a sufficient distance apart that there would not be undue overshadowing to habitable rooms.

**Area D - Silverlands**

6.8.12 Silverlands would be entirely demolished and current residents re-housed over the expanded Greenlands site. Like Greenlands 2 it would also feature 72 new flats in the following ratios:

- 12 one bedroom flats (12 bedrooms)
- 36 two bedroom flats (72 bedrooms)
- 24 four bedroom flats (96 bedrooms)

6.8.13 The buildings would be of a similar style to those at Greenlands however would feature buff bricks
under tiled roofs. Again, a mixture of hips and gables and feature elements that break the eaves line break up the bulk of these buildings.

6.8.14 The site is not connected to the adopted road network and would be accessed via the hospitals internal road network. The scheme would be arranged around an S shaped access road with the buildings largely facing a central courtyard area at a density of 70 dwellings per hectare.

6.8.15 96 car parking spaces would be provided plus 5 disabled bays and 96 cycle spaces. As with area C - Greenlands, this level of provision equates to one parking and one cycle space per one or two bedroom flat and two parking/cycle spaces per two bedroom flat.

**Area E - new hospital entrance**

6.8.16 This area forms an extension to the current hospital main entrance at level 2. This area is presently a slightly crowded area providing some limited facilities for hospital staff and visitors including a small shop and small café. The proposed scheme includes 720 square metres (gross) of new retail floorspace which would be largely given over to an enlarged café and additional retail set around an extended front entrance. Internal to the hospital the existing café and shop would be converted back to hospital floorspace for administrative functions. Consequently, there would only be a net increase of 545 square metres of floor space.

6.8.17 At basement level (level 1) an existing, largely enclosed, undercroft area would be filled in and converted to a new staff restaurant to replace the existing facility. The new restaurant has the advantage of being connected internally to the main hospital complex allowing clinical staff to access it internally.

6.8.18 Both these elements would link into the new multi-storey decked car park in area F to the south. There is a substantial change in levels in and around this area such that the existing main entrance is set at the top of a reasonably large slope. In addition the main car park to the hospital to the south is only accessible via a convoluted route for level access or via the stairs. The new configuration (in conjunction with the new car park) would allow for simpler level access to this part of the hospital in the entrance of those limited mobility.

6.8.19 Externally, the new retail element would be finished with red and/or grey bricks to match the remainder of nearby buildings at upper floor level whilst the lower infill area would be completed with glazing. The structure would have a flat roof.
Area F - multi-storey car park

6.8.20 This area features a new six deck, three level multi-storey decked car park built on the site of the existing car parking area. A total of 702 new parking spaces would be provided within this structure to replace those lost over the west site. Due to the removal of the existing car parking area this results in a net increase of 410 parking spaces in this area.

6.8.21 The car park itself would have dimensions of 180 metres in length and 45 metres in width. Internally it would be arranged with up/down vehicle ramps internal stairwells and a central lift shaft providing level access to the main hospital entrance from level 2 of the car park. Existing through traffic to the Runnymede Hospital and main entrance access to the St Peters Hospital would be maintained by a one way circulation route.

6.8.22 The exterior of the structure would be clad with brick panelling around the steel frame.

Area G - new workshop and alterations to car park

6.8.23 The new workshop building would replace the current administrative and services facilities presently over the west site. It would be set adjacent to the existing boiler house and occupy part of the ramp car park. The building would be two storeys in height with a flat roof and be clad in profiled metal sheeting in a similar manner to the next door boiler house. Alterations to the car park would be made so as to allow deliveries.

6.8.24 Internally the building would be partly given over to two floors, and partly to a single double-height floor for the workshop area. The building would be used solely as the estates office, a general workshop and also for the site based offices for Optivo.

6.8.25 Other parts of the ramp buildings have already been approved for demolition which is expected to occur in January (prior to the expected determination of the planning application). These are proposed to be converted to additional vehicle car parking to replace areas lost over the west site.

Areas H, I and J - buildings with temporary permissions

6.8.26 Chertsey House plus Maple and Abbey car parks are all presently required to be demolished by 2025 due to a condition imposed on their reserved matters approval. No alterations are proposed to these structures however their retention in perpetuity is sought. Further details are included as part of application (2).
6.9 Impact on neighbours and new resident’s amenity

6.9.1 The overwhelming majority if the site is well removed from neighbouring homes such that the development is unlikely to have an impact upon their outlook, cause overlooking or create any additional noise or disturbance.

6.9.2 However, elements of area A (the west site) is in fairly close proximity to a number of properties addressing Stonehill Road on the opposing side of the street. Additionally, Ivy Cottage on the same side as St Peters Hospital is in fairly close proximity to elements of the retirement village and parking area.

6.9.3 Fairview Cottage, Little Orchard and 1 and 2 Garden Cottages along Stonehill Road all have aspect towards the new retirement village. The boundary treatment to the hospital is not expected to change dramatically as this is presently separated by a 2-3 metre high wall with tree screening behind. The new retirement village would be constructed behind this area but due to the vegetated boundary and the distance separating these areas, there should be no increases in overlooking or concerns through loss of outlook. Shadow diagrams indicate no overshadowing to these properties with the exception of morning at mid-winter however due to the inclination of the sun at this time shadowing is largely unavoidable.

6.9.4 Ivy Cottage remains the closest property to the application site and adjoins the hospital site on three sides. The development of the retirement apartments over the site of the walled garden and Greenlands 2 are in closest proximity to this neighbour.

6.9.5 The proposed scheme has been deliberately designed to minimise impact upon this neighbouring property. The nearest building forms the north easternmost corner to the retirement village which is around 20 metres away. Amenity areas and car parking are located in closest proximity to this boundary. The property remains well screened from the application site by dense mature trees both within the hospital site and on this neighbours land such that it is unlikely that any meaningful views or awareness of the resultant development at the hospital site will be noticed.

6.9.6 For the new residents of the site, buildings are well spaced apart. Some flats and houses are in reasonably close proximity to areas of dense vegetation which may result in lower light levels reaching ground floor rooms. The vegetation has generally been retained so as to allow the retention of as many trees and as much native habitat as possible on the site.

6.9.7 The area’s most significantly affected are the ground floor flats of blocks D and E in area C -
Greenlands 2 where the fairly mature vegetation may obscure southern sunshine. However, residents of these blocks will be given the opportunity to select their homes and may choose between having ground floor flats with pleasant leafy views or upper floor flats with more sunshine. This would allow differing residents the opportunity to choose which they prefer. Moreover, all flats in these blocks have multiple aspects allowing light to enter the homes from varying aspects.

6.10 Car Parking

6.10.1 The amount of car parking across the site is detailed on the car parking identification plan and listed in the car parking identification schedule. The whole site presently provides 2,037 non-residential parking spaces. There are an additional 272 residential parking spaces associated with the existing Silverlands, Greenlands and Parklands housing areas.

Non-residential (hospital) parking

6.10.2 Current Runnymede parking standards for hospitals require 1 parking space per 4 members of staff and 1 parking space per visitor. The hospital (including the private Runnymede Hospital) presently has a staff of 3,993 people (although this does include 460 vacant positions). It treats, on average, 1,621 people per day. This generates a requirement for 998 parking spaces for staff and 540 spaces for visitors (total 1,539 required spaces).

6.10.3 The hospital therefore presently demonstrates an excess of parking provision of around 492 parking spaces. During peak times (typically weekdays), this is often insufficient due to the hospitals location which is outside of walking distance for the overwhelming majority of staff and patients given that it serves areas across and beyond the Borough boundaries. Moreover, the public transport infrastructure to connect the site to its catchment is of a low standard (typically buses on the hour only) and often will not provide a direct link.

6.10.4 The disposal of the west site will result in the loss of 954 parking spaces. To replace these, it is sought to construct a new multi-storey, three level, six deck car park over the site of the main public car park (area F and car park A12). This would provide an additional 410 parking spaces. Following the demolition of the ramp buildings, the ramp car park would be extended to provide a further 82 parking spaces (allowing for reconfiguration to provide the new workshop building with this car park).
Overall, 856 new parking spaces would replace those which have been lost. This is summarised in the table below and a differing breakdown is in Figure 9 offered overleaf which shows the distribution of parking between staff and visitors, together with projections moving forward to 2035.

Figure 8: Non-residential parking provision
(to be read in conjunction with car park identification plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car Park Number</th>
<th>Existing non-residential Spaces</th>
<th>Spaces lost from redevelopment</th>
<th>Spaces gained from redevelopment</th>
<th>Net position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>2037</strong></td>
<td><strong>954</strong></td>
<td><strong>856</strong></td>
<td><strong>1939</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Visitor/staff and existing/proposed parking provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use and parking standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Proposed + 20% growth to 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people</td>
<td>Required spaces</td>
<td>Actual spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff @ 1 space per 4 staff</strong></td>
<td>3993</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor @ 1 space per 3 visitors per day</strong></td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined staff + visitors</strong></td>
<td>5614</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail @ 1 space per 30m²</strong></td>
<td>175m²</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>1563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.10.6 Although the hospital presently over-provides by around 492 parking spaces, this would reduce as a consequence of the redevelopment to an over-provision of 394 parking spaces.

6.10.7 For the purposes of this assessment, it has been assumed that the facilities which are being relocated off-campus would, in time, be made up for through the provision of the new acute care wing together with a more intensive use of current hospital floorspace - particularly within the refurbished Abraham Cowley unit.

6.10.8 During construction of the multi-storey car park there is expected to be notable displacement of parking provision. This is expected to occur across the winter of 2018/19 and will be managed through the implementation of a park and ride scheme between St Peters Hospital and Thorpe Park.

**Residential parking for Greenlands 2 and Silverlands**

6.10.9 There is a slight difference between the parking standards provided by the Borough and County, however County standards are considerably more up-to-date than those given in the Borough’s expired SPD.

![Figure 10: Residential parking standards](image)

6.10.10 The level of provision for Greenlands 2 and the redeveloped Silverlands is listed below. As can be seen, this broadly complies with both Councils required standards.
Residential parking for the west site

6.10.11 As this element in is outline form only, detailed parking provision breakdown is not given, however space has broadly been allowed for to offer the required standard of parking spaces for each home. The parking provision is to be made off street in dedicated driveways and garages for houses and in shared courtyards for the apartments circling the village and green and those units within the retirement village.

6.11 Highway impacts

6.11.1 Vehicular access is proposed from a new junction onto Holloway Hill and an improvement to the existing simple priority junction onto Stonehill Road. As part of the proposed vehicle access strategy,
the existing hospital access into the site from Guildford Road will be closed to vehicle traffic.

6.11.2 Pedestrians and cyclists will be able to access the proposed development via the proposed vehicle access on Holloway Hill and the improved access on Stonehill Road. In addition, although the existing hospital access to the south will be closed for vehicle traffic, it will remain open for pedestrians and cyclists. This will provide pedestrians and cyclists with a direct route to pedestrian and cycle infrastructure on Guildford Road and key local amenities and facilities. This connection has the key benefit of providing a shorter journey for pedestrians and cyclists when compared to vehicles travelling to/from the site via accesses onto Holloway Hill and Stonehill Road. This should encourage trips to be undertaken on foot and by cycle. In addition to the main pedestrian and cycle accesses, two pedestrian accesses will be provided into Homewood Park to the west of the site.

6.11.3 The proposed development will result in a net reduction in AM arrival vehicle trips and PM departure vehicle trips. The proposed development will result in a net increase in AM departure vehicle trips and PM arrival vehicle trips. This pattern is generally reflected for trips associated with non-car modes of travel.

6.11.4 As expected, given the site access strategy, the greatest development impact is at the Guildford Road/Holloway Hill junction. Given the 2027 background traffic flows, the level of impact from the proposed development is considered to be minimal.

6.11.5 As discussed with SCC during scoping discussions, where highway capacity improvements are required, it is considered that the most effective means of delivering capacity improvements is to provide a financial contribution towards schemes identified in the INA.

6.12 Trees and ecology

6.12.1 Comprehensive ecological and tree surveys have been carried out across the application in areas which are affected by development proposals. The full reports of these are incorporated as part of this planning application but main findings are summarised below.

Trees

6.12.2 Large parts of the site are covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (TPO244/93). This is a group TPO predominantly covering multiple trees although certain individual high quality specimens have been identified.
6.12.3 The scheme has broadly been designed to retain as many trees as possible with the layout having been designed around those of the highest quality and trees which provide a demonstrable screening benefit for both future residents and neighbours alike.

6.12.4 Specifically, the village green has been located in an area with various high quality species. This area connects with parkland and ecological balancing area with a short stretch of road which utilises significant trees to stand out as a feature and mark waypoints within the scheme. To the south east and south west of the west site are groupings of high quality trees. These have also been retained so as to cushion the new built form from the open countryside beyond.

6.12.5 To the north of the Greenlands and part of the walled garden is an expansive tree belt of mid scale or lower quality trees. This has also been retained to minimise the impact of the development on Holloway Hill which otherwise has the appearance of a semi-rural to rural lane.
Ecology

A wide variety of species were recorded across the site. Notable species which were recorded on the site included a single record of a grass snake, numerous native species of birds, bats, badgers and hedgehogs. The site contains various instances of invasive species including parakeets, rhododendron and Japanese knotweed.

6.12.6 The site was mapped during the course of the surveys to indicate differing habitat areas that supported differing types of native and invasive species. Areas of highest ecological potential were, as far as possible, kept clear of the developable area. However, in some instances these areas needed to be the subject of development for site access and ownership issues.

6.12.7 Where areas of higher ecological value are proposed to be disturbed, appropriate mitigation has been designed into the scheme which includes the new parkland area to the south of the walled garden/retirement village.

6.13 TBHSPA mitigation and SANGS

6.13.1 The site falls within the TBHSPA and therefore any dwellings will have to provide appropriate mitigation. The Runnymede site capacity analysis study notes at 3.51 that “whilst the [St Peters Hospital] site is large enough to provide its own SANG, there is already a SANG to the west of the site at Homewood Park. As such, given the proximity of an existing SANG to the site, SANG provision will be met off site.”

6.13.2 Notwithstanding the above, as noted in the study, the St Peters site can provide mitigation areas to the north, south and eastern parts of the campus. A walking trail can be provided through this area which could link into Homewood Park. Although parts of this walking trail would pass through residential areas in small parts it would offer a much elongated route with easy pedestrian access for other residents of Chertsey and new residents of the hospital site. This could be undertaken in conjunction with off site mitigation at Homewood Park as appropriate.

6.13.3 If this solution is not considered acceptable, contributions can be made to enhance the SANG at Homewood Park.
6.14 Emissions and air quality

6.14.1 An emissions survey has been carried out to assess the impact of emissions from the boiler house using a D1 test. The D1 calculation using the background mapping concentration gave an indicative stack height of 15 metres suggesting that (based on this worst case screening tool) the flue would need to be raised by 4 metres as a result of the proposed neighbouring development.

6.14.2 Additional, more detailed, surveys may indicate that this height level is not required and conditions are invited which require either an increase in stack height or further detailed modelling. In any case, it has demonstrated that suitable mitigation can avoid a detrimental impact on the new homes. The full report forms part of this planning application.

6.15 Heritage

6.15.1 The site does not feature any statutorily listed buildings. The Council’s mapping indicates that there are two locally listed buildings on the application site:

- The ice house - a partially subterranean 19th century cold store
- Barn to Botley Park - this structure burnt down in the 1990s

6.15.2 The ice house is located to the south west of the current walled garden and will be retained as part of the parkland area. A detailed reserved matters submission will consider its precise integration with this area.

6.15.3 The barn which was associated with Botley Park burnt down in a fire in the late 1990s and is no longer present on site.

6.15.4 There are three statutorily listed buildings near the application site. These comprise:

- Anchor House - grade II listed house from the 18th century.
- Botley’s Mansion - grade II listed former stately home now used as a wedding venue. Originally formed part of St Peter’s Hospital when it started life as a mental institution.
- Ivy Cottage - grade II listed timber framed cottage dating from the 17th century.
6.15.5 The closest of these, Ivy Cottage, is set approximately 20 metres away from the nearest building (which forms part of the retirement village). Intervening screening would be maintained and would not disrupt views of the Ivy Cottage which in any case presents towards Holloway Hill on its principal elevations. Other listed buildings are set too far away for the proposed development to have a notable impact upon their setting.

6.15.6 An archaeological desk based assessment supports this application and confirms that impacts are likely to be minor across the site subject to appropriate mitigation.

6.16 Flooding and drainage

6.16.1 The majority of the site is located within the lowest risk areas for flooding (flood zone 1). Some areas to the south and east of the site are located within flood zones 2 and 3 however no development is proposed in these areas. A flood risk assessment and surface water drainage report support this planning application.

6.16.2 The report concludes that in flood risk context, the proposals are safe and appropriate and do not cause increased flood risk and that there are feasible solutions for the discharge of the surface water generated by the site.
7.0 Summary and conclusions

7.1 Summary

7.1.1 The proposed scheme comprises the redevelopment of the west site to provide 328 new open market homes (including 116 retirement apartments). Two areas of current key worker accommodation for hospital staff would be redeveloped to provide an increased number of better homes and enable a higher rate a recruitment and retention at the hospital.

7.1.2 The disposal of the west site would predominantly fund the construction of new acute care unit to be created as an extension to the current ASPH accident and emergency wing. It would also fund improved mental health facilities through a comprehensive refurbishment of the SABP Abraham Cowley Unit. Any residual funds will be put towards further expansion to meet the total 30,000 square metre (net) projected floorspace requirement to 2035.

7.1.3 As a consequence of the relocation of services and loss of parking, a new multi-storey car park would be formed to the south of the main hospital complex. This would link into the hospital via a new front entrance complete with enhanced retail and café offering to improve the patient and visitor experience to the hospital. Other improvements include the provision of replacement workshop facilities, reconfiguration of the 'the ramp' car park area and retention of some buildings in perpetuity which are presently required by the Council to be demolished in 2025.

7.1.4 The scheme overall has been designed taking into account the functional needs of the hospital, the necessity to create an attractive environment for new residents whilst minimising impacts on trees and wildlife on the site.

7.2 Conclusion

7.2.1 The proposed development has been carefully conceived to deliver multiple objectives for the benefit of the residents of Runnymede. It incorporates:

- The disposal of a large area of land that is no longer fit for modern clinical purpose
- Rationalisation of hospital land holdings reducing overheads and maintenance burdens
- Re-investment in hospital facilities to help provide high quality healthcare into the future
• Provision of key worker homes for the benefit of staff to aid in ongoing recruitment and retention

• Provision of new open market homes to assist in Runnymede’s significant shortfall in housing land

7.2.2 It is recognised that the land is located within the metropolitan green belt however the significant benefits outlined above are considered to outweigh any harm to the openness of the green belt. In any case, the future direction of green belt policy travel is for removal of sites that do not contribute to the purposes of including land within the green belt and evidence base studies indicate that the St Peters Hospital campus performs poorly in this regard.

7.2.3 Securing the disposal of the west site swiftly will ensure that the funding released from this sale will be exclusively re-invested in St Peters Hospital. Delaying the sale until the next financial year (2018/19) will result in the funding released from the disposal will have to be shared with other CCGs across the County undermining the plans for enhancements to the St Peters site.

7.2.4 The scheme has been well conceived to strike an appropriate balance between a viable scheme that delivers funding, taking account of the environmental and aesthetic qualities of the site. It delivers a high quality development that will benefit new residents and visitors to the hospital alike.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 General background

1.1.1 This planning statement addendum builds on and should be read in conjunction with the planning statement submitted as part of the original submission for the St Peters Hospital site. It provides additional detail and information and offers some amendments and additions to the scheme.

1.2 Summary of changes and additions

1.2.1 The core changes since the submission of the planning application include:

- Policy context (Runnymede Plan placed on consultation following resolution by full Council)
- Additional justification for very special circumstances due to development in the green belt
- Financial deliverability statement
- Additional justification for delivery of key worker affordable housing
- Amendments to plans to show building footprints
- Addition of indicative hospital expansion plans to 2037 and summary of Sustainable Transformation Plan
- Revisions to layout of Greenlands 2 to retain additional trees
- Provision of section plans across Greenlands 2 and boiler house and workshop
- Update to infiltration testing and provision of flood risk assessment relating to MSCP
- Additional information on staffing numbers and staff movements (onto/off site)
- Highway responses to Surrey County Council and Highways England
- Clarification of SANG and SAMM provision with Natural England
- Clarification on other agreed S106 contributions (education, police infrastructure)
2.0 Summary of policy changes

2.1 Context

2.1.1 Since the submission of the original planning application, Runnymede Council have published their emerging Local Plan covering the period to 2030. This Plan is still in its very early stages and can only be afforded limited weight as it has not been through the consultation process and has not been submitted for examination.

2.1.2 However, it is a clear expression of the Council’s direction of travel in a policy context. It has been ratified by full Council and benefits from the support of elected members. The weight attached to it must also be balanced against the Council’s current development plan. Specifically, the current Local Plan is now approximately 17 years old and does not necessarily accord with current policy guidance. Moreover the Council is not believed to be able to demonstrate a five year land supply thus additionally rendering its housing policies out of date in accordance with paragraph 49 of the NPPF.

2.2 Emerging Runnymede Local Plan 2030

2.2.1 In preparation for submission of the Local Plan for examination the Draft Local Plan has been published for public consultation over the period of six weeks from Thursday 11 January to Thursday 22 February 2018.

2.2.2 The spatial strategy for Runnymede is defined as “to continue to focus development in the Borough’s existing urban areas over the period of the Local Plan. Given however the significant level of housing need which exists in the Borough, as evidenced through the Runnymede-Spelthorne Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), it is evident that there needs to be a step change in housing delivery in Runnymede. This step change can only be achieved through the release of a number of sites from the Green Belt on adoption of the Local Plan and allocating them to meet identified housing (and employment) needs.”

2.2.3 The policies most relevant to the proposed development are;

- SD1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development – indicating a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF.
SD2: Spatial Development Strategy – sets out provision for a minimum of 7413 net additional dwellings over the plan period including 1950 net additional dwellings in Chertsey itself.

SD3: Site Allocations – denotes the sites allocated within the local plan in line with the SLAA document. Site 231 comprises the application site which is allocated for residential led development incorporating a minimum of 400 net additional units to be delivered between 2019 and 2022.

SD4: Active and sustainable travel – support is to be given schemes and development proposals which enhance the accessibility and connectivity between people and places by active and sustainable forms of travel.

SD5: Highway Design Considerations – the Council will support development proposals which maintain or enhance the efficient and safe operation of the highway network and which take account of the needs of all highway users for safe access, egress and servicing arrangements.

SD6: Infrastructure Provision & Timing – relates to the Infrastructure Deliver Plan (IDP) and meeting the infrastructure needs of new developments.

SD8: Sustainable Design - Development proposals are encouraged to; incorporate measures for the secure storage of cycles waste, protect existing biodiversity, maximise opportunities for passive solar gain, incorporate active electrical vehicle charging points, achieve water efficiency of 110 litres per person per day in residential schemes and provide wheelchair adaptable and wheelchair accessible dwellings.

SL13: Housing Allocation at St Peter’s Hospital, Chertsey – This policy allocates the application site for development as per the following policy text;

"The St Peter’s Hospital allocation comprises 12.1ha of land sitting within the larger 31.7ha Hospital Complex which is released from the Green Belt in its entirety. The 12.1ha housing allocation is set over two parcels of 11.1ha to the west of the hospital complex and 1ha to the north east with the hospital retained.

Both sites are expected to come forward within the period 2015-2020 and will deliver a high quality development that will:

a. Make provision for a minimum of 400 net additional C3 dwellings;

b. Take account of TPO244, site boundary vegetation in the design, layout and landscaping of the site especially the boundary vegetation to Homewood Park; This will need to be
demonstrated and implemented through an appropriate landscaping strategy;

c. Through provision of landscaping and boundary vegetation provide net gains in biodiversity; This will need to be demonstrated through appropriate habitat/species surveys and implementation of management plans;

d. Provide a financial contribution towards the provision of a community hub building and associated infrastructure at Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams rather than providing or contributing to outdoor sports facilities and allotments contrary to Policy SL26; Runnymede Draft Local Plan 2015-2030

e. Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network as identified through a site-specific Travel Plan and Transport Assessment exploring opportunities for the site(s) to provide a link between the A320 off road cycle route and Holloway Hill/Stonehill Road and contribute to the delivery of any measures identified in the A320 feasibility study.;

f. Make a financial contribution(s) towards the provision of early years, primary and secondary school infrastructure either through S106 or CIL (or its successor);

g. Avoid impact to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA through an approved scheme of mitigation which makes provision for the delivery of SANG and a financial contribution(s) towards SAMM;

h. Provide access points into the Homewood Park SANG from the western parcel of land;

i. Provide or contribute to any other infrastructure identified at application stage which is necessary to make the site acceptable in planning terms.

It should be noted that an ordinary watercourse runs through the site which could present a flooding risk. This should be addressed in the Flood Risk Assessment which would be expected to be submitted with any planning application at the site. The potential for an ecological buffer to be provided around the watercourse will also be expected to be explored and implemented where it is feasible to do so.”

• SL19: Housing Mix and Size Requirements - Development proposals of 10 or more (net) additional dwellings will be required to generally provide a housing mix as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment or any similar evidence for market and affordable units. Minimum space standards for certain unit types are also illustrated within this policy.

• SL20: Affordable Housing - Development proposals of 11 or more (net) additional dwellings will be expected to provide 35% of dwellings as affordable units with a tenure split of 80% Affordable/Social Rent and 20% Intermediate/discounted market housing. Where viability
evidence demonstrates that the full amount of affordable housing cannot be delivered the Council will negotiate a level of on-site affordable housing that can delivered taking into account the mix of unit size, type and tenure and any grant subsidy received.

- SL23: Accommodating Older Persons and Students – supports the provision of specialist accommodation for these resident groups, subject to listed criteria.
- SL26: New Open Space - The Council will require residential developments of 20 dwellings (net) or more to provide new or enhanced provision of open space in accordance with the standards set out below:
  - A 1.6 hectares per 1000 population for outdoor sports facilities
  - 0.8 hectares per 1000 population for provision for children and teenagers
  - At least 20 standard size allotment plots (250sq metres per plot in size) per 1000 households or where this is not possible, provision of an alternative such as community gardens or similar.

In exceptional circumstances, it may not be possible to make on-site provision for open space. Where it has been demonstrated that it is not feasible or viable to provide on-site provision, off site financial contributions to improve the quality of existing Council owned open spaces within a reasonable proximity to the development site as highlighted by the most up to date local accessibility standards will be considered as mitigation.

- EE1: Townscape and Landscape Quality - Whether within the Borough’s urban areas or Green Belt, development proposals will be expected to achieve high quality design while making efficient use of land, taking account of their impact at the earliest opportunity.
- EE2: Environmental Protection – Provides detail upon noise, air quality, land contamination and light considerations.
- EE8: Locally Listed and other Non-Designated Heritage Assets - Development will be required to preserve the character and significance of locally listed and other non-designated heritage assets, their setting and any features of architectural or historic interest.
- EE10: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area - All additional residential development (including strategic allocations) beyond the 400m Special Protection Area exclusion zone, but within 5km of the Special Protection Area boundary, will need to put in place adequate measures to avoid and mitigate potential effects on the Special Protection Area. These must be delivered prior to occupation and in perpetuity and agreed with Natural England.
• EE11: Green Infrastructure - The Council will seek to avoid further habitat fragmentation of Green Infrastructure by encouraging development proposals which restore, maintain and enhance habitat connectivity,

• EE17: Infilling or Redevelopment on Previously Developed Land in the Green Belt – “With regard to proposals for infilling or redevelopment on previously developed land in the Green Belt, the following considerations will be taken into account in determining whether there would be any greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development:
  
  • Lawful status of existing buildings and any hardstanding;
  
  • General height and storeys of existing and proposed buildings and their disposition around/within the site;
  
  • Existing and proposed floorspace and footprint;
  
  • Existing and proposed hardstanding;
  
  • Existing and proposed development envelope and amount of undeveloped areas;
  
  • Relationship with existing landscape features and integration with surroundings including space within and around the development particularly close to boundaries and views from within and outside the site;
  
  • Phasing of proposed development including any demolition proposed.”

• EE19: Change of Use of Land in the Green Belt - Proposals for changes of use of land may not be inappropriate development per se but the change of use should have no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing use.

2.2.4 In summary, the emerging policy with the Local Plan 2030 is supportive of the proposed scheme as explicitly demonstrated by the allocation of the site within policy SL13. Additionally, it is recognised throughout the plan, that in order to meet the required housing need for the Borough, Green Belt releases will have to be part of the spatial strategy.
2.3 Exceptional Circumstances Supplementary Planning Guidance

2.3.1 The purpose of this additional guidance is to set out the factors that the Council considers amount to the ‘exceptional circumstances’ needed to justify amendments to the Green Belt boundary within the Emerging Local Plan 2035.

2.3.2 In summary, these circumstances are considered to be;

- The heavily constrained nature of the Borough;
- The need for housing - to provide land to achieve the full OAN and to meet identified needs for gypsies and travellers;
- To ensure that the Green Belt boundary is defensible and logical in the light of changes which have occurred since drawing the Green Belt boundary in 1986;
- To allow for growth at St. Peter’s Hospital; and
- Inability of other local authorities to assist with meeting any unmet housing needs from Runnymede

2.3.3 Further detail about each of these circumstances is provided below.

The heavily constrained nature of the Borough

2.3.4 In the ‘Planning for the right homes in the right places’ consultation, Runnymede was identified in the top 6% of Local Authorities in England with the highest amount of constraints covering the Local Authority’s land area (including Green Belt, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Sites of Specific Scientific Interest).

2.3.5 79% of Runnymede is designated Green Belt, generally speaking Green Belt policy operates to prevent built development in the Green Belt unless it falls into one of a small number of accepted categories or is justified by “very special circumstances”.

2.3.6 Runnymede is classified by the Environmental Agency as a top 10 flood risk Local Authority in England with over 5000 properties at risk in a 1% annual probability flood event.

2.3.7 A significant part of Runnymede lies within the zone of influence of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), forming of a Natura 2000 site designated in 2005, which is protected under European Community Wild Birds and Habitat directives.
2.3.8 In addition to the adjacent Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, Runnymede contains a number of internationally, nationally and locally important nature conservation sites as well as areas of ancient woodland, which covers almost 315 ha of the borough. The Borough contains five Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a number of Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) and Local Nature Reserves which together cover almost 1000ha of the Borough. These designations restrict development potential.

2.3.9 The Borough contains a range of open spaces covering a number of categories including parks and gardens, allotments, cemeteries and churchyards which are spread across the Borough.

2.3.10 Furthermore, the Borough contains areas of grades 1 and 2 Agricultural Land which is considered to be a significant constraint to development.

2.3.11 In Runnymede there are a range of waste and mineral designations which cover large swathes of the Borough. Development sites in such areas are unlikely to be available for development until minerals have been worked.

2.3.12 The above paragraphs show that there are many constraints which restrict development in the Borough. The Borough has an area of 7,803ha of which 6,136ha is located in the Green Belt (79%). This leaves 1,667ha of the Borough remaining in the Urban Area (21%). However, within the Urban Area, 393ha (24%) is located in flood zone 3. When other significant constraints to development (including waste and mineral designations, SSSIs, ancient woodland, open spaces and SANG) are also considered, the area of the Borough’s urban area which is considered suitable for development reduces to 1156ha (this means that in total, approximately 31% of the Urban Area benefits from significant constraints to development). All of these factors combined means Runnymede is only able to deliver 2099 homes in its urban areas over the period of the Local Plan.

The need for housing (including pitches and plots for gypsies and travellers)

2.3.13 The Strategic Housing Market has identified the objectively assessed level of need for housing in Runnymede is 498 dwellings per annum. As outlined above, there are numerous constraints which limit the capacity of the urban area to meet the Objectively Assessed Need for housing. Over the next 13 years of the Local Plan, an annual average of 161dpa is anticipated to be delivered in the Borough’s existing urban areas. This represents just 32% of the Council’s identified housing needs.

2.3.14 The great majority of existing traveller sites in the Borough (both authorised and unauthorised sites) are currently located in the Green Belt. This is considered to be unsurprising given the limited
amount of available land in the Borough’s urban areas and competition with higher value land uses such as market housing.

To ensure that the Green Belt boundary is defensible and logical in the light of changes which have occurred since drawing the Green Belt boundary in 1986

2.3.15 Following the completion of the Arup Green Belt Review, a Technical Review of the current Green Belt boundaries was undertaken by the Council. This review was undertaken to consider and, where appropriate, make any minor amendments required to make the Green Belt boundary more logical and/or defensible.

2.3.16 Amendments to the existing boundary line in the technical review have been made for the following reasons:

- Where the availability of more detailed geographical information has highlighted minor discrepancies.
- To follow natural boundary, property or OS lines where the existing GB boundary is illogical/less defensible.
- Where the boundary is not now appropriate or logical following post 1986 development.

2.3.17 In addition to the above, it is considered a relevant factor that the way that villages washed over by the Green Belt should be dealt with differs in the NPPF from previous guidance in PPG2. The Council is proposing the removal of Thorpe Village from the Green Belt following assessment against paragraph 86 of the NPPF.

The need for growth at St Peter’s Hospital

2.3.18 The exception needs document specifically addresses the subject development site stating that: “Following discussions with the Clinical Commissioning Group, it has been advised that in order to accommodate growth anticipated in Runnymede and the wider St Peter’s Hospital Catchment over the period of the Local Plan and beyond, St. Peter’s Hospital will need to expand. In order to achieve this, an element of enabling development is required through the release of public sector land for housing led development on the western part of the existing hospital campus to fund improvements and expansion of the hospital on the remainder of the hospital site. Therefore, the Council considers that exceptional circumstances exist to release this site from the Green Belt and to allocate it within the Local Plan.”
Inability of other local authorities to assist with meeting any unmet housing needs from Runnymede

2.3.19 No Local Authority partner has shown a willingness or ability to meet any unmet housing needs from Runnymede. As such there are considered to be exceptional reasons to amend the Green belt boundaries in Runnymede-to ensure that Runnymede can meet the great majority of its identified housing needs.
3.0 Analysis and commentary

3.1 Updates and plans to address information requirements

3.1.1 This package includes various information updates and amended plans. These are detailed comprehensively below and discussed further in the below sections where relevant:

3.1.2 Revised plan PL11 revision D by Stride Treglown. This plan now includes an indicative location for the potential site of new hospital wings. These buildings are located to the north east of the proposed accident and emergency wing and would replace a cluster of temporary buildings which are already at or near the end of their operation lifespan. A larger wing would be constructed to the south west of the accident and emergency extension within the ramp car park which would be cleared of remaining buildings. In total, these buildings could provide approximately 30,000 square metres of floorspace. This meets the potential requirement to provide accommodation to 2037 in accordance with the Sustainable Transformation Plan (explored further below). Note permission is not sought for this element of the scheme at present and it is shown for illustrative purposes only. It may be revised as a consequence of changes to hospital practices, demographic change and medical advances.

3.1.3 Revised plan PL16 revision B by Stride Treglown. This now shows the full extent of buildings footprints and areas where buildings are to be located. It illustrates that the walled garden footprint would largely be replaced by the retirement village.

3.1.4 Additional plan SPH-B-18-001 by NHS showing cross section across the existing boiler house and proposed workshop. The plans show that the new workshop building would be no higher than the existing boiler house.

3.1.5 Additional plan 5320-P126 by Churchill Hui. This shows sectional elevations east-west and north-south across the existing Greenlands and proposed Greenlands 2 development. From ground level the proposed buildings would be largely the same as the existing buildings although due to them being located on lower ground they would be a slightly lower overall height.

3.1.6 Revised site plan 5320-P101B by Churchill Hui. This has repositioned the two bin/cycle stores within the site and rearranged the parking layout. This arrangement now retains trees T144, T151-155. Although none of these trees are high value specimens they do benefit from some group value. It is further hoped that T147 may be retained through the repositioning of parking spaces however
due to its proximity to the road this may not be viable. All trees are oaks. The resultant layout creates two general areas in the amenity space, one in an area defined by the parking spaces and newly positioned bin/cycle stores which features vegetation. A rough L-shape to the south and east would be more open and suitable for sitting out without significant shadowing from trees.

3.1.7 Plan SK40 – updated tree survey and accompanying report.

3.1.8 Flood risk assessment and surface water infiltration test results by MLM. This responds to issues raised by the Local Lead Flood Authority and Environment Agency.

3.1.9 Financial statement by Colliers – this shows that the development of the west site as proposed is the only way to deliver sufficient capital receipts to fund hospital expansion and that any other quantum of development would not deliver adequate returns. It notes that all elements of this project (hospital expansion, capital release of funds, key worker housing, service rationalisation and car parking) are intrinsically linked.

3.2 Section 106 information

3.2.1 Confirmation has been received from Surrey and Sussex Police that contributions of £31,095 for police infrastructure is acceptable.

3.2.2 Confirmation has been received from Natural England that SPA mitigation can take place via contributions through SANGS and SAMM.

3.2.3 The education authority has not responded to requests to confirm education contributions. The applicant nevertheless agrees in principle to make education contributions.

3.2.4 The applicant is still in discussion with the highway authority regarding highway contributions, on and off site mitigation works. The applicant has agreed in principle to provide certain works and contributions.

3.2.5 The applicant agrees in principle to provide contributions towards a community hub building at parcel A Bittams Lane. In the alternative, the NHS are willing to offer use of the postgraduate education centre which is typically unused/vacant during afternoons and evenings.
3.3 Surrey Heartlands Sustainability and Transformation Plan

3.3.1 The Surrey Heartlands Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) sets out the goals, objectives, resource requirements and deliverability of health services across the Surrey Heartlands region. This includes St Peters Hospital. The STP states:

Surrey Heartlands serves 850,000 people with a combined health revenue allocation of £1bn and combined social care and public health budget of £328m. Compared to national distribution, Surrey Heartlands has a much larger population aged 40 – 65 and 75+. Over the next 10 years the number of people aged 85+ will go up by 36% and by 2025 more than 20% of the population will be aged 65+.

NHS-funded care in the Surrey Heartlands area is commissioned and delivered by multiple organisations. This complexity has in the past inhibited efforts to tackle the significant challenges faced by the local health and social care system – demographics, workforce and infrastructure. Our opportunity, working as a STP footprint, is to address these challenges as a system, enabling us to achieve ‘more than the sum of the parts’. This will also require a change in how we are held accountable as individual organisations.

At the heart of our STP is a commitment to work together as a system to transform public services and secure consistent, sustainable, high quality physical and mental health and care for the people of Surrey Heartlands for the long term.

Since June we have achieved commitment to take forward a number of well defined, practical programmes of joint working to fulfil our ambition. This is supported by a strong track record of collaborative delivery on the ground.

We have also started a deliberative programme of public engagement to involve citizens in defining the priorities and trade offs we will apply to achieve this service transformation, within the resources available locally. Devolution will enable full integration with Surrey County Council, integrating health and care delivery with the wider determinants of health in our population and realising the benefits to health of contributing to the macro-economics of the local landscape to deliver maximum public value.

If we deliver this plan, we will have instituted consistent pathways and standards of care in each of the disease areas that most affect local people, supported by a scaled up prevention strategy involving all public services. We will have ensured there is an integrated model of proactive support.
for people with multiple complex health and care needs at locality level, which is not impacted by organisational boundaries. We will have developed a sustainable, motivated and high quality workforce that is able and enabled to work across organisational boundaries, integrating health and social care and physical and mental health care at the point of a person’s need. We will have optimised the value of our physical assets and support workforce to minimise duplication and channel resources to the front line; and information in support of care will be seamless and available to all professionals.

3.4 Financial deliverability

3.4.1 A financial statement has been provided by Colliers. The primary issues to consider from this statement are that various models for the development of the west site were considered which included a higher and lower quantum of development being delivered, inclusion of various types of affordable housing (rent/shared ownership). Extracts of the statement are below:

Numerous financial models for the proposed redevelopment, considering the “what if” scenarios of increased and decreased densities; the inclusion of the Optivo land for private development; the provision of the open space; the retention of the various trees and ecological habitats; the car parking provision; the landscape belts around the site and the possible location of the new road junctions that will serve the site. We have considered other uses on the site; the height and location of the proposed apartment blocks and the financial efficiency of these options.

The application masterplan has been created through a long and professional master planning exercise, undertaken in consultation with the Trusts professional team and various Council Officers. We have considered the phasing of the development and the delivery of the development including the probably absorption rate for selling the completed accommodation...

... We have considered a number of alternative options to test the imposition of market affordable housing, including a change to the overall densities on the site and the mix of accommodation to test whether this mitigates the requirement for additional accommodation. We considered the addition of affordable accommodation (a mixture of apartments and houses) on the site increasing the density to calculate the impact of the additional units. We tested this with 20 units taking the density to 42 units per hectare and the percentage of new affordable accommodation to 22.8%. We also tested an additional 100 units, bringing the percentage to 35% and a density of 49.5 UPH. We also tested a reduction of the total units to achieve the required 35%, which has the effect of
reducing the total accommodation to 220 units and a density of 21.5 UPH. Finally, we considered the additional of shared ownership accommodation only and social rent only.

In all options we tested the residual value of the site decreased, in some options to a critically low level, rendering the project unviable. In all options the addition of the new accommodation required a redesign of the masterplan, with consequential changes to the cost plan. This is not a simple, straight line exercise and we have spent considerable time in testing our models.

The Optivo development delivering the new staff accommodation is also vital to the overall viability of the project, however the Trusts are not receiving a capital receipt for this land. The land being used for this element of the development is being recycled to assist with the capital projects. The benefit to the Trust is the provision of the new accommodation which will provide a huge boost to the vitality of the staff on the estate. It also assists in the ability to retain the staff for longer periods, thus reducing the day to day operational costs of the hospital.

All the elements of the project are intrinsically linked, each supports another element and if one of these elements is removed, the whole redevelopment project collapses.

3.5 **Green belt impact and very special circumstances**

3.5.1 As has been observed above, the Council’s current plan is out of date, moreover the Council cannot demonstrate a five year land supply. Current studies undertaken by the Council including the Green Belt Study undertaken by ARUP and the more recently published replacement Local Plan indicate that the direction of travel for this site is its removal from the green belt designation.

3.5.2 Nevertheless, Council planners have indicated that they consider that weight still needs to be attached to the green belt status of the site. Particular concerns have been expressed regarding the encroachment of the site to the north west around the walled garden, with issues expressed regarding the introduction of additional built form in this area.

3.5.3 However, the walled garden which the retirement village would replace is already a substantial built feature as it encloses an area of approximately 4,000 square metres with walls extending up to 3 metres in height. Part of the area for the retirement village also replaces the existing Parklands development. Overall the retirement village largely mimics the existing built form including walled garden, Parklands and other derelict buildings and cottages.
3.5.4 Nevertheless, it is apparent that the resultant development would cause some harm to the green belt, notwithstanding that this is a major developed brownfield site that features existing buildings. The proposal relies upon very special circumstances as it would facilitate the disposal of this site with the proceeds reinvested in the hospital as is set out in the planning statement.

3.5.5 The financial deliverability report referred to above shows that any other configuration of development in a lesser quantum (or indeed greater quantum) would not release sufficient funds to undertake the required expansion to the hospital.

3.5.6 The amount of development proposed for the west site is fundamental to hospital improvements. If the west site cannot be delivered in the proposed (or similar) format, insufficient funds would be released to improve the hospital in line with STP objectives. The knock on effect of this is that no improvements would be made to the hospital in the shorter term in the absence of sufficient funding. Improvements to the hospital would in future then invariably tied to higher S106 obligations/CIL payments.

3.5.7 It is accepted that this development precedes a proper and considered review of new housing allocations and green belt deletions through the Local Plan review process. However the overwhelming need for investment in the hospital is considered to be a highly significant very special circumstance that warrants a degree of harm to the green belt.

3.5.8 All recent policy documents indicate that the site is highly likely to be removed from the green belt. The only policy document that supports its retention as a major developed site in the green belt notation is the 17 year old Local Plan. This document substantially precedes the NPPF, moreover its housing policies are out of date due to the Council’s inability to demonstrate a five year land supply. The weight that can be afforded to this document is substantially reduced as a consequence.

3.5.9 In conjunction with the Local Plan review, the Council has also published Exceptional Circumstances Supplementary Planning Guidance. It highlights the difficulties faced by Runnymede due to large portions of land being designated green belt, falling within flood zones, being affected by ecological designations together with a need to provide additional homes for the Borough’s residents.

3.5.10 This document specifically references the St Peters Hospital site and states that:

3.5.11 "Following discussions with the Clinical Commissioning Group, it has been advised that in order to accommodate growth anticipated in Runnymede and the wider St Peter’s Hospital Catchment over the period of the Local Plan and beyond, St. Peter’s Hospital will need to expand. In order to achieve
this, an element of enabling development is required through the release of public sector land for housing led development on the western part of the existing hospital campus to fund improvements and expansion of the hospital on the remainder of the hospital site. Therefore, the Council considers that exceptional circumstances exist to release this site from the Green Belt and to allocate it within the Local Plan.”

3.5.12 The development as proposed has been highlighted by the NHS as the one which delivers sufficient funding to enable this improvement. Very special circumstances have clearly been demonstrated.

3.6 Affordable housing provision

3.6.1 As has been illustrated in the financial deliverability section above, inclusion of additional affordable housing will reduce the residual value of the scheme. In this instance there is a trade-off to be made between securing affordable housing and delivering improved services to the hospital. A proportion of affordable housing will nevertheless be brought forward as key worker homes.

3.6.2 The argument here remains similar to the green belt, very special circumstances argument; that providing affordable housing on the west site undermines the ability of the hospital to improve. Essentially a balancing exercise must be made which considers the benefits of providing additional affordable housing for which there is recognised need and providing healthcare improvements.

3.6.3 Providing general needs affordable housing at 35% on the whole site (disregarding the key worker accommodation already provided on the remainder) would provide 59 homes for 145 people (assuming 2.46 persons per dwelling). Conversely, St Peters Hospital serves a catchment area of 344,670 people which is set to increase to 412,975 within 20 years.

3.6.4 Clearly there is a benefit in providing affordable housing, however this can be delivered elsewhere within the Borough. Additional funds to support healthcare provision can only be delivered from the sale of the west site. In weighing the benefits that can provided through offering affordable housing to 145 people against the healthcare needs of up to 412,975 people a judgement must be reached as to which carries greater merit. It is the applicant’s submission that the opportunity to provide adequate healthcare for the residents of north west Surrey must prevail.
3.7 Key worker/affordable housing allocations cascade

3.7.1 The key worker housing would be ‘affordable’ insofar as rents would be capped at 80% market rent or 50% resident salary, whichever is the lower. No deposit is taken from residents nor are references required. Residents can move in straight away and there is no minimum or maximum period for rental.

3.7.2 At present, the key worker accommodation is available to any person who works at the hospital, not merely clinical and/or junior staff who are likely to require additional financial assistance to live in the area. This having been said, the current salary banding of existing tenants indicates that around 93% earn £30,000 per annum or less (this may vary as tenants change).

3.7.3 The length of time tenants stay at properties is highly varied. Some have been in residence for periods of up to and around 10 years, whereas equally there is quite a high churn rate with some tenants only staying in the accommodation for a few months.

3.7.4 Having regard to discussions had with the Council’s housing team, the following cascade system is now proposed. This cascade system would allow for the lower cost base to be achieved by Optivo, ensure that units were not left unoccupied for long periods of time yet also allow the opportunity for other non-healthcare related key workers to occupy the homes if required.

3.7.5 The nominations policy is therefore as follows:

3.7.6 Priority 1: Healthcare Worker – any person employed by any health service body and/or a self employed person working in the National Health Service; and/or any person working for a public/private organisation providing services to the National Health Service; and/or any student nurse or midwife or any other medical or health care student.

3.7.7 Priority 2: Keyworkers – means any person working or engaged in work with a public sector body or similar organisation (other than a Healthcare Worker) and who provides services that are essential for the continuing sustainability of the local community and local economy and such organisation or person shall include:

- The social services
- The fire service
- The police service
• The teaching/education services
• The prison service and the probation service
• Publicly funded transport
• Any other organisation or body operating in the public sector previously approved in writing by the NHS Trust (such approval not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed) or:
  • Any organisation or body (whether or not operating in the public sector) previously approved in writing by the NHS Trust (such approval not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed);

3.7.8 Priority 3: Other – means any potential tenant who is not a Healthcare worker or a Keyworker and may be a referral (not a nomination) or a direct applicant. Such applications to be dealt with in the following priority order:

• From another Registered Provider or similar organisation
• From the local housing authority, not a nomination but, for example, someone signposted to the scheme by the local authority
• Any person requiring rented accommodation in the locality

3.8 Local community facility and retail

3.8.1 The Council have requested that the development contributes a small retail facility within the estate and/or a community hub. Due to the size of the proposed residential development and its location beyond the hospital and slightly more distant than other residential areas, it is submitted that this would not be a viable addition to the site. It is unlikely to generate sufficient interest/business to make a worthwhile contribution to the site.

3.8.2 A new retail offering is proposed to the front of the hospital. This would primarily serve visitors and hospital staff. It is likely to offer a range of facilities including fresh convenience shopping. It would have direct access to the exterior of the building and likely be open beyond hospital normal day time operating hours.
3.8.3 Although it is accepted that the location of this is not the most convenient for residents of the site, it would represent a nearby retail facility that is within walking distance. It is located in close proximity to the site’s bus stop and therefore would offer the opportunity for linked trips. It is likely upgrades to the bus stop along with pedestrian and cycle routes across the site would be required by the highway authority and this could be linked to improved access to the enhanced retail offering at the hospital.

3.9 Parking provision

3.9.1 Additional clarity on parking numbers has been sought by officers of the Council. An amended table showing car parking numbers is attached. This confirms a net loss of on-site parking in the order of 98 parking spaces.

3.9.2 However as part of the redevelopment of the west site certain services are to be located off site. These are non-clinical functions which are more appropriately delivered in a more accessible town centre context, typical relating to mental health care delivered by Surrey and Borders. In total 130 full time and 50 part time staff would be relocated off-site. 300 patient visits would also be moved off site.

3.9.3 This is likely to result in a net reduction in parking demand in the order of 180 spaces thus resulting a net position where after redevelopment an additional 82 spaces would be available.

3.10 Highway impacts

3.10.1 The applicant will be issuing Highways England with further calculations shortly to demonstrate the minimal impact from the proposed development, particularly when compared to overall growth planned in the area. In addition, calculations relating to changes in traffic flows at M25J11 resulting specifically from relocation of hospital services to Chertsey. The above will be issued with a view to them removing the request for a capacity assessment at M25J11.

3.10.2 If Highways England do remove their request for a capacity assessment, no further work in relation to impacts at M25J11 should be required. However, if a capacity assessment is required this will show that the junction is over capacity at present and Highways England may seek mitigation.
3.10.3 The other point made in their consultation response relates to construction traffic. The Transport Assessment provides some general points relating construction traffic but doesn’t go into detail in terms of vehicles movements as this cannot be known until a developer is identified, contractors are appointed and a programme of works is prepared. In these situations, there would usually be a planning condition requiring a Construction Management Plan to be prepared prior to works commencing on-site. This would seem like the most appropriate way of dealing with this on this occasion. Highways England has requested more information and it has been suggested that this is dealt with by planning condition and await their feedback.

3.10.4 Surrey County Council as local highway authority have indicated that their consultation response will be forthcoming imminently.

3.11 Other consultee comments

3.11.1 Other consultees have made comments regarding the scheme. The applicant does not propose to address these in detail as they may be dealt with satisfactorily by way of planning condition, if indeed they are required at all. These include:

- Comments of archaeologist – programme of work can be secured by way of condition due to sites relatively low archaeological potential
- Contaminated land – investigation can be secured through condition(s)
- Environmental health (noise, air quality, dust) – further information to be provided by way of condition
- Ecology – further studies are already programmed in and cannot be undertaken at this time of year. Can be secured through conditions

3.12 Summary and conclusions

3.12.1 The planning application has been fundamentally designed to:

- ensure the long term viability of the hospital
• enable rationalisation and service improvements
• deliver healthcare improvements to residents of north west Surrey
• provide key worker housing to promote staff retention and reverse staff shortages

3.12.2 This is all to be facilitated through the disposal of the west site. Each component of the scheme has been finely balanced over an exhaustive process considering the financial implications of the development and the manner in which to deliver the best NHS service to Surrey residents. Any significant revisions to the scheme are likely to fundamentally undermine its purpose and potentially put an end to the entire project. In this quite realistic scenario the funding from the disposal of the west site would not be re-invested into St Peters hospital, there would be a delay in providing additional homes to meet the Borough’s housing need and no new key worker accommodation would be provided.
Surrey Future brings together Surrey’s Local Authorities and business leaders to agree the investment priorities to support the county’s economy over the next few decades and establish a list of long-term infrastructure priorities.
Foreword

Surrey is renowned for its strong economy and high quality environment of open countryside and historic market towns. It is a great place in which to live, work and do business.

However, congestion and past lack of investment in transport infrastructure are having a negative impact on Surrey’s economic competitiveness. Managing congestion on Surrey’s roads – which are some of the busiest in the country - is urgently needed to improve traffic flow and to avoid wasting time in traffic jams and losing business through delayed journeys.

Surrey Future, which brings together local authorities and businesses to agree strategic infrastructure priorities for Surrey, have developed this Congestion Programme to help ensure Surrey’s economy remains strong and that planned growth set out in local plans is managed in a sustainable way. Building on the Surrey Transport Plan Congestion Strategy (2011), it sets out a strategic programme for tackling Surrey’s road congestion problems.

We consulted with a wide range of residents, businesses and organisations during 2013 on a draft version of this Congestion Programme, and a number of changes have been made to this final version as a result of the comments we received. Those who responded broadly supported the aims and approach of the programme and we will work together with businesses, Local Enterprise Partnerships, new Local Transport Bodies and Government to help deliver our programme. We would like to thank all those who responded and contributed to making this programme as relevant and up-to-date as possible.

Local Transport Strategies are now being developed for each district and borough and there will be consultations on these during 2014.

Roberto Tambini
Chief Executive, Spelthorne Borough Council
Chair, Surrey Future Steering Board

Cllr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment, Surrey County Council
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Executive Summary

About the Congestion Programme

The Congestion Programme sets out the Surrey Future partnership’s strategic programme for managing traffic congestion on Surrey’s road network in support of economic competitiveness and growth. It has been prepared in partnership with Surrey’s districts and boroughs and other stakeholders, such as Surrey Connects representing business interests, to provide a shared and agreed vision for managing congestion on Surrey’s road network. The programme builds on the Congestion Strategy in the Surrey Transport Plan, which is the county’s third Local Transport Plan.

Changes in the way that major transport schemes are funded are coming into force. The government has announced that funding will be devolved to Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and Local Transport Bodies (LTBs) rather than decided centrally with funding available from 2015. In Surrey there are two LEPs and two LTBs covering separate geographical area. These comprise of Enterprise M3 LEP and Enterprise M3 LTB covering west Surrey and Coast to Capital LEP and LTB covering the eastern boroughs and districts. Funding available to both the LEPs and LTBs is through the single Local Growth Fund where funding will be allocated from 2015-2021.

In order that Surrey remains an attractive area for business, the programme will direct future investment in transport infrastructure. We are taking a proactive approach by identifying the necessary infrastructure required so that when funding becomes available we will be able to deliver our programme.

Congestion and its economic impacts

Congestion has many definitions but we are focusing in particular on journey time reliability as we believe this will have the greatest benefits for our businesses and residents. We know that congestion has a costly impact on the economy with congestion on Surrey’s road network being calculated to cost the UK economy £550 million every year.
Surrey’s strategic location close to London, Heathrow Airport and Gatwick Airport has made Surrey an attractive place for both businesses and residents to locate to, but the downside of this is that Surrey experiences very high traffic levels. Surrey’s motorways carry 80 percent more traffic than the average for the south east region and our A roads 66 percent more traffic than the national average. This has led to many of our roads already operating at capacity and if a traffic incident occurs such as an accident this can cause severe disruption on our roads.

**Housing, employment and population growth**

Across Surrey we need additional housing and an additional 2,600 new homes per year are currently planned along with a projected population increase of 9 percent over the next 20 years. We also expect developments outside of the county planned in Hampshire and West Sussex to come forward. These include Aldershot Urban Extension (4,000 homes), Whitehill/Bordon eco-town (4,000 homes), Broadbridge Heath (2,000 homes), north-west Crawley (1,900 homes) and East Grinstead (1,500 homes). Employment growth is forecast to grow by 11 percent over the next 20 years with the majority of this growth focused in our strategic centres. This growth will place increased pressure on our road network.

**Congestion bottlenecks**

We have looked at the current situation on our road network and have used technical highway modelling to look at where current and future congestion bottlenecks are and will occur. This information told us that areas under significant strain are:

- Guildford town centre
- A3 as it runs through the town of Guildford
- A3 between the Ripley junction and the A3/M25 (junction 10) Wisley interchange
- A245 Portsmouth Road, west of A3 Painshill junction
- A31 Alton Road on the approach to and through Farnham town centre
- M3 junctions 3 to 4
- M25 junctions 13 to 14

These areas are considered to be the most severely congested junctions and corridors in the county. However, we know that other junctions and areas are also suffering from congestion. A more detailed list of congested bottlenecks in the county can be found in Annex 2.

In addition there are some problems that we consider to have a strategic importance. The A3 is an area of significant congestion that is likely to get progressively worse and road and rail access to both Heathrow and Gatwick Airports is poor from Surrey. Although we are currently unsure of the most appropriate solution for these issues we will work with our partners to develop proposals to tackle these challenges.

**Our integrated approach to managing congestion**

Our approach to managing congestion does not solely rely on road improvement schemes but also focuses on better management of traffic on our roads and encouraging people out of their cars by providing a more efficient public transport system and better pedestrian and cyclist environments. Our strategy consists of three key elements:
• Delivering a more efficient road network
• Addressing infrastructure gaps and managing bottlenecks on our transport network
• Alternatives to car travel and behavioural change.

Our proposed delivery programme

The delivery programme below shown in Table 1 and 2 is our proposed programme of major road schemes from 2015 to 2019 and post 2019. The programme has been divided into two timeframes as we have more certainty over what funding is likely to come forward in the 2015-2019 period.

Table 1 – Our proposed programme from 2015-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epsom Town Centre package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford gyratory improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhill Balanced Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede Roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30 / A331 Corridor Improvements including Meadows Roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Arch Capacity Improvements, Woking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egham Sustainable Transport Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnham Town Centre Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Improvements, Camberley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Network Benefits Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24 Capel to Surrey boundary Corridor Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Hickey's Corner junction improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorking Town Centre Traffic Management Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiln Lane Link, Epsom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24 Clarks Green to Holmwood, Mole Valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 – Our proposed transport schemes post 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Network Improvements, Reigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Hickley’s Corner Underpass, Farnham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford A3 Strategic Corridor Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford Hub Transport Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate-Redhill Hub Transport Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staines-upon-Thames Bridge Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking Hub Transport Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrecclesham Relief Road, Farnham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are in discussion with the Highways Agency on how to deal with congestion on our motorways and the A3.

Other schemes proposed to manage congestion and address local transport issues in each district and borough are outlined in Annex 1. These will be developed through Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes.

Next steps

Following the consultation on the draft Congestion Programme in March 2013, the delivery programme has been reviewed and revised. The delivery programme will now be incorporated into forthcoming Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes produced by the county council in agreement with borough and districts councils. These will ensure that local problems as well as strategic transport issues impacting the county will be addressed.

The Surrey Future partnership has also produced a Rail Strategy for Surrey. The delivery programme and strategic transport issues highlighted in the Congestion Programme and recommendations from the Rail Strategy have been combined in a short brochure. This sets out Surrey’s key transport infrastructure priorities for the next 15-20 years which will support economic growth in Surrey, the south east and beyond.
Introduction

Surrey Future is a partnership initiative formed of Surrey’s Local Authorities and business community. We are working together to agree investment priorities for the next 15 – 20 years to ensure a strong Surrey economy. The Congestion Programme is our first strategic programme setting out transport priorities in the county for managing traffic congestion. The Surrey Future initiative has also produced in conjunction with the Congestion programme a Rail Strategy. The Rail Strategy looks to increase capacity on the rail network across Surrey.

Surrey County Council is the statutory local transport and highway authority and leads on many areas of this work. This programme has been produced with Surrey’s district and borough local authorities and builds on the third Surrey Local Transport Plan Congestion Strategy (2011). It has been informed by district and borough local plans, surveys of business undertaken by Enterprise M3 Local Economic Partnership and Surrey Connects and a Transport for Surrey major schemes workshop. By working together we are identifying the infrastructure necessary to support new development for inclusion in the local planning authority’s Infrastructure Delivery Plans.

Changes in the way that major transport schemes are funded are coming into force. The government has announced that funding will be devolved to Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and Local Transport Bodies (LTBs) rather than decided centrally with funding available from 2015. In Surrey there are two LEPs and two LTBs covering separate geographical areas. These comprise of Enterprise M3 LEP and Enterprise M3 LTB covering west Surrey and Coast to Capital LEP and LTB covering the eastern boroughs and districts. Funding available to both the LEPs and LTBs is through the single Local Growth Fund where funding will be allocated from 2015-2021.

By producing this programme the authorities in Surrey are taking a proactive approach to changes in the way transport schemes are funded. By prioritising now we will be in a position to bid for money from the local Single Growth Fund through the Local Enterprise Partnerships and Local Transport Bodies and other funding streams available to us to deliver schemes that will promote long-term economic growth and make real improvements in managing congestion.

Congestion can be defined in a number of different ways. For the purpose of this document congestion is defined in terms of journey time reliability. When a single journey is delayed by a substantial amount leading to difficulty in planning journeys and impacts upon logistics for businesses within the county.

Congestion and its impact upon the economy

The UK is more reliant on the success of the Surrey economy than any other local authority area outside London. To provide some context, Surrey’s economy was worth £28 billion in 2008 which is even greater in size than that of Birmingham, valued at £20.1 billion.

__________________________

1 ONS statistical bulletin, regional, sub-regional and local gross value added 2009
For many years Surrey has had a large, high performing economy, benefiting enormously from its close proximity to London, Heathrow and Gatwick and its high quality environment. However, Surrey and the south east economy have slipped in competitiveness. The World Knowledge Competitiveness Index (2008)\(^2\) shows that the south east of England slipped 34 places from a ranked position of 40\(^{th}\) in 2004 to 74\(^{th}\) out of 145 global regions in 2008. The region has also slipped within the European Competitiveness Index (2006/07)\(^3\) being ranked 16\(^{th}\) among the 118 European regions, down from 12\(^{th}\) in 2004. Surrey has also performed poorly in terms of direct foreign inward investment. Figures from SEEDA for 2008-09 show that Surrey’s share (12%) of all inward investment for the South East was considerably lower than counties such as Berkshire (31%) and Hampshire (22%).

One of the reasons for this fall in competitiveness has been due to a lack of investment in infrastructure provision in the county, especially in terms of transport infrastructure. Recent studies have demonstrated the need for transport investment as an enabler of economic growth and stability. This is demonstrated by a study carried out in 2010 which told us Britain’s GVA could have been increased by £1.6 billion per annum, and tax revenues could have been £750 million higher, if investment in south east transport infrastructure had been on a par with the national average\(^4\). Therefore infrastructure delivery is highly important in Surrey for the county to remain internationally competitive.

Congestion on Surrey’s local roads, trunk roads and motorways, is estimated to cost Britain’s economy £550 million per annum\(^5\). Congestion can lead to unreliable journeys where it is difficult to predict how long a journey will take. As Surrey’s road network is saturated it has little spare capacity to cope with unforeseen incidents, such as accidents, poor weather and road works. This can lead to long queues on several key roads within the county which act as a deterrent to new businesses who might locate to Surrey or, in some cases it can prompt existing Surrey businesses to consider relocating to areas with lower traffic levels. Congestion is likely to worsen in the future as the population in Surrey is predicted to grow 9 percent over the next 20 years, placing additional pressure on transport infrastructure\(^6\).

**Surrey’s transport network**

Surrey has first class transportation links, with major trunk roads running through it and an extensive rail network serving 84 railway stations. Surrey’s proximity to London, Heathrow and Gatwick Airports, and access to major arterial routes as well as frequent rail services to London and beyond, has made Surrey an attractive county both for businesses to locate to, and people to live in. This has impacted upon the considerable demand for movement within, to, from and through the county.

**Road**

---

\(^2\) Centre for International Competitiveness (2008) World Knowledge Competitiveness Index


\(^4\) Oxford Econometrics 2010


\(^6\) TEMPRO data based on ONS 2008-based population projections
The road network in Surrey comprises the Strategic Road Network (SRN), Primary Route Network (PRN) and local roads. The SRN consists of national trunk roads comprising the M25, M3 and M23, and a number of regionally significant trunk roads including the A3 and parts of the A30, A23 and A316 and is managed by the Highways Agency. The SRN has evolved principally to service London shown in Figure 1. The authorities responsible for each road category are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 – Road hierarchy in Surrey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Type</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorway</td>
<td>Motorway</td>
<td>Strategic Road Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A trunk A principal</td>
<td>Primary Route Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Distributor Road Network</td>
<td>Non-Strategic Road Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Access Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 – Surrey's transport network
Buses

The local bus network is an integral part of the transport system in Surrey. Some of the more urbanised areas of Surrey, and particularly those areas bordering London, are relatively well served by bus services. In rural areas, particularly to the south of the county, there are fewer routes and services are less frequent, many operating only hourly or at lower frequencies.

Rail

Surrey is served by an extensive rail network with 84 rail stations. Movements to and from central London are well catered for by the main London to Brighton line, London to Portsmouth / Southampton services and various secondary and branch line services. There is limited provision for orbital movement across Surrey. However, the North Downs Line connecting Gatwick and Reading via Redhill and Guildford, the Ascot-Aldershot line and the Virginia Water to Weybridge route offer opportunities to move across Surrey directly.
Housing, employment and population growth

Proposed housing growth

Future growth and development, both within and beyond Surrey, will have an impact on transport demand which, if nothing is done, could worsen road traffic congestion and journey time reliability.

New housing developments within the county have mostly been small scale rather than large strategic developments, mainly due to the majority of the county being designated as green belt. Nonetheless approximately 2,600 net additional homes per annum are currently planned for. Small scale developments will have a cumulative impact upon the transport network. However, it has been more difficult for authorities to collect contributions towards infrastructure due to the nature of development coming forward. This may be less so once the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is in place.

There are three strategic developments planned to come forward within the county. These include the former DERA site at Longcross, which will provide an additional 1,500 homes (and 80,000 sqm of additional office space), Princess Royal Barracks in Deepcut which will provide an additional 1,200 homes to the south of Camberley and Horley which will provide 2,600 additional homes. Additional infrastructure required to accommodate these developments will be sought through developer contributions. In addition to Surrey’s strategic sites coming forward there are a number of potential developments which will take place in neighbouring authorities that will impact upon the transport network within the county.

These include:

- Aldershot Urban Extension within the Blackwater Valley providing an additional 4,000 homes placing additional pressure on the A30/A331 corridor
- Eco-town development of Whitehill/Bordon providing an additional 4,000 homes (2,725 homes to be delivered by 2028) placing additional pressure on the A31 and A3 corridors
- North-west sector of Crawley providing an additional 1,900 homes placing additional pressure upon the M23
- East Grinstead providing an additional 1,500 homes placing additional pressure on the A264
- Broadbridge Heath in Horsham providing an additional 2,000 homes placing additional pressure on the A24 and A281
- North of Horsham providing an additional 2,500 homes placing additional pressure on the A264 and A24.

Housing growth is also proposed in Greater London and is set out within the London Plan. This growth may also contribute to additional pressure on Surrey’s road network.

---

7 Based on Local Plan figures
Proposed employment growth

Surrey's past employment growth has been varied with the highest percentage growth in employment found in the boroughs and districts of Guildford, Waverley and Mole Valley. Surrey’s future employment is forecast to grow by 11 percent over the next 20 years from 2012 to 2031 (see Figure 2). Employment growth for this period is expected to be 15 percent around Heathrow Airport increasing the need for better transport links to the Airport. The forecast employment growth will place additional pressure on our road network.

Figure 2 - Forecast employment change 2012-2031

External to Surrey, in Hampshire the borough of Rushmoor (Farnborough and Aldershot) and the Thames Valley (Bracknell Forest, Windsor and Maidenhead and Slough) are expected to grow by more than 15 percent by 2031. This is likely to increase pressure along the A331 corridor and other roads on our network. There is also employment growth in Greater London with growth expected at 11 percent by 2031 equating to 400,000 new jobs.

Looking forward, much of the new commercial floor space in Surrey will be focused in the strategic centres identified in Figure 3 or result from the redevelopment of strategic employment sites. The DERA site at Longcross will provide significant new employment opportunities by supplying an additional 80,000 sqm of additional office space to the north of the M3. The 2011 census data shows that 69 percent of journeys to work are made by car. If this stays the same then the additional growth in employment is likely to place additional pressure on our transport network.
Commuting patterns

Surrey had a total of 517,500\(^8\) jobs in 2011. Of the workforce in Surrey approximately two thirds of the working population live and work in the county. There is also significant in-commuting into the county with approximately 145,000\(^9\) non-Surrey residents commuting into the county. Patterns of in-commuting from London strongly reflect proximity to the capital. For example, over 80 percent of those travelling into Epsom and Ewell to work (excluding workers from elsewhere in Surrey) come from London. Incommuting to Waverley by contrast has only 7 percent of non-Surrey workers travelling from London. Of the northern district and boroughs within the county there is a significant amount of incommuting from the Thames Valley area.

There is a high percentage of people living and working in the same borough or district within the county with the majority of the remaining workforce commuting to London. Of the Surrey residents living and working in the same district or borough nearly 70 percent commute by car. These patterns show that we do have the opportunity to encourage people

\(^8\) ONS Annual Population Survey
\(^9\) 2001 Census data
out of their cars as they are likely to be travelling short distances. As an example Epsom and Ewell is our smallest borough and measures just over 6 miles from its northern to southern borough boundary and 39 percent of its working population works within the borough. Our approach to modal shift is described in ‘Alternatives to car travel’ on page 40.

Table 4 - Work locations of residents of Surrey boroughs and districts (2001)

Source: Census 2001

Population growth

The population in Surrey grew by 7 percent from 2001 to 2011. At a borough and district level, the highest population growth was seen in Epsom & Ewell which grew by 12 percent due to the delivery of the housing on the former hospital sites. Surrey’s population is forecast to grow by a further 9 percent over the next 20 years (see Figure 4) with similar forecast population growth in Greater London. At a borough level, the most growth is expected in Runnymede, Elmbridge, Reigate and Banstead and Epsom and Ewell. Surrounding areas are also expecting high levels of growth with Hampshire, West and East Sussex and Kent expecting to grow by over 10 percent. This growth both within the county and external is likely to lead to increasing pressure on our road network.
Figure 4 - Forecast population growth 2012-2031

Source: TEMPRO data based on ONS 2008-based population projections
Road congestion

Congestion impacts

Congestion acts as a drain on the local economy. This includes the costs of delays and negative impacts on the amenity and attractiveness of town centres which can deter visitors and shoppers. It is also a constraint upon existing businesses within the county and has a negative impact on growth as accessibility by road is a major consideration for business location decisions. Congestion not only has a negative impact upon the economic competitiveness of the county but also can have a negative impact upon the natural environment and also the urban environment. Road traffic is a key issue in relation to air quality. Stop start driving conditions and slower vehicle speeds resulting from congestion can lead to higher roadside pollutant concentrations. To date, 24 Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) have been declared in Surrey. Most of the AQMAs in Surrey are designated on transport corridors and within urban areas. Proposals for schemes that will look to improve air quality in these particular areas will be addressed in the Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes and through Action Plans produced by borough and districts. Road traffic and congestion is also a major contributor to carbon emissions. By trying to reduce congestion and encourage more sustainable travel choices we are actively seeking to reduce carbon emissions in Surrey.

Capacity problems

Capacity problems on Surrey’s road network are shown in Figure 5 along with expected future capacity issues if no mitigation is put in place. Because large parts of the road network are already at capacity and suffer from congestion at peak periods, this can have a major impact when an incident occurs causing significant congestion. A particular problem is when parts of the SRN experience a traffic problem, such as a collision. This can divert large amounts of traffic onto other roads. As these are already heavily used in normal conditions they cannot cope when drivers divert away from the SRN looking for an alternative route.

---

10 This modelling was completed before the opening of the Hindhead Tunnel.
Figure 5 – Capacity of Surrey’s road network
Current capacity problems on the road network (2011)

Indicative future capacity problems on the road network (2026)

This plan is based on Vehicle Capacity Ratio (VCR) data from the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highways Network (2011) produced by Surrey County Council. Over capacity figures are based on a VCR of 1.00-1.59 and severely over capacity on a VCR of over 1.66.
Current and future congestion

We have modelled the cost of congestion and Figure 6 shows the parts of the network that suffer from the highest level of congestion and which areas have the highest cost to the economy across the whole network. We have assessed the levels of proposed growth both within the county and externally and how this will impact our road network. This modelling has forecast that if we do nothing, congestion will get significantly worse in the future with more and more junctions experiencing problems. Current areas that are subject to high levels of congestion will continue to experience problems and these may even be exacerbated.

Strategic Road Network

Technical modelling has shown that parts of the strategic road network are already experiencing severe traffic congestion and are at capacity. This is particularly evident during peak hours and is caused by a mixture of through traffic, due to the strategic location of the county and locally generated movements. The areas considered to have the worst levels of congestion at present are:

- Guildford town centre
- A3 as it runs through the town of Guildford
- A3 between the Ripley junction and the A3/M25 (junction 10) Wisley interchange junction
- M3 junctions 3 to 4
- M25 junctions 13 to 14

The work also concluded that further areas that would come under considerable network stress are:

- M25 junctions 5 to 6

Primary route network and local roads

The areas considered to have the worst levels of congestion at present (see Figure 7) on the Local Road network are:

- A245 Portsmouth Road (west of A3 Painshill junction)
- A31 Alton Road (approaching and through Farnham).

The transport highway modelling work concluded that further areas that are likely to come under considerable network stress in the future are:

- A31 between Farnham and Guildford
- A320 St Peter’s Way (as well as other local roads surrounding the M25 junction 11).
There are a number of other areas suffering from congestion on the network. We know that our town centres suffer from congestion and other roads not highlighted here are subject to bottlenecks. Figure 7 shows those areas suffering from the most severe congestion. Further congestion bottlenecks that have been found through transport highway modelling are listed in Annex 2.

---

11 The cost of congestion has been calculated using data from 2008
Figure 7 – Current and future congestion areas on our road network
Strategic transport issues

Due to Surrey’s strategic location there are a number of transport issues that have an impact on the whole county and beyond. The key strategic transport issues are summarised in Figure 8 and discussed in further detail below.

**Figure 8 – Key strategic transport issues**

Key international gateways

Heathrow Airport although not within the county boundary is a major employment centre and attracts large numbers of passengers and employees, all of whom require access to the area. The 2008/09 on-airport employment survey at Heathrow showed that 12% (almost 9000 people) of the workforce travel from Surrey boroughs and districts with just under half living in the surrounding borough of Spelthorne. Heathrow suffers from poor surface access from neighbouring areas due to congestion on the surrounding road network. The lack of long-distance railway services also adds to congestion on the roads around the airport, contributing to poor journey time reliability.

The Airtrack scheme was a proposed direct heavy rail link from London Waterloo to Heathrow Airport. The scheme would have provided improved rail accessibility to Heathrow by providing a new link to Staines upon Thames and would have provided direct rail links
from Guildford. However, this scheme was abandoned in 2011. Proposals were also put forward for a scheme known as ‘Airtrack Lite’. The proposals included that the Waterloo to Windsor service would divide at Staines-upon-Thames, and the Weybridge to London via the Hounslow loop service would be recast as Weybridge to Heathrow and Heathrow to London services. The focus is now on the Heathrow Western Access scheme providing greater accessibility from the Great Western Mainline, providing an interchange at Reading but does not address accessibility problems from Surrey. Therefore proposals will need to be developed to improve accessibility to Heathrow Airport. The Surrey Future partnership are currently looking at options on how to improve access to Heathrow Airport to coincide with work being undertaken by the Davies Commission setting out where airport capacity should be increased. As a short term approach, improvements to public transport access in the form of improved bus services and routes would help to alleviate the situation along with improving cycling routes in close proximity to the airport.

Gatwick Airport is also a major employer on Surrey’s southern boundary attracting significant numbers of passengers and employees. Direct rail links from Surrey to Gatwick are provided by the North Downs line and the Brighton Main Line. However, the North Downs line has only two services per hour and there is a capacity issue on the Brighton Main Line. The Surrey Rail Strategy has identified potential solutions to address these issues.

**Key transport corridors**

A number of key transport corridors run through the county. These roads are already subject to high levels of congestion. The A3 corridor that provides access to London and Portsmouth in the south is a vitally important strategic route. With the opening of the Hindhead tunnel in 2011 the route has become more attractive to drivers, placing additional pressure on the corridor. Existing traffic congestion which can be made significantly worse when incidents occur on the route. The Highways Agency had proposed a number of junction improvements along the corridor as part of the Regional Transport Programme, but these no longer have funding due to the abolition of the Regional Transport Board. These improvements are still supported by the county council and the Highways Agency and are being developed subject to a strong business case and funding. In the longer term a more strategic solution to support a vibrant and growing Guildford is very likely to be required to deal with congestion on the A3.

Other strategic corridors within the county are the M25 providing an orbital route around London (almost one third of the M25 falls within the county boundary), the M3 forming part of the European E05 route and the M23 providing access from Hooley to Crawley and Gatwick Airport.

The Highways Agency has published estimates of future congestion on their network in the south east, based on estimates of population and housing growth. Future network stress was highlighted on all of these strategic transport corridors. In order to manage this additional stress upon the network, the Highways Agency will need to develop a number of transport schemes. Schemes that are currently being progressed are shown in Figure 9:
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- Managed motorway scheme M3 junction 2 to 4
- Managed motorway scheme M25 junction 7 to 5

We are in discussion with the Highways Agency over progressing the following schemes which are areas of particularly high network stress and are necessary for managing congestion on the road network in Surrey.

- A3/M25 (junction 10) Wisley Interchange
- A23/M23 Hooley Junction
- A3 Guildford Capacity Improvements

**Figure 9 – Highways Agency existing schemes**
Surrey’s approach to managing congestion

An integrated approach

In the past, the solution to alleviate congestion was considered to be to build additional capacity. This is no longer considered as always being the most appropriate means of addressing congestion for a number of reasons:

- the potential environmental impacts and sustainability issues
- the cost of providing additional capacity
- current suppressed demand returning to the network and the potential for additional ‘generated’ demand
- the displacement of problems to other areas of the network.

Therefore, a more all encompassing strategy has been developed in order to deal with congestion which builds on the objectives of the Congestion Strategy of the county Local Transport Plan. Our programme focuses on addressing traffic management and behavioural change and developing schemes that address local bottlenecks affecting Surrey’s road network in order to deliver improved journey time reliability. This strategy is necessary to support economic growth within the county, increase our economic competiveness and to successfully deliver the level of growth proposed in our Local Plans.

Our programme is focused on three elements described below:

1. Delivering a more efficient road network
   - Expanding the Network Management Information Centre (NMIC)
   - Improving incidents management by working with the Highways Agency
   - Improving traffic management across the road network
   - Providing smarter choices through travel planning
   - Improving the way road maintenance and road works are integrated and managed
   - Improving the enforcement of regulations such as parking and loading restrictions
   - Asset management.

2. Addressing infrastructure gaps and increasing and managing bottlenecks on our road network
   - Delivery of our major schemes programme focusing on town centres, junction improvements and corridor improvements
   - Providing solutions for the A3 strategic corridor
   - Working with partners to improve surface access to Heathrow Airport and rail access to Gatwick Airport.
3. Alternatives to car travel and behavioural change

- Influencing travel behaviour and encouraging modal shift
- Improving public transport and cycle networks
- Addressing capacity on our rail network
- Providing superfast broadband across Surrey.
Delivering a more efficient road network

Traffic management

Traffic management on the local road network in Surrey is delivered through the county council’s Network Management and Information Centre (NMIC). The use of this facility has helped resolve problems on the network by providing accurate and timely information to road users and in managing and addressing issues when problems arise.

Currently, there is limited network management capability in the west and southwest border area of the county. A priority is to improve the system in areas such as the A331 Blackwater Valley in the Aldershot-Camberley area, and the A30 corridor through better links with neighbouring authorities and enabling information sharing. Improving network management facilities would also enhance the county council’s ability to respond to major incidents, in partnership with the Highways Agency and Surrey Police.

By improving network management we will deliver improvements through coordinating existing information sources, provide real time updates on incidents and operational activities and extend variable message signs to include A31/Blackwater Valley Route and M3 junctions. This will allow accurate and timely driver information resulting in re-routing to avoid congestion/incidents with the potential to link and integrate our system with the M3 and M25 Managed Motorway.

Urban Traffic Control (UTC) is also an important part of network management which has been integrated in a number of areas of Surrey such as Guildford, Staines and Epsom and around 650 traffic signal installations and pedestrian controlled crossings. With traffic flows on the principal road network being nearly double the national average and with many of these roads acting as diversion routes when incidents occur on the motorways and trunk roads the installation of UTC within areas of Surrey has improved the efficiency of busy junctions and to help reduce congestion. Expansion of UTC to specific junctions and areas
within Surrey will be reviewed as part of improving the existing network management system with integration with the Highways Agency facilities.

**Incident management**

When incidents occur on the road network this can cause congestion due to blocked roads. Research published by the RAC estimates that road closures caused by collisions account for a quarter of all congestion and cost the country more than £5 billion a year\(^{13}\). In order to improve the level of disruption caused to drivers, better coordination between road operators and public transport operators is required. This will enable individuals and businesses to find alternative forms of transport at short notice and reduce travel time when incidents occur.

Due to the high volume of traffic on Surrey’s roads, there is little spare capacity in the system to deal with an incident which disrupts traffic. As a result, a single incident can give rise to major disruption across a wide area as drivers look for alternative routes. An incident can be defined as a collision, a broken down vehicle, poor weather, road works or a planned event such as a race meeting or concert. The implications of these events can be extremely severe and cause drivers delays for several hours.

At present, there has not been a systematic programme to reduce delays caused by incidents. We will work with the police and the Highways Agency to tackle these problems through a combination of engineering, enforcement and driver information and to look for ways to improve the clear-up after an incident. This would build on work being undertaken by the Highways Agency, Department for Transport (DfT) and police on issues such as recording the scene of an accident.

We will also work with partners to best manage and reduce the number of incidents that occur on our roads. Where possible, we will identify patterns into the causes of incidents and learn from good practice in reducing future incidents and in mitigating their impact.

**Providing better information to the public and improved travel planning**

Driver information takes many forms: local radio, television bulletins, emails, websites and, increasingly, in-car information from satellite navigation devices. On the roadside, both the county council and the Highways Agency have a range of variable message signs which can be used to advise drivers.

This remains one of the most important ways to manage congestion. However, the provision of this type of information is currently incomplete. The Surrey Travel SMART website at present does not provide information on roads outside of the county. Similarly, the Highways Agency website does not cover local roads. We propose to bring together all of the bodies who provide traffic information to see if we can negotiate a coordinated approach to explore the latest developments around traffic information. This would enable the public to have information on all road networks and public transport and we would also aim to provide a journey planner through the Travel SMART website enabling all traffic information to be provided from one website. In addition, the county council is looking to provide further
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roadside messages and information disseminated to radio stations and via Traffic Message Channel (TMC) to interactive satellite navigation systems and for this to be integrated with other adjacent authorities and the Highways Agency.

**Demand management**

As the majority of roads on our network are at capacity or close to reaching capacity at peak periods it is necessary to look at ways to reduce the level of demand on our roads. Currently, journey time reliability at peak times on our road network is poor. We are looking at innovative ways to manage this, including a dialogue with businesses to ensure this Congestion Programme best meets their needs and to consider how changes in corporate travel behaviour could impact on congestion. This could be achieved through greater flexibility in working hours, such as staggered working, together with support for employees to work from home, for example through the provision of superfast broadband.

**Asset management**

Asset management is the allocation of resources for the management, operation, preservation and enhancement of the highway infrastructure to meet the needs of current and future customers. The county council is responsible for a highway network comprising just over 4,800 km of carriageway, approximately two thirds of which is in a rural environment. The footway and cycleway network is over 5,000km, of which just under 200km is shared cycleway/footway. In terms of structures, the council is responsible for approximately 1,650 road bridges, footbridges, underpasses, subways, culverts, and retaining walls. The highway assets also include drainage, street furniture and road markings.

Surrey County Council produces a maintenance programme in order to ensure that resources are allocated to projects which safeguard the highway infrastructure and support the delivery of the overall transport objectives of Surrey. One priority going forward is to improve Surrey’s roads by developing a five-year capital investment programme which will provide additional capital funding to support the highways. An Asset Management Strategy is being produced by the county council to allow for maximum network availability when any planned maintenance activities are organised and to ensure that a joined up and coordinated approach is developed with partners.

**Road works**

In Surrey it is estimated that over 40,000 road and street works are carried out annually. These works can cause considerable inconvenience to residents and businesses and substantial delays to traffic. The county council is proposing to introduce a permit scheme which would allow it to regulate and coordinate road works on Surrey’s road network. This would allow for increased integration of utility works with road works promoted by the county council. Permit schemes have been found to be very successful by other county councils and across London. They have found that this increase in collaborative working has resulted in less ‘individual’ works being carried out leading to a decrease in network disruption.
Improving enforcement of regulations

Illegal parking and the unlawful use of loading bays can cause congestion on our road network. Congestion can also be caused by the delivery of goods to retailers if it is not managed effectively. In order to deal with these issues more effectively, implementing town centre management plans where they are required can improve congestion. This might mean having a more joined up approach in town centres for deliveries and through using CCTV to identify incidents such as illegal parking, and issuing fines to reinforce appropriate driver behaviour.
Addressing infrastructure gaps and increasing and managing bottlenecks on our road network

Town centre improvements

A high proportion of economic activity in Surrey is centred in and around the strategic town centres within the county. These centres are critical to the future economic prosperity of the county but they also correspond with some of the greatest development pressures, and the most severe transport problems.

Surrey has a network of 28 towns including the six strategic centres of Guildford, Woking, Redhill, Camberley, Staines and Epsom. Of these centres Guildford, Woking and Redhill are currently a focus for delivering more sustainable travel choices through our Travel Smart initiative which won funding through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. We hope to roll out this programme to other centres when funding becomes available. A number of transport schemes have been designed to address transport problems including managing congestion within the strategic centres in order to allow for business retention and growth and to improve journey time reliability and their overall vitality. These schemes are shown in Figure 10.

Figure 10 - Town centre improvement schemes
**Strategic centres**

**Guildford**

Guildford is the county town of Surrey and is an established regional centre within the south east. The town plays a major strategic role in terms of the economy and Guildford rail station acts as an important transport interchange hub. In 2010 the UK Competitiveness Index ranked Guildford as the most competitive city in the UK outside London. It is the dominant shopping and employment centre in the county and has been subject to considerable employment growth in recent years. The University of Surrey, Royal Surrey County Hospital and the Surrey Research Park are all located within the town. The Surrey Research Park contributes around £350 million per annum to the Guildford economy. The county council has already delivered a new signalised junction that opened in December 2012, to replace Hospital Roundabout and this has improved journey time reliability to and from the Surrey Research Park and the Royal Surrey County Hospital.

The A3, which runs through and bisects the Guildford urban area, is subject to high levels of congestion. Technical modelling has forecast that, if nothing is done, this congestion is likely to become worse in the future along with further traffic congestion within the town centre. In order for Guildford to remain economically competitive and continue to attract and retain businesses, congestion and journey time unreliability in the area needs to be addressed especially on the A3 corridor. There is already some anecdotal evidence of businesses within the area relocating due to the poor transport infrastructure surrounding the A3.

Another important economic area is Slyfield Industrial Estate which lies to the east of Guildford town. The industrial estate suffers from traffic congestion acting as a constraint to growth within the area. The area has been identified as an area for potential industrial intensification within the estate and redevelopment forms part of the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (SARP). In order for the intensification of the site to go forward a new link road is required. The Clay Lane Link Road will allow for the expansion of existing businesses within the area and further develop and support Guildford’s high tech company cluster. The Link Road has gained funding from the PWLB through the Local Enterprise Partnership.

A number of schemes and interventions have either been developed, are under development or are under consideration. Pedestrian and cycle improvements and a new park and ride site at Onslow are committed and will be delivered. A major scheme for the present Guildford gyratory in the town centre is under development. Schemes under consideration for future development include improvements to the A3 as it runs through the town of Guildford, potential provision of new park and ride sites serving the town centre and developing the Guildford Hub transport improvements major scheme.
Woking

Woking town centre is undergoing considerable regeneration and has emerged as a key public transport hub due to its direct rail links to London, Portsmouth, Southampton and Farnborough. It is the busiest station in the county in terms of passenger interchanges. The railway line and the principal road, the A320, which passes through the town centre, have a negative impact causing severance and poor pedestrian and cyclist accessibility. The town centre also experiences a level of traffic congestion which businesses see as having a negative impact on growth and some businesses are considering leaving the area. In order to support the regeneration of the area and to stimulate economic growth a number of transport schemes are being developed. These include improving cyclist and pedestrian movements from north to south in the town centre under the railway at Victoria Arch and proposals to improve Woking as a public transport hub to support the current Cycle Woking initiative.
Sheerwater lies to the east of Woking town centre. Sheerwater is recognised as a ‘priority place’ in need of inward investment and stimulation of economic activity. Poor access to Sheerwater’s Business Parks is a major obstacle to securing inward investment in the area. However, a new link road will be built with construction to begin in 2013 to improve accessibility to the area. This scheme has secured funding through the Enterprise M3 Local Economic Partnership’s Growing Enterprise Fund.

**Redhill**

Redhill, located in the east of the county, is a major employment and business centre accommodating specialist businesses in advanced electronics, engineering and financial services. The town centre requires significant regeneration. Redhill suffers from severance caused by the A23 passing through the town centre and from congestion and poor accessibility especially to Reigate, which is located two miles to the west. Poor bus services and train connectivity to Reigate are also having a negative impact on businesses within the area and some large employers have resorted to funding coaches from Redhill to Reigate due to the poor connectivity. This will be addressed through the planned Reigate-Redhill Hub transport improvements. These improvements will improve bus services over the area and may introduce two park and ride sites and improve the interchange facilities.

To support regeneration in the area and to support and retain businesses, improvements included within the Redhill Balanced Network scheme will be delivered. These include improved facilities for buses, cycling and walking which will reduce congestion and improve journey time reliability.

**Camberley**

In the west of the county, Camberley is a major commercial, retail and leisure centre. Located between Junction 3 and 4 of the M3, the town has good links to the strategic road network and industrial parks are located to the south of the town centre. The town has seen rapid growth over the last 30 years and further planned growth and cross boundary development in Bracknell and Aldershot will place increasing pressure on transport infrastructure within the area. If nothing is done, the area could become less attractive to business. The town and surrounding area also suffer from traffic congestion as a result of...
the A30 bisecting the town centre. A number of highway improvements have already been developed within and surrounding the town centre as part of a larger package of A30/A331 corridor improvements. These include a number of junction improvements to the A30 and cycle networks along the A30 to provide more sustainable transport choices. They will improve accessibility to the shopping and business sector in Camberley.

**Epsom**

Epsom is an important commercial and retail centre and contains a number of head offices and a campus of the University of the Creative Arts. The town centre is subject to high volumes of through traffic due to the A24 bisecting the town which has a negative impact on the townscape, air quality and provides a poor environment for pedestrians and cyclists. The high volumes of traffic often cause congestion on the one way gyratory system within the town centre impacting upon journey time reliability.

An action plan has been developed forming part of the Local Plan which focuses on relieving congestion, improving air quality and improving the environment for pedestrians and cyclists. The scheme, known as Plan E, looks to return a part of the gyratory to two way traffic, provide new pedestrian and cycle links and improve public transport accessibility.

**Staines upon Thames**

Staines upon Thames is an important commercial and retail centre located in the north of the county in close proximity to London and Heathrow. It has good access to the M25 and due to its geographic location has attracted a number of national and international businesses to the area. The proposals to widen Staines Bridge are from the original Airtrack proposals to improve accessibility to the town centre and promote further economic growth. The scheme will relieve congestion and improve accessibility by widening the footways, cycleways and carriageway. The scheme is for the provision of three lanes of traffic and to improve the
junctons on either side of the bridge decreasing traffic congestion in the town centre and improve journey time reliability.

Other retail/commercial centres

**Farnham**

Farnham is the largest shopping centre in Waverley and has a significant employment role. The significant and growing adverse impact of traffic in the town centre affects the vitality of the town. There are a high number of road traffic accidents involving pedestrians and poor air quality is present within the town. The proposed town centre package will provide a better and safer environment for pedestrians. The enhancement of the town centre environment will provide a long-term contribution to the viability and vitality of the town and the reduction in congestion should result in economic benefits in terms of reduced lost working time and health benefits due to improved air quality.

**Egham**

Egham is a small town located in the north of Surrey within the London commuter belt. It has good access to the SRN near Junction 13 of the M25 motorway. Egham is an important economic centre with a number of international businesses but suffers from congestion. Congestion in the area is a serious impediment to future economic activity which is further exacerbated by the railway line which is a barrier to movement causing further traffic delay. The proposed scheme for the town centre provides sustainable transport infrastructure which will help tackle existing congestion and unlock the economic potential of the area.

**Dorking**

Dorking is a small market town providing services to the surrounding area. The service sector provides the majority of employment opportunities with a number of national and international companies residing within the town. The town however is subject to traffic congestion due to the A24, providing access to London and the south, affecting the town’s vitality. The traffic management measures proposed will enhance the town centre vitality and provide a more attractive environment for businesses and residents by reducing congestion within the town centre. The scheme will also enhance accessibility to the town centre by delivering improved pedestrian, cycle and public transport links.

**Reigate**

Reigate is a prosperous and attractive market town, and home to a number of large blue chip businesses. The town is characterised by good road accessibility but has poor rail links leading to heavy reliance on the road network for travel to and through the town, resulting in significant congestion in the area and causing poor journey time reliability. Congestion in the area is also caused by level crossing down times. A number of road network improvements
around the town centre are being developed in order to improve congestion and journey time reliability.
Corridor improvements

A number of transport schemes have been designed to manage congestion within transport corridors with the objective of improving journey time reliability. These are shown in Figure 11 below.

Figure 11: Corridor improvements schemes

A24 Clark’s Green to Holmwood and Capel to Surrey Boundary

The A24 is a busy primary route linking London with the south coast and provides access to significant employment opportunities within the Gatwick Diamond economic area. This stretch of the dual-carriageway has several gaps in the central reservation for access and is a major source of accidents. The Horsham to Capel section has an accident rate three times the national average. It is essential that the gaps in the central reservation are closed and that the speed differential problems at the existing roundabouts are addressed. The entire length will be subject to comprehensive road safety improvements including gap closures, enhanced access arrangements, improved visibility, signing and road markings to reduce the likelihood of incidents occurring.
Guildford A3 strategic corridor improvements

The A3 is a vitally important strategic route providing access from London to Portsmouth. With the introduction of the Hindhead tunnel, the A3 has become more attractive for existing traffic travelling to and from the south coast to take advantage of the quicker journey times to Guildford, London and nearby centres of employment. We therefore expect there to be more traffic using the A3. The A3 in Surrey already suffers from severe peak time congestion at several points including junction 10 of the M25/A3 at Wisley, a number of junctions within Guildford and the A3/A31 Hogsback junction to the south of Guildford. This high level of congestion can act as a disincentive for new businesses looking to relocate to towns along the A3. The Highways Agency proposed a number of junction improvements on the A3 around Guildford as part of the Regional Transport Programme, but this is now defunct with the abolition of the Regional Transport Body. A strategic transport study of the A3 in Surrey will be carried out to assess further improvements that could ease congestion.

Wrecclesham Relief Road

Wrecclesham Relief Road has been a long standing transport scheme that has not been able to come forward due to funding being unavailable. The A325 passes through Wrecclesham and the area suffers from high traffic flows, congestion, poor air quality and a poor accident record. The relief road would connect the A325 south of Wrecclesham, to the A31 west of Farnham, bypassing Wrecclesham village. There are a number of developments in surrounding areas that will add additional pressure on to the transport network within the area such as Aldershot Urban Extension and Whitehill/Bordon in Hampshire which would have a significant impact on traffic flows in the southern part of the Blackwater Valley area.
A30/A331 Corridor Improvements

The A30/A331 scheme comprises improvements to the Meadows Roundabout and improving accessibility to the business sector in Camberley providing a more attractive environment for businesses. The scheme would manage congestion within the area and provide improved accessibility for all modes of transport in the area. The proposals will also improve access to the shopping centre and nearby locations in Bracknell Forest and Hart District in Hampshire, including Blackwater Rail station and its industrial hinterland.
Local bottlenecks/junction improvements

A number of transport schemes have been designed to manage congestion at local bottlenecks identified across the county that will result in improved journey time reliability. These are shown in Figure 12 below.

Figure 12: Local bottleneck/junction improvements schemes

Kiln Lane Link

The Kiln Lane Link is a proposed road crossing under the Epsom to Waterloo railway on the A24. The purpose of the scheme is to improve local accessibility by removing the barrier the railway causes to east-west movement. It will provide a link between residential communities and local facilities for all modes of transport and to unlock development opportunities surrounding the road crossing.

The Kiln Lane Link scheme, in addition to reducing traffic volume in Ewell Village would help reduce vehicle movements on the north-east side of Epsom. Delivery of this scheme would also provide an additional route across the railway line, which would ease the pressure on the existing crossing points and reduce congestion on the A24.
Runnymede Roundabout
Runnymede roundabout is a congestion pinch point serving the M25 Junction 13 slip roads via the A30. There is significant growth potential for commercial, retail and residential development in the area, but in order to unlock this potential improvements to this junction are required. The proposed scheme looks to convert the roundabout to signal control and widen the carriageways. These improvements will have a positive impact on traffic congestion in the area and are expected to deliver substantial journey time savings.

A31 Hickley's Corner junction improvement and underpass
The Hickley’s Corner junction lies on the A31 Farnham Bypass and is heavily congested at peak times, resulting in long traffic queues and delays. This has an adverse impact on development, not just locally, but also in the wider sub-region. This is because the junction and A31 form a key link in the Primary Route Network, providing access to major destinations in Surrey and Hampshire. There are two proposed schemes for this junction. The first proposal is a junction improvement to remove a severe bottleneck on the A31. The reduced journey times and improved journey time reliability will help support planned development in the Blackwater Valley, the Aldershot Urban Extension, Guildford town centre, the Whitehill-Bordon Eco Town and further afield. The second proposal for the longer term is for a roundabout to replace the initial junction and for the A31 to pass below through an underpass and for the Firgrove Hill Bridge to be rebuilt. These proposals will allow for the provision of four lanes of traffic along the A31 at this congestion bottleneck.
Alternatives to car travel

Travel patterns

People travel for a wide variety of reasons. At a national level, currently half of all trips are made for leisure purposes, including shopping, visiting friends, entertainment and participating in sport, and some 18 percent of trips are made for business and commuting purposes. Most trips tend to average less than 10 miles, 95 percent of all trips are less than 25 miles and 67 percent are less than five miles. The challenge is to make walking, cycling or public transport more attractive options for shorter distance travel.

Behavioural change

Through analysing travel patterns within the county, we know that a large percentage of short journeys which could either be cycled or walked are completed by car. If people could be persuaded not to use their cars this would help to reduce the number of vehicles present on the road network. Currently the county is focussing on delivering more sustainable travel choices through its Travel Smart programme which is centred on the towns of Guildford, Woking and Reigate/Redhill and will be further rolled out across the county when funding becomes available and will be integrated with our other approaches.

The Travel Smart programme covers a range of soft measures and infrastructure provisions which seek to encourage more people to choose sustainable travel by improving information, opportunities and the attractiveness of alternative modes. Surrey’s approach to encouraging behavioural change focuses upon four main principles that enable behavioural change. These are involvement, infrastructure, information and intervention, as described in Table 5.

Table 5: The 4 principles for behavioural change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Working with target groups such as businesses and residents to define travel problems and solutions and to work with public transport operators to ensure that transport nodes are integrated and therefore accessible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Building infrastructure that is both highly visible and effective and using targeted awareness campaigns to maximise behavioural change. By delivering improved cycle and walking routes, improved lighting and security, improved bus shelters and bus corridors and secure cycle parking this approach delivers a greater opportunity for modal shift and therefore can decrease traffic congestion by decreasing the number of individuals travelling by car.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Information

Enabling individuals and businesses to have access to up to date travel information to promote different travel options. An important principle is to ensure that key employment and retail areas are linked to public transport nodes and that these areas are accessible by walking and cycling. In addition, providing individuals with up to date travel information such as real-time journey information and journey planners and hard and electronic multimode and interactive mapping.

### Intervention points

Providing infrastructure and information to maximise behavioural change at key points and times such as business relocation, for local residents and visitors.

---

### Improving public transport, pedestrian and cycle networks

In line with Travel Smart principles, walking and cycling improvements will be carried out initially in Woking, Guildford and Reigate/Redhill. Through this programme we will improve the public realm for pedestrians through investment in signage including the installation of wayfinder mapping similar to the ‘legible London’ programme. In addition, the county council manages an extensive rights of way network which provides further opportunity to improve the environment and safety of pedestrians and cyclists by moving them away from the road network. We will also provide increased accessibility to employment and retail centres as these areas suffer not only from traffic congestion but also severance limiting movement to and from these centres. The improvements will provide continuous, well signed, safe and direct cycle routes to encourage individuals to walk or cycle to their destinations. Other infrastructure will complement these schemes such as park and ride, bus priority and corridor improvements. If the initial pilot towns are successful, schemes will be developed in other towns when funding becomes available.
Improving Surrey’s bus network

The bus network in Surrey is an integral part of our transport system. There were 29.9 million bus passenger journeys in Surrey in 2010/11. Buses provide an alternative to car travel, and by providing this alternative, levels of congestion and unreliability for all users of the road network in Surrey are reduced.

The use of Park and Ride schemes in Guildford have been very successful helping to relieve congestion on key corridors and has removed traffic from the busy town centre.

The bus network will be improved by a programme of route enhancements, including priority routes and provision of real time passenger information on buses and at bus stops. As with road transport, the aim will be to improve journey time reliability which will in turn encourage more people to use buses as a reliable alternative to the car. Bus and rail travel will be made easier through improved passenger information, including better coordination of information through mobile phone apps and the anticipated introduction of better integrated ticketing across the public transport network.

Travel planning

Travel plans are typically produced by schools and organisations. They have an important role to play in ensuring effective, reliable, safe and sustainable travel behaviour is embedded in the culture of organisations and schools in Surrey as these journeys can result in localised congestion. Through developing school and organisational travel plans, more sustainable choices for pupils, parents and employees can be delivered along with assessing any barriers that may exist to sustainable choices. A travel plan sets out the measures and initiatives a school or organisation will adopt to reduce car journeys and increase other methods of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. As the Local Transport Authority Surrey County Council supports the production of travel plans by working with schools in assisting with surveys, education and training to improve skills, engineering schemes and marketing events. The county adopted the Surrey Travel Planning Strategy in 2011 outlining how the county will work with schools and organisations to encourage more sustainable journeys.

Low emissions strategies

Low emission strategies reduce transport emissions by implementing more sustainable transport choices to promote modal shift and look to accelerate the uptake of low emission fuels and technologies. Low emission strategies have been adopted in a number of towns and cities across Britain such as York where an AQMA has been designated. Within Surrey where 24 AQMAs have been designated this approach could be effective in improving air quality. A Low Emissions Feasibility Study has been carried out for the town of Farnham to look to improve air quality within the town and to manage congestion. This approach could be considered by the county council and district and boroughs in the management of AQMAs.
Rail strategy

Rail is crucially important to Surrey. We have 84 rail stations, the second most of any county. The Surrey Future initiative has also produced in conjunction with this Congestion Programme a Rail Strategy. The Rail Strategy identifies the measures that we believe are necessary to improve rail services, reduce overcrowding and increase passenger numbers. These include longer trains and platforms, signalling improvements, engineering works, track bottlenecks and turning the international platforms at Waterloo into domestic platforms. We will also look at ways to improve level crossings both to ensure pedestrian safety and reduce level crossing down times.

Increasing capacity on the rail network is likely to increase the number of Surrey residents commuting to local rail stations. This may have an impact on local congestion. This will need to be mitigated and accessibility to some rail stations may need to be improved. Some rail stations within the county are on the peripheries of settlement areas such as Esher rail station.

Providing superfast broadband across Surrey

The delivery of superfast broadband is seen as vital to support business growth and development. Delivering superfast broadband across the county will provide benefits that are attractive to businesses and will help retain companies already located in the county as well as attract new companies to the area. Superfast broadband will provide a wide range of benefits to businesses in both urban and rural areas of Surrey and further afield and is likely to have a positive impact on our transport network as improvements to online communications can increase teleworking practices, thereby reducing the need to travel and allow employees the choice to work from home further reducing the need for employees to travel.
Our programme of transport schemes

The table below lists the programme of transport schemes we propose to develop to improve congestion across the county.

Table 6 – Our programme of transport schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Scheme</th>
<th>Estimated Target construction date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epsom Town Centre Area Action Plan (Plan E)</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhill Balanced Network</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede Roundabout</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Arch Capacity Improvements, Woking</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egham Sustainable Transport Package</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Network Benefits Package</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30 / A331 Corridor Improvements including Meadows Roundabout</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford gyratory improvements</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorking Town Centre Traffic Management Measures</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Hickley’s Corner junction improvement</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiln Lane Link</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Improvements, Camberley</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24 Capel to Surrey boundary Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnham Town Centre Package</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24 Clarks Green to Holmwood; Mole Valley</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Network Improvements, Reigate</td>
<td>Post-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Hickley’s Corner Underpass, Farnham</td>
<td>Post-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford A3 Strategic Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>Post-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford Hub Transport Improvements</td>
<td>Post-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate-Redhill Hub Transport Improvements</td>
<td>Post-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staines-upon-Thames Bridge Widening</td>
<td>Post-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrecclesham Relief Road, Farnham</td>
<td>Post-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking Hub Transport Improvements</td>
<td>Post-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding options

The schemes proposed within this document have been identified to support growth in the county and ensure a strong economy. Most of the identified schemes within this programme, are likely to be funded from the local Single Growth Fund through the Local Transport Bodies and Local Enterprise Partnerships but will require a number of other funding streams to meet any shortfall or match funding required:

- New Homes Bonus (NHB)
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- Prudential borrowing
- Pinchpoint funding
- Growing Places Fund.

Proposals to fund our aspirational schemes such as the A3 corridor improvements will be financed through additional funding streams from DfT. However, because future funding is never certain, the county council is currently looking at a number of other options listed within Table 7.

Table 7 – Other options for financing transport schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Parking Levy</td>
<td>This levy essentially imposes a charge in respect of the provision of workplace parking places at office premises. The WPL is collected by way of a licensing scheme and is a charge made for each parking place provided by an employer and used by employees. Income is ring-fenced to be spent on the infrastructure identified when the levy is agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Increment Financing (TIF) through Business Rate Retention</td>
<td>Due to changes in legislation local authorities will be able to make use of business rates growth across the whole of their administrative area to fund infrastructure improvements. Infrastructure schemes funded through the TIF will be reliant on growth of businesses within their administrative area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension scheme funding</td>
<td>Central government is calling for greater investment in infrastructure by local government pension schemes. One initiative that central government is using to encourage investment in infrastructure is through the ‘UK Guarantees Scheme’ where the Treasury will guarantee risk on infrastructure projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

Following the consultation on the draft Congestion Programme, the delivery programme has been reviewed and an additional scheme has been included. This scheme is the Clay Lane Link Road which will help to deliver the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (SARP) in the borough of Guildford.

The delivery programme will now be built into forthcoming Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes produced by the county council in agreement with borough and districts. These will ensure that local problems as well as strategic transport issues impacting the county will be addressed.

The Surrey Future partnership in conjunction with the Congestion Programme have also produced a Rail Strategy. The Rail Strategy can be found at www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyfuture. The delivery programme and strategic transport issues highlighted in the Congestion Programme and recommendations from the Rail Strategy have been combined within a brochure that sets out Surrey’s key transport infrastructure priorities for the next 15-20 years. The agreed top transport infrastructure priorities for Surrey are:

- A3 corridor
- The major schemes programme (23 transport schemes across the county to tackle areas of significant congestion in town centres, at key junctions and on strategic corridors)
- Improvements to the North Downs Line
- Crossrail 2 regional route
- Improving journeys to Heathrow and Gatwick.

These priorities for Surrey have been agreed by all 12 Surrey local authorities, the business community and Surrey universities. We know they will drive economic growth in Surrey, the south east and beyond.

To keep up to date with news from the Surrey Future partnership’s ongoing work visit www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyfuture
Annex 1

Borough and district transport challenges

As the statutory Local Transport Authority, the county council is producing in partnership with each borough and district council a borough/district-level Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programmes. These will form part of the countywide Surrey Transport Plan, the third Local Transport Plan (LTP3). For each borough or district, the strategy and Forward Programme will address both the policy objectives for the area, reflecting the Local Plan and other elements of the development plan for the borough/district, and the challenges associated with existing and future travel demands. If we do not mitigate these impacts the additional travel demands associated with potential or proposed future residential and commercial growth could adversely impact on the county’s future economic competitiveness and growth. For each borough and district, a summary of the main transport challenges and our emerging proposed approach is set out within this annex.

Map showing Surrey districts and boroughs
Timetable for production of Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes

The timetable below is indicative and needs to be finalised with borough and districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Status of Local Plan</th>
<th>Stage 1 Informal Local Committee</th>
<th>Stage 2 Consultation</th>
<th>Stage 3 Formal Local Committee</th>
<th>Cabinet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>23 April 14</td>
<td>May – July 14</td>
<td>Sept 14</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>Examination stage</td>
<td>14 July 14</td>
<td>Sept- Oct 14</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>6 Feb 14</td>
<td>May – July 14</td>
<td>Sept 14</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>24 Jan 14</td>
<td>Sept- Oct 14</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Oct 12 Nov 13</td>
<td>May – July 14</td>
<td>Sept 14</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>19 June 14</td>
<td>Sept- Oct 14</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>Pre-submission</td>
<td>2 Dec 13 24 April 14</td>
<td>Sept- Oct 14</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>12 Feb 14 7 May 14</td>
<td>May – July 14</td>
<td>Sept 14</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>17 Feb 14</td>
<td>May – July 14</td>
<td>Sept 14</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>13 Nov 14</td>
<td>Sept- Oct 14</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>11 April 14</td>
<td>Sept- Oct 14</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elmbridge borough

Introduction

The borough is located immediately to the south west of London with good accessibility to central London and the M25 and M3. The main settlement within the borough is Walton on Thames providing a range of services to the local area. Smaller settlements include Weybridge, Cobham, Esher, East and West Molesey and Hersham which are primarily residential centres.

Main transport challenges

Within the borough there are a number of transport challenges. Several traffic congestion pinch points have been identified. These include Esher town centre, East and West Molesey, north and south Weybridge, A244 corridor including Walton town centre and A245 corridor including Cobham High Street. In addition to traffic congestion, further issues affect the borough, including:

- Community severance in Esher caused by the intersection of several main roads and high levels of traffic congestion
- Accessibility to Esher railway station as it is located about a mile from the town centre
- Poor accessibility to public transport in Walton and Weybridge
- Community severance, traffic congestion and poor safety records in Walton and A244 corridor
- Community severance and a lack of parking provision in East and West Molesey
- Poor air quality with seven Air Quality Management Areas designated within the borough.

Our proposed approach

There are no major transport schemes identified within Elmbridge, but the schemes listed below are proposed to address problems identified with the existing transport infrastructure in the borough. The list below is not definitive and the county council and borough council are working together to find the right solutions to the transport problems within the borough. The schemes worked up between the county and borough councils will look to encourage more sustainable forms of transport and to minimise the need to travel.

- A package of schemes to improve pedestrian/cyclist accessibility, junction improvements and town centre management in Esher
- Improving pedestrian, cyclist and public transport links to Esher Station
- Accessibility improvements for pedestrian and cyclists to Walton Rail Station
- A package of schemes to improve transport problems in East and West Molesey including traffic calming, cycle and pedestrian routes, junction improvements and parking restrictions
- Accessibility and cycling improvements in Weybridge area
- A245 and A244 including Walton town centre route corridor study to assess level of junction improvements and pedestrian and cyclist improvements
• Air quality measures as set out within Air Quality Management Area Action Plans which are currently been produced.

Potential funding will be a combination of developer contributions such as Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), central government grants, local committee allocations and through the borough council.
Epsom and Ewell borough

Introduction

The predominately urban borough of Epsom and Ewell is located in the north of Surrey and 15 miles south west of central London. Epsom town centre is the main focus for economic activity within the borough. There are a number of smaller secondary centres including Ewell Village and Stoneleigh. The main highway through the borough is the A24 between Leatherhead in the south west and Sutton in the north east. The other principal roads in the borough are the A240 between Banstead (south east) and Kingston (north west) to the west of Stoneleigh, A232 between Ewell and the London borough of Sutton and the B280 radiating to the west of Epsom Town Centre and the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.

Main transport challenges

Many of the main roads within the borough have the impact of separating communities and restricting pedestrian and cycling movements due to the built up nature of the borough. Many of these roads suffer from high levels of congestion. This is made worse by the railway line which provides a barrier to movement. The high level of congestion not only increases journey times but has a negative impact upon air quality. It can also make public transport less reliable. The main transport challenges within the borough have been identified as:

- congestion on the A24 having a negative impact on air quality within Epsom Town Centre
- congestion in and around the High Street in Ewell Village contributing to the area being designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)
- bus reliability is poor due to high levels of congestion
- congestion on a number of corridors including A24, A240, A232, B280 and B2200
- poor accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists to train stations in the borough.

Our proposed approach

Two major schemes have been identified for Epsom and Ewell:

- Epsom Town Centre Area Action Plan (Plan E)
- Kiln Lane Link

The schemes listed below are also proposed to address the problems identified with the existing transport infrastructure in the borough. They look to encourage more sustainable forms of transport and to minimise the need to travel.

- a package of schemes to improve pedestrian/cyclist accessibility and improve congestion within Epsom Town Centre
- Kiln Lane link will look to relieve congestion on the A24 by removing the barrier the railway causes to east-west movement across the borough
- investment in the bus network such as 'Real Time Passenger Information' in order to encourage more sustainable transport options
- rail platforms extensions to increase rail capacity
- measures to improve air quality in Ewell Village and Epsom town centre.

Potential funding will be a combination of developer contributions such as Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), central government grants, local committee allocations and through the borough council.
Introduction

Guildford borough is situated in south west Surrey, within commuting distance of central London and approximately 40 miles from the south coast of England. The county town of Guildford is the main focus for economic activity within Surrey. Ash and Tongham are smaller centres in the borough, with further communities in numerous village settlements and hamlets. The A3 trunk road and the M25 motorway, which form part of Highways Agency’s strategic road network, both pass through the borough. There are twelve rail stations in the borough. The borough benefits from a frequent fast train service via Woking to London Waterloo (Portsmouth Direct Line), as well as a stopping service via the New Guildford Line. It also has good rail links with Reading, Redhill and Gatwick via the North Downs Line. Guildford town centre has two rail stations; Guildford rail station, the busiest station in the county for entries and exits, which provides an interchange between four lines, and London Road rail station.

Main transport challenges

The following key access and transport challenges have been identified:

- Traffic congestion during peak hours in Guildford town centre, especially on the gyratory system and its approaches, the A3 trunk road as it runs through the town of Guildford, the A3 trunk road between the Ripley junction and the A3/M25 (junction 10) Wisley interchange junction
- Noise pollution caused by the A3 trunk road within Guildford town centre
- Adverse impacts of high traffic volumes on road safety, severance, noise, local air quality, the demand for parking and the setting and amenity of local neighbourhoods across the borough
- Severance of the town of Guildford and its constituent neighbourhoods resulting from a combination of the A3 trunk road, railway lines and the River Wey. There are also a limited number of crossing points, which impacts especially on pedestrians and cyclists
- A lack of access to services, jobs and educational opportunities for those living in some rural settlements that do not have access to a car
- Intensified and new challenges resulting from potential future higher levels of traffic on roads in the borough, generated by the demand for travel to and from existing and future homes, workplaces, shops and leisure facilities
- Growing rail overcrowding on some peak period rail services from stations in the borough.

Our proposed approach

Three major schemes have been identified for Guildford borough:

- Guildford Gyratory improvements
- Guildford A3 Strategic Corridor Improvements
- Guildford Hub Transport Improvements
The schemes listed below are also proposed to address the challenges identified with the existing transport infrastructure in the borough. The following schemes are being progressed to help ease congestion and encourage sustainable travel:

- A scheme is under development to reconfigure the Guildford gyratory. Key objectives include improving pedestrian provision and accessibility, increasing movement by sustainable modes, improving journey time reliability and improving the quality of place
- Pedestrian and cycle improvements, including a network of signed routes in Guildford
- Potential provision of new park and ride sites serving the town centre
- Highway improvements including junction improvements, management of on street parking arrangements and traffic management
- Road safety improvements including additional pedestrian crossings and traffic calming measures
- Improvements to interchange arrangements, particularly in and around Guildford station
- Bus priority and corridor improvements.

The package of schemes for Guildford will be informed by the Guildford town centre and Approaches Movement Study, which is to be commissioned by Guildford Borough Council.

Potential funding will be a combination of developer contributions such as Section 106 and CIL, central government grants, local committee allocations, Local Sustainable Transport Fund, Growing Places Fund and other contributions from the county and borough councils.
Mole Valley district

Introduction

Mole Valley district lies at the heart of Surrey, mid-way between London and the Sussex coast. Dorking and Leatherhead are the key market towns providing retail and other services for surrounding areas. Small centres such as Ashtead, Bookham and Fetcham also provide a range of local shopping and other services for the day to day needs of their communities. The district has three main principal roads consisting of the M25, A24 running north to south and the A25 running east to west. Gatwick Airport is located in the neighbouring West Sussex Borough of Crawley and adjoins Mole Valley’s south eastern boundary. Access by road to the airport is perceived as being good, but there is the potential to improve rail access.

Main transport challenges

In summary the main transport challenges facing the district are:

- Major congestion pinch points on the transport network, particularly approaches to town centres
- High levels of congestion in the town centres notably Dorking and Leatherhead
- Access to public transport can be poor in areas of the district
- Limited provision for parking at train stations.

Our proposed approach

Three major schemes have been identified for Mole Valley:

- A24 Capel to Surrey boundary corridor improvements
- Dorking Town Centre Traffic Management Measures
- A24 Clarks Green to Holmwood

The schemes listed below are also proposed to address the problems identified with the existing transport infrastructure in the district. They look to encourage more sustainable forms of transport and to minimise the need to travel.

- A package of schemes to reduce congestion within Dorking town centre including junction improvements, cycle and pedestrian facilities and passenger transport
- Junction improvements on the Leatherhead gyratory
- A package of schemes to address transport issues in Ashtead, Bookham, Fetcham and Leatherhead including passenger transport, highway improvements, parking measures, pedestrian and cycle facilities
- A package of schemes in rural areas providing highways improvements.

Potential funding will be a combination of developer contributions such as Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), central government grants, local committee allocations and through the district council.
Reigate and Banstead borough

Introduction

The borough of Reigate and Banstead is located in the east of the county, adjoining Greater London to the north, Crawley and Gatwick Airport to the south, and Horsham District in West Sussex. The main settlements within the borough are Redhill and Reigate with smaller centres comprising Horley, Merstham, Tadworth and Preston. The principal road network is centred around Redhill. North to south links comprise the A217 and A23 and east to west links are the A25 and the M25. There are nine designated Air Quality Management Areas within the borough.

Main transport challenges

In summary the main transport challenges facing the district are:

- Congestion, impacting upon air quality, and poor accessibility between Reigate and Redhill and other areas in the borough
- Poor accessibility, congestion and community severance between Merstham, Redhill West and the town centre
- Inadequate walking and cycling routes between new residential developments and Redhill town centre; within the centre of Horley, pedestrian accessibility to the town centre from residential areas is particularly poor
- Community severance caused by the A217 and A23 resulting in a barrier between Redhill rail station, bus station and the town centre
- Congestion on the Redhill ring road caused by poor signage for car park and HGVs
- Areas within the borough have infrequent public transport leading to the majority of journeys within the borough being completed by car.
- Poor public transport provision in the evenings and on Sundays in Preston, along with poor pedestrian and cyclist access to surrounding areas.

Our proposed approach

Three major schemes have been identified for Reigate and Banstead:

- Redhill Balanced Network
- Road Network Improvements in Reigate
- Reigate – Redhill Hub Transport Improvements

The schemes listed below are also proposed to address the problems identified with the existing transport infrastructure in the borough. They look to encourage more sustainable forms of transport and to minimize the need to travel.

- A23 corridor improvements including junction improvements and pedestrian and cyclist improvements
- A217 corridor improvements including safety, pedestrian, cyclist and junction improvements
• Transport improvements within Redhill town centre including public realm, pedestrian and cyclist improvements, traffic management measures and bus priority improvements, air quality measures, highway safety improvements
• Improvements to Reigate town centre including bus corridor, improved cycle and pedestrian routes and highway safety improvements
• Transport improvements in Horley including town centre public realm improvements, improved bus services, cycle and pedestrian facilities, junction improvements and traffic calming.

Potential funding will be a combination of developer contributions such as Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), central government grants, local committee allocations, Local Sustainable Transport Fund, Growing Places Fund and through the borough council.
Runnymede borough

Introduction
The three main towns of Addlestone, Chertsey and Egham are all well connected to the local road network. These urban areas are most likely to see the majority of development in the borough and through the DERA site at Longcross where an additional 1,500 homes will be delivered. The borough is split into quarters by the north-south M25 and the east-west M3. The other principal roads are the A30 and the A320 providing connectivity to Woking and Guildford, the A380 to Windsor and the A317 to Weybridge.

Main transport challenges
When there is severe congestion on the motorways there are knock on effects on the local road network as traffic leaves the M25 and M3 seeking alternative routes on local A and B roads. There is also a major motorway junction at the centre of the borough where the M25 and M3 intersect. On the local road network, the A30 Egham bypass suffers from congestion at peak times along with the local roads surrounding the M3 Junction 3 and within the town centres of Addlestone, Chertsey and Egham. The main challenges in the borough have been identified as:

- Traffic congestion in Egham town centre caused by railway crossing points and high volumes of traffic
- Egham bypass and railway are barriers to movement
- High level of congestion within Addlestone town centre and inadequate facilities for pedestrians and cyclists
- High traffic levels and speeds on the main distributor roads with inadequate facilities for cyclists and pedestrians in Chertsey town centre.

Our proposed approach
Two major schemes have been identified for Runnymede borough:

- Runnymede Roundabout
- Egham Sustainable Transport Package

The schemes listed below are also proposed to address the problems identified with the existing transport infrastructure in the borough. They look to encourage more sustainable forms of transport and to minimise the need to travel.

- In addition to Runnymede roundabout and Egham sustainable package, further improvements including bus services to employment areas, highway improvements, road safety schemes, pedestrian and cycling improvements
- A package of schemes in Addlestone comprising road safety and pedestrian and cyclist improvements
- A package of schemes in Chertsey comprising road safety and pedestrian and cyclist improvements
- Improvements to Longcross Rail Station and enhanced service levels
- Various highway improvements, public transport improvements, pedestrian and cyclist improvements and road safety schemes in the smaller centres.
Potential funding will be a combination of developer contributions such as Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), central government grants, local committee allocations and through the borough council.
Spelthorne Borough

Introduction
The predominately urban Borough of Spelthorne is located in the north east of Surrey adjoining greater London. The Borough consists of a number of settlements. It includes Staines upon Thames, which is the largest retail and commercial centre within the borough and Sunbury, Ashford and Shepperton. Heathrow Airport immediately adjoins the northern boundary of the borough and is a major employment site employing over 76,000 people. It is a major generator of traffic and road journeys in Spelthorne.

Main transport challenges
Within the borough the strategic road network comprises the M3, M25, A30 and A3113 (Airport Way). These roads generally operate at high levels of stress throughout the day and are particularly congested at peak times. The whole of the Borough is designated as an Air Quality Management Area because of poor air quality. The main transport challenges within the borough are:

- Traffic congestion within Staines upon Thames town centre
- Traffic congestion caused by traffic flows from south west London and Heathrow affecting Ashford, Stanwell and Sunbury
- Poorer air quality within parts of Staines upon Thames town centre, Sunbury and parts of Shepperton

Our proposed approach
One major scheme has been identified for Spelthorne:

- Staines Bridge Widening

The schemes listed below are also proposed to address the problems identified with the existing transport infrastructure in the borough. They look to encourage more sustainable forms of transport and to minimise the need to travel.

- The Staines Movement Study will inform transport improvements in Staines upon Thames town centre and the wider area which may include bus improvements, pedestrian and cycling improvements, junction improvements and improved traffic management.
- Introduction of air quality measures on transport corridors around Ashford, Stanwell, Sunbury and Shepperton
- A package of improvements in Shepperton town centre which may include safety improvements, air quality measures on relevant transport corridors and public transport improvements.

Potential funding may come from a combination of developer contributions such as Section 106 and in due course Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), central government grants, local committee allocations and Growing Places Fund.
Surrey Heath borough

Introduction

Surrey Heath borough is located to the west of the county and adjoins Hampshire and Bracknell. Camberley is the main settlement within the borough and is designated as a strategic town centre. It serves as an important retail and commercial centre for the west of the county. The principal road network in the borough consists of the M3 running north-east to south-west through the borough, the A30, the A322 providing a link from the M3 to the M4 and the A331 (Blackwater Valley Route) providing a north-south link from the M3 to the A31 Hog’s Back.

The majority of housing within the borough will be delivered within Camberley and through the redevelopment of the Princess Royal Barracks, Deepcut where an additional 1,200 homes will be delivered. The transport network in the borough will be put under further pressure from cross-boundary development especially the Aldershot Urban Extension, a development of 4,000 homes.

Main transport challenges

There are a number of bottlenecks within the borough that are subject to high levels of traffic congestion. Technical modelling has found that congestion will be further exacerbated without any form of mitigation. The main challenges in the borough have been identified as:

- Congestion in Camberley Town Centre, M3 corridor Junction 4 to Junction 2, A325 in the Frimley Area and A331 corridor, and on the A319 in Chobham
- Constraint on traffic movements across the borough are constrained by the Borough’s long southern boundary with the River which is crossed by only four bridging points
- Poor bus services particularly in rural areas where services run infrequently and there are no evening services.

Our proposed approach

Two major schemes have been identified for Surrey Heath:

- A30/A331 Corridor improvements including Meadows Roundabout
- Highways improvements, Camberley

The schemes listed below are also proposed to address the problems identified with the existing transport infrastructure in the borough. They look to encourage more sustainable forms of transport and to minimise the need to travel.

- A package of schemes within Camberley Town Centre including pedestrian improvements, bus infrastructure improvements and cycle route improvements
- Improved access to the Yorktown area
- Improvements to A325 Frimley roundabout (also known as Toshiba Roundabout)
- Junction improvements along the A325 and traffic management improvements
- Junction improvements on approaches to M3
Potential funding will be a combination of developer contributions such as Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), central government grants, local committee allocations, Growing Places Fund and through the borough council.
Tandridge district

Introduction

Tandridge district is the most easterly of the eleven districts in Surrey, bordering Kent to the east, London to the north and East and West Sussex to the south. With an area of 248km$^2$ and just under 80,000 people, it has the lowest population density in the county. Some 94% of the district is designated as Green Belt and the urban area occupies the remaining 6%, much of which lies predominantly in the northern half of the district. The principal road network comprises of the M25, M23, A25, A22 and A264.

Main transport challenges

Both the M25 and M23 run through the district. Delays on the motorway network often result in serious congestion on routes such as the A25 and on parts of the A22. Due to the rural nature of the district, it is not particularly well served by public transport, except for rail lines into London making modal shift more difficult. The challenge is therefore to ensure services are adequate and offer a real alternative to using the car. The main transport challenges within the borough have been identified as:

- Poor public transport in rural areas
- Lack of parking in urban areas and especially at local rail stations due to commuters
- HGV traffic on A25 corridor impacting upon villages
- Congestion on a number of junctions of A22 resulting in poor journey time reliability
- Poor pedestrian and cyclist facilities on A25 and A22 corridors
- Congestion centred on Station Avenue in Caterham Valley
- Rat running on rural roads
- Congestion on the A264 and cross boundary traffic.

Our proposed approach

There are no major transport schemes identified within Tandridge, but the schemes listed below are proposed to address problems identified with the existing transport infrastructure in the district. They look to encourage more sustainable forms of transport and to minimise the need to travel.

- A25 Study to assess required improvements to the corridor including road improvements, junction improvements, pedestrian and cyclist improvements
- Provision of adequate transport infrastructure and services (including public transport) that supports the aim of reducing the need to travel by car.
- encourage alternative modes of transport, in particular in rural areas, by supporting rural transport initiatives
- Junction and pedestrian and cyclist improvements on the A22
- Parking strategies/greater parking provision at railway stations

Potential funding will be a combination of developer contributions such as Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), central government grants, local committee allocations and through the district council.
Waverley borough

Introduction
The borough of Waverley is located in the south western corner of the county and is predominantly rural in nature with 80 percent designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and/or an Area of Great Landscape Value. The majority of residents live in the settlement areas of Farnham, Godalming, Haslemere and Cranleigh. These are the main shopping and employment centres within the borough. The borough also includes Dunsfold Park which is a major local employment centre. The main highway network in Waverley consists of the A31 through Farnham, the A287, the A3 running from Hindhead towards Guildford through the centre of the borough, the A286, the A283 and the A281. The main railway lines run through Godalming from Guildford, towards Haslemere, and through Farnham.

Main transport challenges
A number of transport challenges are experienced on the borough’s transport network including:

- Existing and future congestion on the A31 in Farnham leading to poor air quality and unreliable journey times
- Community severance caused by the road network especially in Farnham resulting in a barrier to movement, particularly by walking and cycling resulting in less sustainable travel patterns
- Limited pedestrian and cyclist facilities in some areas of the borough, along with limited bus infrastructure provision in places, which combine to provide restricted accessibility for those without a car.

Our proposed approach
Four major schemes have been identified for Waverley:

- Farnham Town Centre Package
- A31 Hickley’s Corner Junction Improvement
- A31 Hickley’s Corner Underpass
- Wrecclesham Relief Road

The schemes listed below are also proposed to address the problems identified with the existing transport infrastructure in the borough. The proposed approach below is being developed but is subject to feasibility and consultation. The proposed schemes are intended to encourage more sustainable travel patterns in the borough, improve journey time reliability, reduce congestion and improve transport accessibility by sustainable modes. The proposed schemes include:

- Roundabout and junction improvements: the A325 Corridor and A31/A325 Coxbridge Roundabout; A31 Hickley’s Corner; and A31 Shepherd & Flock Roundabout
- Farnham town centre improvements to include upgrade of bus infrastructure, improved walking and cycling accessibility
- Improvements to Farnham railway station forecourt
• Traffic management and route improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in Godalming and Haslemere
• Bus improvements in Farnham, Cranleigh, Haslemere and in rural areas.

Potential funding will be a combination of developer contributions such as Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), central government grants, local committee allocations, Growing Places Fund and through the borough council.
Woking borough

Introduction

Woking Borough is located in north west Surrey, approximately 25 miles from London. The borough covers approximately 6,400 hectares and is predominantly urban in character. The main settlements in the borough are Woking and West Byfleet. The main highways through Woking are the A320, A324 and A322. These provide access to surrounding settlements and to the A3 and M25 which provide access to London and the south. Woking is served by two railway lines providing frequent services to London Waterloo and much of the south and west.

Main transport challenges

The road network, railways and waterways act as barriers to movement in some areas of the borough. A small number of crossings of these barriers contribute to congestion as traffic concentrates at these points, particularly during the peak hours.

Congestion contributes to unreliable journey times, is detrimental to air quality and can act as a deterrent for businesses to locate offices in the area thereby inhibiting economic growth. Particular congestion bottlenecks have been identified in Woking town centre, Brookwood and on approaches to the M25.

The main challenges in the borough have been identified as:

- Congestion in Woking town centre, Maybury, Knaphill and St Johns, and on the A324/A322 at Brookwood crossroads
- Poor air quality in Knaphill
- The railway line acts as a barrier to north-south movement in Woking town centre and also separates Maybury and Sheerwater, making it difficult to access the town centre and employment areas in Maybury and Sheerwater.

Our proposed approach

Two major schemes have been identified for Woking:

- Victoria Arch Capacity Improvements
- Woking Hub Transport Improvements

The schemes listed below are also proposed to address the problems identified with the existing transport infrastructure in the borough. The schemes are intended to encourage more sustainable travel patterns in the borough, improve journey time reliability and improve transport interchange opportunities. Some of these schemes are currently being implemented such as the Sheerwater Link Road. More detailed information and timescales are included within the Local Transport Strategy which will be published by the county council for consultation in late 2013. The schemes include:

- Improvements along the A320 corridor from Woking town centre to the Six Crossroads
• Provision of the Sheerwater Link Road (construction due to start early 2013)
• Improvements to the one-way system in West Byfleet
• Woking transport interchange hub at Woking station
• Improvements to Victoria Arch to the benefit of all modes to increase accessibility and reduce severance caused by the railway
• Area improvements to the walking and cycling network, to complete some of the gaps in provision.

Potential sources of funding have been identified as CIL and S106 agreements, central government grants via the county council, funding from the LEP through the Growing Places Fund, Woking Local Committee allocations and funding from Woking Borough Council.
## Annex 2

### Other congestion bottlenecks identified within the county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Borough/District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A244 Hersham Road</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A244 Oxshott Road to A3</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A245 Byfleet Road/B365 Seven Hills Road</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A309/A3050 to Hampton Court</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2200 Chessington Road to the Kingston boundary</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24 London Road to the Sutton boundary and south towards Leatherhead</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A240 Kingston Road/Ewell by pass to the Kingston boundary</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A232 Cheam Road to the Sutton Boundary</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B280 Christ Church Road to the Kingston Boundary</td>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford town centre: A323, A322, Bridge Street/Friary Bridge gyratory arms and A3100</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Aldershot and Farnborough: A331, A323 A324 between Pirbright and Normandy</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 corridor: west GBC to A3 south of Guildford town centre</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A320 and A332 south of Worpleson</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A324 between Pirbright and Normandy</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3000 Compton</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leatherhead one-way system and Randalls Road</td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorking one-way system</td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Borough/District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25 between Westcott and Dorking</td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepdene Roundabout (junction of A25 Reigate Road with A24 Deepdene Avenue)</td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25 to Leatherhead bypass</td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Givons Grove Roundabout (junction of A24 Leatherhead By-Pass Road with A24 Dorking Road, A246 Young Street and B2450 Dorking Road)</td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoll Roundabout (junction of A24 Leatherhead Road with B2122 Epsom Road and A243 Leatherhead By-Pass Road)</td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough Roundabout (junction of A245 Kingston Road with B2430 Kingston Road and Barnett Wood Lane).</td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A217 Brighton Road (Banstead Downs), north of Junction 8 of M25, Reigate Hill</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23 London Road</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23 Horley Road (South of Earlswood)</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23 Horley to Redhill</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Head/Balcombe Road junction</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longbridge roundabout</td>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A320 St Peter’s Way - as well as other local roads surrounding the M25 junction 11</td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A317/B3121 St Georges Roundabout</td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A317 corridor</td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30 London Road</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A244 Gaston Bridge</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A308 Staines Road West</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Borough/District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B378 Ashford Road</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton Lane</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton Lane – Chertsey Bridge Road junction</td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B311 Red Road</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3015 The Maultway</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A319 – A3046 Chobham</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A319/A8383 Chertsey Road/Chobham High Street</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30 Blackwater – Bagshot</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A325 Corridor</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A331 Corridor</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3/A322 junction</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A325/B3411 junction</td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22 corridor (Whyteleafe, Caterham and Godstone)</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25 corridor</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A264 corridor (Felbridge) including A264/A22 junction and</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A264/Crawley Down Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outwood Lane crossroads</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22/B2030 Godstone Road junction</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Road/Chaldon oad and Coulsdon Road junction</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A287 Hindhead Road, Haslemere</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farncombe Street, Farncombe</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3016 Upper Hale Road, and A3016 Hale Road (north of</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Bells Roundabout), Farnham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3005 Alma Lane, Farnham</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A287 Castle Street, Farnham</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Borough/District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A287 Farnham town centre</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3016 Upper Hale Road</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A325 Farnham town centre</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A324/A322 Brookwood Crossroads</td>
<td>Woking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Crossroads Roundabout</td>
<td>Woking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A320 Corridor</td>
<td>Woking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A245 Corridor</td>
<td>Woking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex 3

## Addressing the risks identified by the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epsom Town Centre Action Plan</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>How implementation of the Congestion Programme will address the identified risks &amp; recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Target Bid Date: 2015/16 (Scheme A in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td>No significant risks identified – Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) not likely to be required at project level.</td>
<td>The findings &amp; recommendations of the SEA are noted, &amp; the following actions will be incorporated into the development of the scheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>• EIA Screening Opinion obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority.</td>
<td>• PD rights position clarified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarify position re. permitted development (PD) rights with relevant planning authority.</td>
<td>• BC Conservation Officer consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consult Epsom &amp; Ewell Borough Council (E&amp;EBC) Conservation Officer re. safeguarding Conservation Areas &amp; Listed Buildings.</td>
<td>• BC &amp; SCC consulted on flood risk &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consult E&amp;EBC &amp; Surrey County Council (SCC) on surface water management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redhill Balanced Network</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Target Bid Date: 2015/16 (Scheme C in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td>No significant risks identified – EIA not likely to be required at project level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarify position re. PD rights with relevant planning authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consult Reigate &amp; Banstead BC Conservation Officer re. safeguarding Conservation Areas &amp; Listed Buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consult R&amp;BBC Environmental Health Officer (EHO) re. air quality issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede Roundabout</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>How implementation of the Congestion Programme will address the identified risks &amp; recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risks: Heritage assets identified – EIA not likely to be required at project level, subject to it being demonstrated that the Scheduled Monument adjacent to the scheme area would not be adversely affected.</td>
<td>The findings &amp; recommendations of the SEA are noted, &amp; the following actions will be incorporated into the development of the scheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations: Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      |                                    |   • EIA Screening Opinion obtained.  
|                      |                                    |   • PD rights position clarified.  
|                      |                                    |   • English Heritage & SCC Archaeologist consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
|                      |                                    |   • Environment Agency consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
|                      |                                    |   • BC & SCC consulted on flood risk & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
|                      |                                    |   • Natural England consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
|                      |                                    |   • SCC & BC Ecologists, & SWT consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
|                      |                                    |   • BC EHO consulted on air quality & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
|                      |                                    |  |
| Victoria Arch Capacity Improvements, Woking | Risks: No significant risks identified – EIA not likely to be required at project level. |  |
| Estimated Target Bid Date: 2015/16 (Scheme N in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report) | Recommendations: Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority. |  
|                      |                                    |  
|                      |                                    |   • EIA Screening Opinion obtained.  
|                      |                                    |   • PD rights position clarified.  
|                      |                                    |   • BC Conservation Officer consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
<p>| | | |
|                      |                                    |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Risks &amp; Recommendations from the SEA</th>
<th>How implementation of the Congestion Programme will address the identified risks &amp; recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egham Sustainable Transport Package</strong>&lt;br&gt;Estimated Target Bid Date: 2015/16 (Scheme F in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td>The findings &amp; recommendations of the SEA are noted, &amp; the following actions will be incorporated into the development of the scheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risks</strong>&lt;br&gt;No significant risks identified – EIA not likely to be required at project level.</td>
<td>• EIA Screening Opinion obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong>&lt;br&gt;Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority.&lt;br&gt;Clarify position re. PD rights with relevant planning authority.&lt;br&gt;Consult English Heritage &amp; SCC Archaeologists re. safeguarding nearby Scheduled Monuments &amp; Registered Parks &amp; Gardens.&lt;br&gt;Consult RBC Conservation Officer re. safeguarding Conservation Areas &amp; Listed Buildings.&lt;br&gt;Consult Natural England re. safeguarding of nearby SSSIs, SACs, SPAs, &amp; Ramsar Sites.&lt;br&gt;Consult the Environment Agency re. safeguarding the quality of the nearby main river &amp; addressing fluvial flood risk.&lt;br&gt;Consult RBC &amp; SCC on surface water management.&lt;br&gt;Consult RBC EHO re. air quality issues.</td>
<td>• PD rights position clarified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wider Network Benefits Package</strong>&lt;br&gt;Estimated Target Bid Date: 2015/16 (Scheme I in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risks</strong>&lt;br&gt;Not assessed as the scheme is concerned with network management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong>&lt;br&gt;Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority.&lt;br&gt;Clarify position re. PD rights with relevant planning authority.&lt;br&gt;Consult the Environment Agency re. safeguarding the quality of the nearby main river &amp; addressing fluvial flood risk.&lt;br&gt;Consult Natural England re. safeguarding of nearby SSSI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A30/A331 Corridor Improvements</strong>&lt;br&gt;Estimated Target Bid Date: 2016/17 (Scheme E in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td>The findings &amp; recommendations of the SEA are noted, &amp; the following actions will be incorporated into the development of the scheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risks</strong>&lt;br&gt;Risks to ecological assets identified – EIA not likely to be required at project level, subject to it being demonstrated that the SSSI close to the scheme area would not be adversely affected.</td>
<td>• EIA Screening Opinion obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong>&lt;br&gt;Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority.&lt;br&gt;Clarify position re. PD rights with relevant planning authority.&lt;br&gt;Consult the Environment Agency re. safeguarding the quality of the nearby main river &amp; addressing fluvial flood risk.&lt;br&gt;Consult Natural England re. safeguarding of nearby SSSI.&lt;br&gt;Consult the SCC and Surrey Heath BC Ecologists &amp; the SWT re. safeguarding nearby SNCIs.&lt;br&gt;Consult SHBC Conservation Officer re. safeguarding Conservation Areas &amp; Listed Buildings.&lt;br&gt;Consult SHBC EHO re. air quality issues.</td>
<td>• PD rights position clarified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environment Agency consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Natural England consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SCC &amp; BC Ecologists, &amp; SWT consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• BC Conservation Officer consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• BC EHO consulted on air quality &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package</td>
<td>Key Risks &amp; Recommendations from the SEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guildford Gyratory improvements</strong>&lt;br&gt;Estimated Target Bid Date: 2016/17 (Scheme B in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td><strong>Risks</strong>&lt;br&gt;Risks to heritage assets identified – EIA not likely to be required at project level, subject to it being demonstrated that the Scheduled Monuments within the scheme area would not be adversely affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dorking Town Centre Traffic Management Measures</strong>&lt;br&gt;Estimated Target Bid Date: 2016/17 (Scheme L in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td><strong>Risks</strong>&lt;br&gt;No significant risks identified – EIA not likely to be required at project level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farnham Town Centre Package</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risks</strong>&lt;br&gt;Risks to heritage assets identified – EIA not likely to be required at project level, subject to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Estimated Target Bid Date: 2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Hickley's Corner Junction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement, Farnham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiln Lane Link, Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberley Highway Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings & recommendations of the SEA are noted, & the following actions will be incorporated into the development of the scheme:
- EIA Screening Opinion obtained.
- PD rights position clarified.
- BC Conservation Officer consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.
- Environment Agency consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.
- BC & SCC consulted on flood risk & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.
- SCC & BC Ecologists, & SWT consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.
- BC EHO consulted on air quality & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.
Consult the Environment Agency re. safeguarding the quality of the nearby main river & addressing fluvial flood risk.
Consult Natural England re. safeguarding of nearby SSSI.
Consult the SCC & SHBC Ecologists & the SWT re. safeguarding nearby SNCIs.
Consult SHBC Conservation Officer re. safeguarding Conservation Areas & Listed Buildings.

- SCC & BC Ecologists, & SWT consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.
- BC Conservation Officer consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.
### A24 Capel to Surrey/West Sussex Border Corridor Improvements

**Estimated Target Bid Date:** 2017/18  
**(Scheme J in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Risks</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommendations</strong></th>
<th><strong>How implementation of the Congestion Programme will address the identified risks &amp; recommendations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Risks to ecological assets identified – EIA may be required at project level. | Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority. | The findings & recommendations of the SEA are noted, & the following actions will be incorporated into the development of the scheme:  
- EIA Screening Opinion obtained.  
- Planning permission position clarified.  
- Natural England consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
- SCC & DC Ecologists, & SWT consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
- DC Conservation Officer consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Risks</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommendations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Risks to ecological assets identified – EIA may be required at project level. | Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority.  
Clarify position re. planning permission with relevant planning authority.  
Consult Natural England re. safeguarding of nearby SSSI.  
Consult the SCC and Mole Valley DC Ecologists & the SWT re. safeguarding nearby SNCIs.  
Consult MVDC Conservation Officer re. safeguarding Conservation Areas & Listed Buildings. |

### A24 Clarks Green to Holmwood, Mole Valley

**Estimated Target Bid Date:** 2018/19  
**(Scheme O in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Risks</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommendations</strong></th>
<th><strong>How implementation of the Congestion Programme will address the identified risks &amp; recommendations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Risks to landscape assets identified – EIA may be required at project level. | Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority. | The findings & recommendations of the SEA are noted, & the following actions will be incorporated into the development of the scheme:  
- EIA Screening Opinion obtained.  
- Planning permission position clarified.  
- Natural England consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
- SCC & DC Ecologists, & SWT consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
- DC Conservation Officer consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Risks</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommendations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Risks to landscape assets identified – EIA may be required at project level. | Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority.  
Clarify position re. planning permission with relevant planning authority.  
Consult Natural England, SCC & MVDC Landscape Architects, & Surrey Hills AONB Office re. safeguarding the nearby AONB & AGLV.  
Consult the Environment Agency re. safeguarding the quality of the nearby main river.  
Consult the SCC and Mole Valley DC Ecologists & the SWT re. safeguarding nearby SNCIs & Ancient Woodland.  
Consult MVDC Conservation Officer re. safeguarding Conservation Areas & Listed Buildings. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Network Improvements, Reigate</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>How implementation of the Congestion Programme will address the identified risks &amp; recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Target Bid Date: post-2019 (Scheme P in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td>Risks to heritage assets identified – EIA not likely to be required at project level, subject to it being demonstrated that the nearby Scheduled Monument would not be adversely affected.</td>
<td>The findings &amp; recommendations of the SEA are noted, &amp; the following actions will be incorporated into the development of the scheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A31 Hickley’s Corner Underpass, Farnham</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>The findings &amp; recommendations of the SEA are noted, &amp; the following actions will be incorporated into the development of the scheme:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Target Bid Date: post-2019 (Scheme Q in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td>No significant risks identified – EIA not likely to be required at project level.</td>
<td>- EIA Screening Opinion obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guildford A3 Strategic Corridor Improvements</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>The findings &amp; recommendations of the SEA are noted, &amp; the following actions will be incorporated into the development of the scheme:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Target Bid Date: post-2019 (Scheme R in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td>Three options were assessed – Option R(a) (improvements to the A3 on its existing alignment) was least likely to give rise to significant environmental impacts. Option R(c) (Bid of a new bypass) was most likely to give rise to significant environmental impacts &amp; would require EIA.</td>
<td>- Consideration of environmental impacts scoped into any options appraisal work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Ensure any options appraisal work takes full account of the likely environmental impacts of the options considered. For the preferred option obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority. Clarify position re. planning permission with relevant planning authority. Consult Natural England re. safeguarding of SSSIs, SPAs and SAC surrounding Guildford. Consult the SCC &amp; GBC Ecologists &amp; the SWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reigate-Redhill Hub Transport Improvements | Risks to heritage assets & air quality, & of flooding, identified – EIA may be required at project level. | Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority. Clarify position re. planning permission with relevant planning authority. Consult English Heritage & SCC Archaeologists re. safeguarding Scheduled Monuments & Registered Parks & Gardens. Consult the LLFA & RBBC re. addressing surface water flood risk. Consult RBBC Conservation Officer re. safeguarding Conservation Areas & Listed Buildings. | EIA Screening Opinion obtained. Planning permission position clarified. English Heritage & SCC Archaeologists consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme. LLFA & RBBC consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme. RBBC Conservation Officer consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme. BC EHO consulted on air quality &...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Estimated Target Bid Date: post-2019</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>The findings &amp; recommendations of the SEA are noted, &amp; the following actions will be incorporated into the development of the scheme:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staines-upon-Thames Bridge Widening</td>
<td>(Scheme U in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td>Risks to heritage &amp; nature conservation assets, the water environment &amp; flooding, &amp; air quality identified – EIA may be required at project level.</td>
<td>Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority. Clarify position re. planning permission with relevant planning authority. Consult the Environment Agency re. safeguarding the quality of the nearby main river &amp; addressing fluvial flood risk. Consult RBC &amp; SBC Conservation Officers re. safeguarding Conservation Areas &amp; Listed Buildings. Consult the SCC &amp; BC Ecologists &amp; the SWT re. safeguarding nearby SNCIs.</td>
<td>EIA Screening Opinion obtained. Planning permission position clarified. Environment Agency consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme. BC Conservation Officers consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme. SCC &amp; BC Ecologists, &amp; SWT consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme. BC EHOs consulted on air quality &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking Hub Transport Improvements</td>
<td>(Scheme V in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td>Risks to heritage &amp; nature conservation assets &amp; air quality, &amp; of flooding, identified – EIA may be required at project level.</td>
<td>Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant planning authority. Clarify position re. planning permission with relevant planning authority. Consult Natural England re. safeguarding of SSSIs and the SPA surrounding Woking. Consult the SCC &amp; WoBC Ecologists &amp; the SWT re. safeguarding nearby SNCIs. Consult English Heritage &amp; SCC Archaeologists re. safeguarding Scheduled Monuments &amp; Registered Parks &amp; Gardens. Consult the LLFA &amp; WoBC re. addressing surface water flood risk. Consult WoBC Conservation Officer re. safeguarding Conservation Areas &amp; Listed Buildings.</td>
<td>EIA Screening Opinion obtained. Planning permission position clarified. Natural England consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme. SCC &amp; BC Ecologists, &amp; SWT consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme. English Heritage &amp; SCC Archaeologists consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme. LLFA &amp; BC consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme. BC Conservation Officer consulted &amp; advice reflected in the design of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrecclesham Relief Road, Farnham</td>
<td>(Scheme W in Appendix 1 to the Environmental Report)</td>
<td>Risks to landscape &amp; nature conservation assets, &amp; water quality &amp; flooding, identified – EIA may be required at project level.</td>
<td>Obtain EIA Screening Opinion from relevant</td>
<td>EIA Screening Opinion obtained. Planning permission position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Planning Authority | Clarify position re. planning permission with relevant planning authority.  
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                    | Consult South Downs National Park Authority re. safeguarding the context & setting of the South Downs National Park.  
|                    | Consult the SCC, Hampshire County Council, WaBC & Eat Hampshire DC Ecologists & the SWT & the Hampshire Wildlife Trust re. safeguarding nearby SNCIs.  
|                    | Consult the Environment Agency re. safeguarding the quality of the nearby main river & addressing fluvial flood risk.  
|                    |                                                                                                                                    | clarified.  
|                    | - South Downs NPA consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
|                    | - SCC, HCC & BC Ecologists, & SWT & HWT consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme.  
|                    | Environment Agency consulted & advice reflected in the design of the scheme. |
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff were commissioned by Thames Valley Berkshire, Enterprise M3, Solent and Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnerships (working closely with the local highway authorities) to undertake an assessment of the economic benefits of strategic transport corridors. As well as enhancing connectivity within the area covered by the four LEPs, the corridors will also provide strategic links to neighbouring LEP areas such as Dorset, points north of Berkshire and the Greater London area.

For clarity, this is not a ‘traditional’ transport economics as monetised journey time savings and accident reduction benefits have not been calculated. Instead, the focus is on the wider economic impacts of the strategic corridors and specifically, how these can help boost connectivity and productivity in the region.

The geographical area covered by the four LEPs is of significant national economic importance as a large proportion of national wealth is generated here. As an example, the economy in Berkshire and the Thames Valley is one of the highest performing in the country given the very high levels of Gross Value Added (GVA) per head generated. Put simply, this means the area produces a significant share of national wealth - thus it is thus in the national interest for this to continue given how much is contributed to the “national economic cause”.

Similarly, the economy of the Solent area is thriving with emphasis on the maritime and related specialist sectors near to Southampton and Portsmouth. For these to continue thriving, enhanced transport connectivity is essential, both between the two cities as well as between the Solent area and other areas of economic importance.

In addition, there is a fast-developing ‘hi tech’ sector within Surrey that is characterised by very high levels of productivity (GVA per worker). Given this is forecast to increase considerably in the future as these sectors expand, enhanced transport connectivity will be essential. However, without intervention, the very high levels of usage of the county’s transport system is causing increasing amounts of delay and congestion and therefore acting as a block to full growth potential.

The ‘Gatwick Diamond’ agglomeration of industry in Sussex is another major generator of economic wealth. With key transport corridors such as the Brighton Main Line and the M23 / A23 corridor already operating at or near full capacity, corridor enhancements will generate significant economic benefits by enabling the area’s growth potential to be realised.

The strategic transport corridors also address the lack of point-to-point connectivity across the region. This is the case for strategic links between Sussex and the Thames Valley where there is presently very poor transport access given the lack of direct links. This is why proposals to significantly enhance the North Downs Line (linking Redhill, Reigate and Guildford with the Thames Valley) are so important. Also, a new corridor between Horsham and the Thames Valley will offer significant economic benefits.

As well as generating economic wealth, the corridors will provide much-needed connectivity between some of the more peripheral areas of the region and centres of high economic growth. In East Sussex, for example, the coastal areas near Eastbourne and Hastings will benefit from much improved connectivity to mid-Sussex, Surrey and the Greater London area.
Improved connectivity is therefore essential for the following two key reasons:

→ To facilitate continued economic expansion in the region via increased productivity and the national economic benefits this generates; and

→ Improved access for workers accessing labour markets and areas of high productivity – this also works ‘both ways’ as firms will have improved access to a larger pool of suitably qualified workers.

The methodology used is based on current DfT guidance whereby agglomeration improvements stem from the enhanced productivity generated by better transport links. This is particularly applicable in the South East where there is a very high level of travel to / from places of employment. The concentrations of residential areas and areas of employment throughout the region mean that long-distance journeys to work are regularly made.

All of the major existing corridors see high levels of journeys being made and therefore if connectivity is improved, productivity will be also enhanced with all the consequent economic benefits this produces.

The wider benefits calculated include the following: 1) increased agglomeration (through enhanced productivity), 2) the employment the additional GVA supports and 3) the various taxation benefits generated from additional employment.

Based on the strategic corridor analysis, the results provide a powerful indicator of the economic benefits that could be generated. The results below show the “Top Ten” corridors and the impacts generated.

**SUMMARY RESULTS BY “TOP TEN” CORRIDORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Income Tax Gain</th>
<th>Corporation Tax Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Relief Road</td>
<td>£5.9 billion</td>
<td>36,000 jobs</td>
<td>£430 million</td>
<td>£282 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sussex Way</td>
<td>£4.4 billion</td>
<td>29,000 jobs</td>
<td>£346 million</td>
<td>£211 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sussex to Thames Valley</td>
<td>£3.6 billion</td>
<td>15,700 jobs</td>
<td>£189 million</td>
<td>£174 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton to Portsmouth</td>
<td>£2 billion</td>
<td>12,300 jobs</td>
<td>£150 million</td>
<td>£95 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading to Waterloo</td>
<td>£1.9 billion</td>
<td>7,500 jobs</td>
<td>£90 million</td>
<td>£90 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Downs Line</td>
<td>£1.9 billion</td>
<td>8,000 jobs</td>
<td>£97 million</td>
<td>£89 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Access to Heathrow</td>
<td>£1.8 billion</td>
<td>8,200 jobs</td>
<td>£100 million</td>
<td>£88 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A27 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>£1.5 billion</td>
<td>9,300 jobs</td>
<td>£111 million</td>
<td>£75 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Main Line</td>
<td>£1.5 billion</td>
<td>7,500 jobs</td>
<td>£90 million</td>
<td>£70 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>£1.1 billion</td>
<td>6,000 jobs</td>
<td>£71 million</td>
<td>£55 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In overall economic impact terms (ensuring there is no ‘double counting’ of benefits across corridors serving similar geographies), total additional annual GVA would exceed £19.5 billion with over 100,000 additional jobs supported by this additional economic activity. Government would also gain annual additional revenue of £1.2 billion from personal income taxation and just under £1 billion per annum from corporation taxation.

It is important to point out that the above impacts represent the typical impact if this were to happen at the current time. In reality, these impacts will be realised every year from scheme implementation as they represent the difference between the ‘status quo’ (i.e. doing nothing) and the impact with these corridors in place.
There are also major synergies between the corridors:

→ Enhancing connectivity along the South Coast: There are several major conurbations and centres of economic activity along the South Coast. These generate significant levels of economic activity and are forecast to grow in several different ways. Traffic levels and congestion on key corridors has reached a point whereby delays are commonplace. Corridor improvements along the A27, M27 and A31 will therefore enhance overall connectivity on an east-west axis.

In addition, the cities of Southampton and Portsmouth in the Solent area are economic 'powerhouses' in their own right and will benefit significantly from enhanced connectivity between them;

→ Enhancing the links between the South Coast and points further north: Due to relatively long journey times and the comparative peripherality of the South Coast, several of the corridors put forward will enhance connectivity to London and other major centres of economic activity.

The proposed upgrade of the ‘A3’ (Portsmouth – London) corridor as well as the upgraded Brighton Main Line and upgraded connection between Eastbourne and Surrey will all provide enhanced connectivity.

In addition, there will also be considerable synergy between ‘north – south’ and ‘east – west’ corridors. Examples include better access to Portsmouth and the Solent area from the A3 corridor and subsequent better connectivity to points east and west (using the upgraded A27 and M27 corridors). Improving the A34 between Southampton and points north will also help to take ‘pressure’ off some of the other corridors;

→ Enhancing 'north – south' connectivity in the region: In the Hampshire, Surrey and Mid-Sussex areas, historical corridor development has focussed on the main routes into London. Good north – south connectivity has therefore been difficult to achieve and this has been compounded in recent years by high levels of traffic on the north – south corridors.

By proposing new corridors that link Mid-Sussex (Horsham) with the Thames Valley (Bracknell/Reading) as well as upgraded existing corridors (such as the upgraded North Downs Line), connectivity will be enhanced.

Better north – south links will enable workers in these major centres to live further away as their commute times will be significantly enhanced. Similarly, improved connectivity between Basingstoke and Reading as well as between Southampton and Newbury will support growth in the region;

→ Enhancing connectivity between the South West / West of the region and London: Although there are several major transport corridors linking the study area to London, there remain ‘pockets’ of population and economic activity that are comparatively poorly served. By improving connectivity in these corridors, workers will be able to access a much wider range of employment opportunities.

There is also potential for the corridors to provide strong linkages with neighbouring LEP areas and the wider South East / South West regions.

The analysis has also shown that although the costs of these improvements will be high, the extent of the potential benefits could exceed these by some margin. Although several of these corridors will be major undertakings requiring significant planning, construction works and expenditure, the ‘goal’ of greatly enhanced economic activity will have major national and not just regional importance. This is why it is vital that these improvements be considered and developed further.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 SCOPE OF THE WORK

Enterprise M3, Coast to Capital, Solent and Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnerships, working closely with the local highway authorities, have appointed WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff to identify, describe and quantify the economic case for improving connectivity in major strategic movement corridors across South East England.

Rather than developing a traditional transport economic case, the objective is to identify outputs that set out the role of transport in raising productivity and supporting economic growth at a transformational level within the South East. As well as recognising the need to strengthen connectivity with London, another key objective is to strengthen existing and promote new corridors that will drive economic growth.

The focus on productivity is important as in the recent HM Treasury publication, “Fixing the Foundations”, the Government has set out its 15 point plan to raise productivity, centred on two pillars:

➔ Encouraging long-term investment in economic capital, including infrastructure, skills and knowledge; and
➔ Promoting a dynamic economy that encourages innovation and helps resources flow to their most productive use.

The development of a “Modern Transport System with a Secure Future” is identified within the plan as one of the 15 areas of focus.

There are several different types of economic activity that take place and the extent to which transport can influence these is illustrated in Figure 1-1 below. Several of the transport-related impacts shown below are incorporated as part of this study.

Figure 1-1 Economic Activity and the Influence of Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Activity</th>
<th>Influence of Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP / GVA Growth</td>
<td>Yes: transport generates growth through connectivity (also see ‘Productivity’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Productivity</td>
<td>Yes: transport can boost productivity via better connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Yes: transport-induced growth will boost employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Skills</td>
<td>No: this is more of a “policy” initiative for Government agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inward Investment</td>
<td>Partial: transport can influence inward investment but is not the sole determinant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use / Development</td>
<td>Partial: transport can help &quot;unlock&quot; sites for development but there are other factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 STRATEGIC MOVEMENT CORRIDORS

The development of the movement corridors will be expected to address known and forecast problems and issues and to deliver the following benefits:

→ Provision of new homes and business space in appropriate locations;
→ Enhanced economic interactions and labour mobility through connectivity improvements;
→ Better road and rail access to nationally important ports and airports;
→ Improved cross country road and rail routes linking South East economic areas without the need to travel via Central London;
→ Reducing congestion and removing bottlenecks on strategic road corridors;
→ Improved journey times on the major rail lines into London; and
→ Enhancements to the attractiveness of the area for new investment.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE DRAFT REPORT

This report sets out the work undertaken, the methodology used and the findings across the range of issues and topics specified in the study brief.

The remainder of the report contains the following chapters:

→ Chapter Two summarises the stakeholder engagement and data collation;
→ Chapter Three describes the methodology used;
→ Chapter Four identifies the movement corridors;
→ Chapter Five contains the initial prioritisation of corridors;
→ Chapter Six contains a preliminary identification of potential solutions;
→ Chapter Seven contains a summary of potential infrastructure improvements;
→ Chapter Eight contains descriptions and diagrams showing how the corridors will link areas of planned housing development; and
→ Chapter Nine contains a summary, conclusions and recommendations for further work.
2

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND DATA COLLATION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

A major element of the work has been stakeholder engagement and the collation of relevant data and information. The purpose of this chapter is to summarise the findings from the stakeholder engagement and to provide details of the various items of data obtained.

2.2 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Given the wide geographical area covered by the study and the large number of stakeholders involved and interested in the study, it was important to consult and engage with a variety of organisations at the earliest opportunity.

We set out to do this through the following:

- **Stakeholder Consultation Events:**
  - Event 1 was held on Tuesday 3\(^{rd}\) November 2015 in Horsham and was attended by representatives from local authorities in the study area as well as the organisation representing South East England Councils (SEEC), DfT and public transport operators (such as Stagecoach Rail, operators of South West Trains). The session outlined the objectives of the study and the proposed approach with useful feedback being provided by the attendees.
  - Event 2 was held on Monday 7\(^{th}\) December 2015 in Basingstoke. This was attended by a large number of stakeholders from local authorities and other organisations. WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff ran through progress to date, including discussion of the economic metrics used and data collated. The preliminary findings for the selected strategic movements were also discussed.

- **Individual Meetings with Stakeholders:**
  - DfT meeting, Thursday 19\(^{th}\) November 2015. WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff met David Bull and economist Jago Penrose at DfT’s Great Minster House offices to discuss the objectives of the study and the methodology to be used to calculate economic benefits. The use of current DfT WebTAG guidance as the “building blocks” to the analysis was discussed as well as the way in which other economic impacts not typically associated with transport scheme appraisals.
  - Surrey County Council meeting (freight issues), Wednesday 25\(^{th}\) November 2015. This meeting with Peter Hitchings of SCC’s freight team was important as it highlighted the extent of freight and logistics movements in both Surrey and the wider region. Key issues discussed including the extent that freight movements are generated in the area (both road and rail) and the key freight movement corridors.
  - AECOM meeting, Friday 27\(^{th}\) November 2015. AECOM are currently working on the ‘Solent Strategic Transport Investment Plan’ for Solent LEP and given the synergies between the two studies, a meeting took place where both parties discussed their respective work. AECOM offered to review any Solent-specific corridor proposals and issues emerging from our work.
  - Stagecoach Rail (South West Trains) meeting, Tuesday 1\(^{st}\) December 2015. This meeting with Phil Dominey, Stakeholder Engagement Manager, was extremely useful as Stagecoach are preparing for the upcoming South Western franchise bid and are collating
data across the South East region on forecast housing developments and employment growth. There are clearly synergies between their work and our’s. We therefore agreed to remain in regular contact as both workstreams progress.

- Heathrow Hub meeting, Tuesday 2nd February 2016. This meeting with Steve Costello enabled the study team to understand the aspirations of Heathrow Hub (the independent organisation proposing to extend the northern runway at Heathrow Airport). These aspirations include several major transport corridor proposals in the region, including new rail links to the airport that are not dissimilar to some of new rail corridors proposed here.

- Highways England meeting, Tuesday 9th February 2016. Meeting with John Henderson to discuss HE’s current insight into potential corridor developments in the South East. Again, several of the corridors discussed were not dissimilar to those being proposed here, especially those corridors providing enhanced connectivity between the south coast and points further north as well as better linkage between Sussex and the Thames Valley.

### Discussions with Other Organisations:

- Office of National Statistics (ONS). Given the importance of ONS data covering GVA at a sub-regional level and employment / wage data, WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff have maintained regular contact with key contacts there (Richard Prothero and Trevor Fenton). Richard has advised on GVA data and other more detailed economic data whilst Trevor has advised on the proportions of GVA data that very broadly represent companies’ profits (for corporation tax increase calculations).

- Local Authority Economic Data teams. As well as collating the information described in 2.3, we have obtained useful economic metrics from discussions with various other organisations, including Hampshire County Council’s Social and Economic Research Manager (Alan Cole, already well known to WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff from previous work) and TV Berkshire’s Economic Research Analyst (Caroline Perkins).

#### 2.3 DATA COLLECTION AND COLLATION

A major part of the work has been the collation of all relevant data, information and studies. The ‘data request’ to all stakeholders (including various agencies and local authorities) was issued by each respective member of the LEP Steering Group and covered the following:

### Request to Highway Authorities:

- Transport flow data (by key mode, particularly road and rail)
- Relevant studies and reports covering transport movements and economic development
- Data relating to key freight movements
- Any other information that you consider relevant to this work

### Request to Planning Authorities:

- Relevant Local Plans
- Relevant local economic data where this has been collated (such as local GVA and employment data)
- Any other relevant information covering economic development and trends / projections
Several items were received from local authorities and other agencies, including key data from District Councils in the study area. These are summarised in Table 2-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>KEY ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woking BC</td>
<td>Adopted Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipated Capacity of Allocated Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester CC</td>
<td>Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</td>
<td>Various economic / employment / industry studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Valley BC</td>
<td>Revised Local Plan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey CC</td>
<td>Surface Access to Airports Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Downs Railway Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey Rail Strategy (Issues and Options Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne BC</td>
<td>Allocations Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Strategies and Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Strategy 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Economic Assessment September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park</td>
<td>Census 2011: SDNPA Districts Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Land Review 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Plan Master (24/08/15 – Whole Document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Economy – Economic Indicators 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solent LEP</td>
<td>Solent Strategic Economic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solent Growth Deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Connecting Growth” document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Transforming Solent” - Marine and Maritime Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Evidence Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Evidence Base – Technical Annex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Transforming Solent” - Growth Strategy, October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushmoor BC</td>
<td>Core Strategy October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key Employment Sites November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest DC</td>
<td>Local Plan Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2 (Development Management Policies and Site Specific Details)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>London and South East Market Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South East Route - Sussex Area Route Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wessex Route Study (also provided by Enterprise M3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise M3 LEP</td>
<td>EM3 Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM3 Growth Deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM3 Growth Deal - First and Second Tranche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highways England Strategic Business Plan 2015-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DfT Road Investment Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Economic Plan 2014-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke and Deane BC</td>
<td>Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Projections April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRES Employee and Employment Trends 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire CC</td>
<td>Hampshire Economic Assessment 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hampshire Economic Area Topic Paper: Gross Value Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hampshire Economic Area Topic Paper: Economic Projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Register and Employment Survey (BRES): Employee Jobs in Hampshire (July 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commuter Flow Data for each LAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead BC</td>
<td>Various Local Plan data and demographic / employment / economic projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight Council</td>
<td>Core Strategy (adopted March 2012, updated May 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Island Plan Proposals Map (Overview Map, adopted March 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IoW Employment Land Study, GL Hearn, March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havant BC</td>
<td>Economic Profile for Havant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport for South Hampshire and Isle of Wight Evidence Base - Gosport Borough Local Plan (2011-2029), March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Plan – Employment Background Paper, June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Diamond</td>
<td>Gatwick Diamond BIS Statistics, August 2015 (various economic / demographic metrics for Gatwick Diamond area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham BC</td>
<td>Fareham Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies, June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fareham Local Development Framework, Core Strategy, adopted August 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various employment and transport strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire DC</td>
<td>East Hampshire District Local Plan Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Submission: East Hampshire District Local Plan - Housing and Employment Allocations (incorporating minor modifications), June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast to Capital LEP</td>
<td>Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coast to Capital Housing Policy, September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various items from local authorities and other organisations (such as Gatwick Diamond – see above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data from the District Councils helped inform the housing and future growth analysis reported in Chapter 8. The Local Plan data provided indications of future plans, including new housing and employment site developments in key areas.

To supplement the data received in Table 2-1, we collated additional information from all local authorities in the study area. This meant that we were able to cover the plans of 45 different local authorities.

The figures in Chapter 8 indicate how the corridors will provide essential links and access to new developments throughout the region.

### 2.4 COLLATION OF ECONOMIC DATA

As well as the data from local authorities and various agencies, we have also collated economic data from sources such as ONS and DfT (the latter via the WebTAG Wider Impacts Dataset). This covers the following:

- **ONS GVA data** (from the most recent dataset available – the 2014 data was made available from ONS on 9th December 2015). The dataset includes:
  - 2014 Workplace GVA by NUTS3 area (see below for further explanation of NUTS3 areas)
  - 2014 Workplace GVA per head (by NUTS3 area) – this represents productivity
  - 2014 Workplace GVA by industry (NUTS3 level)
  - 2012 Workplace-based compensation of employees (NUTS2) – this represents the amount of GVA accounted for by incomes paid to employees and is used, amongst other purposes, as part of the process to calculate corporation tax benefits

- **ONS NOMIS data** (from the latest online dataset available). The dataset includes:
  - Employment data per Local Authority (July 2014 to June 2015 annual data)
  - Earnings data per Local Authority (2015 data)
  - Data on JSA claimants and numbers of businesses per Local Authority

- **DfT Employment / GDP per worker data** (from the current WebTAG "Wider Impacts" dataset). This includes:
- Total employment by Local Authority District (LAD) at five year intervals between 2006 and 2076
- Employment by sector (by LAD) at five year intervals between 2006 and 2076
- GDP per worker by sector (by LAD) for each five year interval as above

Given the importance of this data, further details are provided below.

**ONS GVA DATA**

The “NUTS3” level is the lowest geography by which ONS produces GVA and productivity data. NUTS stands for Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics and is a standard ‘economic geography’ mapping system used throughout the EU.

To demonstrate this, the NUTS1 level covers the South East region as a whole whilst under this, NUTS2 covers 1) “Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire”, 2) “Surrey, East and West Sussex”, 3) “Hampshire and Isle of Wight” and 4) “Kent”.

For the analysis we are undertaking, we have compiled data for the following NUTS3 areas in the study geography (highlighted in underscored bold). This also covers the more disaggregated geography incorporated in the December 2014 ONS updates:

- Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire:
  - Berkshire
- Surrey, East and West Sussex:
  - Brighton and Hove
  - East Sussex CC
  - West Surrey
  - East Surrey
  - West Sussex (South West)
  - West Sussex (North West)
- Hampshire and the Isle of Wight:
  - Portsmouth
  - Southampton
  - North Hampshire
  - Central Hampshire
  - South Hampshire
  - Isle of Wight

The final NUTS2 area (“Kent”) has not been used as this comprises two sub-regions in the county that are outside our study area (Medway and Kent CC).

We do, however, use GVA data from outside the above NUTS3 areas when looking at corridors that link the study area with ‘outside’ areas. Examples include Wiltshire, Tunbridge Wells, Christchurch and Bournemouth.

As well as the study area defined above, ONS data is also available for the neighbouring LEP areas as defined in the study brief. The ONS datasets are the most comprehensive and up to
date available (note that due to the complexity of collating GVA data, each annual release represents one year in arrears – i.e. the data released in December 2015 was for 2014).

As well as the headline GVA data, productivity metrics are also available from ONS in the form of ‘GVA per capita’ data. GVA data is also disaggregated by ‘worker compensation’ (i.e. incomes) and by industrial sector in each area. Both are important datasets and have been used in this analysis. This is explained in more detail in Chapter 3.

ONS have also recently expanded their dataset to cover GVA and productivity for each of the LEPs. As an illustration of just how important the South East (and study area) is in terms of economic activity at a national level, the following two charts from ONS illustrate high performance relative to the UK average.

**Figure 2-1** Nominal GVA per Hour Worked - Highest Ranking NUTS3 Sub-regions, 2013

Figure 2-1 clearly shows how three of the areas in study area (Berkshire, Surrey and Hampshire) out-perform the UK average with Berkshire only second to Inner London West. This clearly shows the ‘economic importance’ of key areas in the South East as more GVA is produced per hour worked compared to many other parts of the country. The South East therefore has the potential to continue contributing substantially to national wealth and the consequent economic benefits this provides to the country as a whole. As a further example of this, Berkshire’s GVA per head (based on the most recent ONS data) is almost 85% higher than that in Birmingham.

Figure 2-2 shows similar data, this time for the highest-ranking LEPs, with all four ‘study LEPs’ ranked in the Top Ten in terms of productivity performance (relative to the national average).
Even before any corridor analysis is undertaken, these are extremely powerful metrics and indicate that with improved transport infrastructure in place, the already strong economic performance (with consequent national benefits) will improve even further.

**NOMIS DATA**

ONS also publishes NOMIS (“National Online Manpower Information System”) demographic and labour market data. This is up to date data and is important for our work as we use it to disaggregate the available GVA data to more localised areas.

In Berkshire, for example, NOMIS data for employment in each Local Authority District (LAD) can be used alongside workplace earnings data to enable us to apportion Berkshire GVA data to each LAD. Unsurprisingly, the highest proportion of GVA is generated in Reading.

The use of NOMIS is explained in more detail in Chapter 3.

**DFT “WIDER IMPACTS” DATA**

“Wider Impacts” is the term used by DfT in its WebTAG guidance for transport appraisal. Wider Impacts in this context cover Agglomeration and Labour Market impacts. The former refers to improvements in economic activity in a certain area due to transport improvements whilst the latter labour market changes due to these improvements (i.e. the national benefit of more workers becoming economically active as a result of the transport intervention).

The dataset developed by DfT to calculate these impacts will be used for this study and covers each Local Authority District in the country as well as four key industrial sectors in the economy (Construction, Consumer Services, Manufacturing and Producer Services).

Unlike the ONS data described above (based on out-turn metrics), the DfT WebTAG dataset is provided as a forecast up to 2076.

One key proviso made clear in the dataset is that these forecasts should not be used for any purpose other than estimating Wider Impacts. Their usage for this work is described in Chapter 3.
At the time of writing (February 2016), the DfT’s wider economic impacts guidance is being updated to reflect TIEP report recommendations. The update will cover 1) more context-specific appraisals, 2) more transparent reporting and 3) greater consideration of land use change. The elasticities used for Wider Impacts calculation will also be updated with the final guidance update scheduled for November 2016.

Finally, the extent of geographical coverage in the dataset is shown in Table 2-2 below.

### Table 2-2  Local Authority Districts in DfT Dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY LEVEL</th>
<th>LOCAL AUTHORITY DISTRICT (LAD)</th>
<th>LEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td>Adur</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arun</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horsham</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid Sussex</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthing</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>Bracknell Forest</td>
<td>Thames Valley Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Thames Valley Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>Thames Valley Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Berkshire</td>
<td>Thames Valley Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windsor and Maidenhead</td>
<td>Thames Valley Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wokingham</td>
<td>Thames Valley Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex</td>
<td>Brighton and Hove</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td>(rest of East CC area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>(rest of East CC area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rother</td>
<td>(rest of East CC area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wealden</td>
<td>(rest of East CC area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>Basingstoke and Deane</td>
<td>Enterprise M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Hampshire</td>
<td>Enterprise M3 / Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastleigh</td>
<td>Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fareham</td>
<td>Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gosport</td>
<td>Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Enterprise M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Havant</td>
<td>Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Forest</td>
<td>Enterprise M3 / Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rushmoor</td>
<td>Enterprise M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test Valley</td>
<td>Enterprise M3 / Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>Enterprise M3 / Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Isle of Wight</td>
<td>Solent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>Enterprise M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epsom and Ewell</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Enterprise M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>Enterprise M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>Enterprise M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>Enterprise M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Coast to Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>Enterprise M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>Enterprise M3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we set out the methodology used. There are several key features:

1. The “building blocks” of the analysis use recognised guidance based on Treasury Green Book principles (i.e. DfT’s WebTAG approach covering Wider Impacts is itself based on Green Book guidance);

2. Although founded on WebTAG principles, several add-on economic impacts and metrics are derived (such as the impacts improved productivity has on regional GVA, employment and taxation revenues);

3. The impacts are calculated in two ways: 1) firstly, as a “snapshot” of current impacts (i.e. what is the economic impact if the change took place now?) and 2) what is the “longer term” (or forecast) impact over time? – this is explained in more detail below;

4. The approach is used at a high level to identify and prioritise corridors before more detailed analysis takes place for shortlisted corridors (i.e. to include proposed residential developments etc.); and

5. The method is designed to be flexible enough to be able to test several different strategic movement corridors.

To broadly demonstrate which elements of the approach are based on current DfT guidance and which are additional to this current guidance, Figure 3-1 illustrates the various types of impacts and on what basis they are derived.

Figure 3-1 Components of Methodology
We recognised the importance of gaining stakeholder acceptance of the method and in particular, acceptance from DfT given their ongoing work on assessing the wider impacts of transport schemes.

As noted in Section 2.2, we met with DfT on Thursday 19\textsuperscript{th} November at which the following was discussed:

→ The intended outcomes of the study;
→ The method to be used for this study; and
→ Discussion of DfT’s own “direction of travel” on assessing the impact of transport on economic development and productivity.

DfT noted the proposed approach, especially the use of current WebTAG guidance and the use of changes in generalised costs of travel to calculate a range of productivity-based economic benefits. We also sought clarification from DfT on a number of data source issues.

Before setting out the approach, it is important to state that transport schemes also generate ‘conventional’ benefits as well as the wider impacts we are assessing here. Although conventional impacts such as monetised journey time savings and the value of reduced accidents are not quantified here, they nevertheless form part of the justification for transport schemes and when included as part of a full business case, are likely to boost the overall justification for the schemes.

Figure 3-2 sets out the key types of impacts of a transport scheme and those that are quantified as part of this study.

**Figure 3-2  Conventional and Wider Economic Impacts of Transport Schemes**

- **Journey Time Savings**: Conventional economic appraisal: not considered here
- **Accident Reductions**: Conventional economic appraisal: not considered here
- **Agglomeration / Productivity**: Wider impact assessment: considered here
- **GDP / GVA Impacts**: Wider impact assessment: considered here
- **Employment Impacts**: Wider impact assessment: considered here
- **Government Revenue Impacts**: Wider impact assessment: considered here
3.2 OVERVIEW OF METHOD

To provide an overview of the method, Figure 3-3 shows the key economic impacts that flow from improved connectivity.

![Figure 3-3 Overview of Method](image)

The following describes this process:

- In the yellow box, this shows that the principal driver of change (and economic benefits) is the improvement in connectivity in each corridor;
- In the orange boxes, the key effects of improved connectivity are 1) increased productivity (due to agglomeration benefits as workers now have better access to higher value jobs and businesses now have better access to a larger pool of suitably skilled workers) and 2) increased GVA stemming from higher productivity per worker;
- The green boxes labelled under “Improved Mobility Impacts” refer to the benefits that are primarily due to the improvements in personal mobility (such as better access to/from labour markets) arising from corridor improvements. As well as additional employment supported by increased economic activity, there will be financial benefits to Government in the form of increased income taxation; and
- The blue boxes (under “Improved Firms’ Production Impacts”) indicate the types of impacts associated with improved corporate and business activity. These impacts include 1) increased corporation tax due increased profits from enhanced activity and 2) potential gains from decreases in firms’ production costs (i.e. with reduced transport costs, firms can produce the same level of output at lower costs).
Whereas Figure 3-3 sets out the range of economic impacts stemming from better connectivity, the key steps in the method are as follows:

→ The study area (i.e. the area covered by the four LEPs plus the rest of the East Sussex County Council areas as well as the linkages to neighbouring LEPs and London) is mapped with the respective Local Authority Districts (LADs) acting as zones;

→ Each potential strategic movement corridor is represented by a link between Origin Point A and Destination Point B (for example, the Brighton Main Line is one such corridor with the A3 road corridor between Guildford and Portsmouth being another);

→ Given current DfT “agglomeration” guidance, a productivity impact of improving journey time / journey reliability can be used in each corridor for two purposes:
  - To identify and prioritise corridors relative to each other (i.e. a transformative 15 minute journey time improvement in one corridor may have a very different impact compared to the same improvement in another corridor)
  - To calculate the economic impacts of improvements in each corridor

→ Once the productivity impact has been calculated, this can be used to calculate a series of economic benefits, including increased GVA, employment and Government financial benefits; and

→ Using graphics and figures, these impacts can be shown on a series of diagrams and maps.

Figure 3-4 shows an example of how this process works in practice. The example chosen is the A3 corridor improvement between M25 Junction 10 (in Elmbridge Borough Council) and Portsmouth.

**Figure 3-4  Example of Corridor Improvement Method**

- Change in Generalised Travel Cost = 12%
- Transformational journey time (with congestion relief) = 55 minutes
- Typical current journey time (in peak time, with congestion) = 70 minutes
Figure 3-4 shows the Local Authority Districts that the A3 corridor passes through. Assuming a current ‘worst case’ (congested) journey time of 70 minutes – including, for example, severe delays in the Guildford area – a transformative corridor improvement (suitable widening of the Guildford section etc.) could give a journey time / journey reliability improvement of 15 minutes.

Taking into account given travel values of time and fuel costs, the change in generalised costs (i.e. the monetised value of all key elements of the journey) will be approximately 12% - in other words, a 12% reduction in generalised costs.

There are published elasticities by each different sector of the economy (WebTAG categorises these as 1) Construction, 2) Consumer Services, 3) Manufacturing and 4) Producer Services). The elasticities are ratios that are used to calculate the percentage change in productivity based on the percentage change in generalised costs.

The following shows how this process works for each of the four sectors:

- **Construction**: elasticity = -0.057: i.e. a 10% decrease in generalised costs gives an 0.6% increase in productivity;
- **Consumer Services**: elasticity = -0.047: i.e. a 10% decrease in generalised costs gives an 0.5% increase in productivity;
- **Manufacturing**: elasticity = -0.025: i.e. a 10% decrease in generalised costs gives an 0.3% increase in productivity;
- **Producer Services**: elasticity = -0.157: i.e. a 10% decrease in generalised costs gives an 1.6% increase in productivity.

To establish whether these ‘national’ elasticities could be adjusted to reflect more local factors, the Transport Appraisal and Strategic Modelling (TASM) team at DfT were contacted. Their advice was that although agglomeration elasticities were estimated nationally, where a robust case is made for it, it is possible for scheme promoters to utilise more context-specific (for example regional) elasticities. These would be drawn from the literature or estimated from available data. Results from such an approach should be reported as a sensitivity test alongside results using WebTAG elasticities. For this analysis, this could form the basis of more detailed corridor assessment where this is required in future.

It is the changes (reductions) in the generalised cost of travel within each corridor that drives changes in productivity, GVA and the various other economic and financial metrics. Taking the A3 corridor improvement in Figure 3-4, for example, the impacts will be calculated for all LADs in the corridor and not just the ‘origin’ (e.g. Elmbridge) and ‘destination’ (e.g. Portsmouth) areas.

For each LAD and for each of the four sectors, the following is calculated:

- The total GVA uplift based on the percentage increase in productivity multiplied by a) GVA per worker, b) total number of workers and c) the proportion of economic activity in that particular sector;
- Direct employment based on the uplift in GVA divided by the amount of GVA required to support each worker in each LAD (the proportion of GVA spent on employee incomes and the proportion of GVA ‘spend’ retained in each area is also taken into account); and
- Indirect and induced employment is calculated by applying standard employment multipliers to the direct employment totals.

The employment impacts are used to derive income taxation benefits to Government as well as the JSA payment savings resulting from more workers moving into employment. Both these impacts demonstrate the ‘wider’ financial gains for Government and use income distribution and JSA data from official statistical sources.
Corporation taxation benefits are calculated by applying the proportion of GVA representing corporate profits and the corporation tax rate to the uplift in GVA.

The economic value of the increase in production due to corridor improvements applies to the two sectors most likely to benefit from these impacts; a) the Construction sector and b) the Manufacturing sector. Activities in each of these sectors comprises some form of physical output that can be produced for a lower unit cost when transportation improves within each corridor.

The economic value of these impacts is calculated by applying an elasticity value (-0.052) to the change in generalised cost in each corridor and to the total GVA representing each of the two sectors. The resulting value is a further uplift in GVA.

The above method has several advantages:

→ It is based on recognised methods and can be calculated relatively quickly given the information already available;

→ It is flexible and can be used to assess different types and lengths of corridors (featuring different modes);

→ Once the productivity impacts have been calculated, these can be applied to the latest ONS GVA data to give a regional and national impact; and

→ There is sufficient flexibility in the input assumptions for each corridor so that these can be adjusted for sensitivity testing.

It is also important to emphasise that the types of economic benefit described above are based on a “snapshot” of the impacts. In other words, it is possible to calculate the benefits that are likely to occur using current year data for each corridor.

“Long term” forecasts have also been produced and these form part of the high level cost-benefit appraisal of each shortlisted proposal. This enables the benefits to be forecast over a given period.
3.3 DATA SOURCES USED

There are several different data sources used. To summarise these and to indicate the geographical disaggregation of the data, Table 3-1 shows each key item and its source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA CATEGORY</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHY</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GVA (includes GVA by industry sector)</td>
<td>NUTS3 level (2013 data released in December 2014)</td>
<td>ONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVA (includes GVA by workplace income)</td>
<td>NUTS2 level (2012 data released in December 2014)</td>
<td>ONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and average earnings data</td>
<td>Local Authority District (LAD) level</td>
<td>ONS NOMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agglomeration elasticities</td>
<td>(By four key sectors in the economy)</td>
<td>DfT WebTAG (Unit A2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic output (expenditure) retained in region</td>
<td>General UK data</td>
<td>ONS: detailed household expenditure by gross income quintile group for all households, 2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of GVA representative of corporate profit</td>
<td>General UK data</td>
<td>ONS: discussion with Trevor Fenton, Regional Accounts, 27.11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK JSA data</td>
<td>General UK data</td>
<td>Govt statistics: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/jobseekers-allowance/what-youll-get">https://www.gov.uk/jobseekers-allowance/what-youll-get</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4

IDENTIFICATION OF MOVEMENT CORRIDORS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

We have used a combination of economic data, transport information and general knowledge of the South East region to identify and define strategic movement corridors. The corridors are defined at a high strategic level and comprise both existing and potential corridors.

This chapter contains a summary of these corridors and the rationale for their selection and further analysis. Once the corridors have been identified, they are prioritised based on the further analyses reported in Chapter 5.

4.2 BASIS FOR SELECTING CORRIDORS

The selection of corridors was based on several factors, including an in-depth appreciation of the key centres of economic activity in the study region and the key transport issues affecting the region. The basis for selecting the corridors is as follows:

→ For existing corridors, corridors were selected on the basis of known high traffic flows, capacity constraints (especially during busy ‘peak’ periods) and the extent to which the corridors have a major ‘connectivity’ purpose. Examples include:
  - **A3 Corridor**: despite the opening of the Hindhead Tunnel in 2011, the A3 continues to experience significant congestion on key sections
  - **Brighton Main Line**: the rail link between Brighton and London provides essential connectivity not only between the South Coast and the capital, but also between major towns on the route
  - **A27 Corridor**: this major road corridor is one of the key transport arteries along the South Coast and experiences significant congestion at key pinchpoints

→ For potential corridors, a slightly different set of criteria applied as the objective here was to identify corridors where there was unlikely to be major existing flows but nevertheless considerable potential for providing transformative links between major centres. Examples include:
  - **Mid-Sussex to Thames Valley Road Corridor**: linking Horsham with Reading and the Thames Valley, this road would provide a vital new north-south corridor linking mid-Sussex with the economic powerhouse in the Thames Valley
  - **Southern Access to Heathrow**: this new corridor (including use of key sections of existing rail links) would provide crucial southern access to Heathrow Airport from locations such as Guildford, Woking and Staines
  - **“South Sussex Way”**: this is a transformational corridor linking Salisbury (via the A36) with Winchester, Petersfield, Horsham and Tunbridge Wells (to connect with the A21)

The corridors selected do not include some of the principal motorway corridors (such as the M25) as these are currently the subject of other major studies, including Highways England’s “M25 South West Quadrant Study” and the various Route Based Strategy (RBS) analyses being undertaken.
The selection of corridors also reflected discussions with stakeholders with the second consultation event on Monday 7th December 2015 providing useful feedback on the initial series of corridors selected.

The corridors also reflected the work already being undertaken in certain LEP areas. We have liaised, for example, with the AECOM team working on Solent’s Transport Investment Plan and have therefore selected corridors that reflected their emerging findings.

Examples include improvements in the crucial Southampton to Portsmouth corridor as well as improved links between the Solent area and the other LEP areas (such as the M3 / A34 corridor north of Southampton).

As part of the stakeholder consultation events, the transport mode to be assessed for each corridor was discussed. Taking the ‘A3’ corridor improvement as an example, the analysis could either focus on the upgrade being based on a single mode (such as road) or could cover both rail and road improvements.

It was agreed that the initial high level economic impact analysis would focus on each corridor initially with further work at the feasibility stage focussing on the most appropriate mode to take forwards.

Rather than view the corridor improvements as low-key, we have assumed that the changes will be ‘transformational’ in that major journey opportunity, time and reliability enhancements will take place.

Also, the advantage of our method is that we have sufficient flexibility to make quick adjustments to our input assumptions so that the economic impacts can be readily tested.

Finally, the list of corridors is not exhaustive and is primarily intended to demonstrate the economic potential of a series of major transformative corridors across a large area in the South East.

### 4.3 CORRIDORS EVALUATED

The series of corridors evaluated are summarised in Table 4-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION / STATUS</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3 Corridor</td>
<td>Upgrade of corridor between Surrey and the outskirts of Portsmouth</td>
<td>The corridor between London and Portsmouth – whether by rail of road – is a key transport artery and experiences severe delays at busy periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22 Corridor</td>
<td>An improvement in the corridor linking Eastbourne on the South Coast with Surrey,</td>
<td>The existing A22 road corridor (and parallel rail routes) does not offer good connectivity between this part of East Sussex and points further north (including the M25 and London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade</td>
<td>the M25 and points further north</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A27 Corridor</td>
<td>Upgrade of the corridor between Brighton and Portsmouth</td>
<td>There are several ‘bottlenecks’ on the A27 (e.g. at Arundel and Chichester) – this is a major east-west corridor near the South Coast (note also that the ‘Coastway’ rail route parallels the A27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Upgrade</td>
<td>An improvement to the Hog's Back - Farnham - Alton road corridor</td>
<td>The A31 (and its intersection with the A3 near Guildford) is one of the main ‘bottlenecks’ in this part of Surrey and Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33 Road Upgrade (Basingstoke – Reading)</td>
<td>An upgrade of this key road corridor</td>
<td>Traffic data shows how busy this corridor is between two of the key centres of employment in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34 Corridor Upgrade (Southampton to Newbury and M4 J13)</td>
<td>An upgrade of this key road corridor</td>
<td>This is another busy, ‘economically important’ corridor in the region. (Traffic data also shows high flows.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A320 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>An upgrade of the A320 road corridor linking Guildford with Woking and M25 Junction 11</td>
<td>Based on previous WSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Main Line Upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrade of the main rail link between Brighton and London</td>
<td>This is one of the main transport corridors in the region (note that the parallel road corridor is the M23 via Gatwick Airport).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Sussex to Thames Valley New Corridor</td>
<td>A new ‘transformative’ corridor between mid-Sussex and the Thames Valley</td>
<td>Given the lack of north-south corridors in the region, this transformative corridor will link these two key areas – note that there is also some overlap with the proposed ‘North Downs Line’ upgrade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhaven - Lewes - Brighton Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>An upgrade of this important corridor between Newhaven and Lewes</td>
<td>The links between these major towns on the South Coast currently involves a time-consuming journey, including the very busy junction between the A26 and A27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Downs Line Upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrading the current diesel-operated line between Redhill, Reigate, Dorking, Guildford and Reading (this route also provides a direct link between Redhill and Gatwick Airport)</td>
<td>This upgrade would involve enhancing connectivity on this critical corridor – although this has some similarities with the proposed Mid-Sussex to Thames Valley corridor described above, the rail route travels on an east-west axis before heading north between Guildford and Reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading - Waterloo Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>An upgrade of the line between Reading, Bracknell and London Waterloo</td>
<td>Given continued economic growth in the Thames Valley area and relatively slow rail journey times in this corridor, these improvements will allow the key towns in Berkshire to be better connected to various locations on the line into Waterloo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Southern Access to Heathrow’</td>
<td>A new rail link between Guildford and Heathrow (via Woking, Virginia Water, Staines &amp; Heathrow Airport)</td>
<td>This new corridor will open up new journey opportunities between Guildford, Gatwick - and points south of Heathrow - and the airport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton - New Forest Corridor Upgrade (M27 / A31)</td>
<td>An improvement on the M27 and A31 heading west out of Southampton and the Solent area</td>
<td>This is a busy transport artery connecting Southampton with the New Forest and all points west (such as Poole and Bournemouth).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton to Portsmouth Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>Both cities in the Solent area are economic ‘powerhouses’ in their own right and improved connectivity between them will offer significant agglomeration benefits</td>
<td>By improving the existing rail corridor significantly, journey times will be reduced allowing far better connectivity for businesses and workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“South Sussex Way”</td>
<td>Salisbury (A36) – Winchester – Petersfield – Horsham - Tunbridge Wells to connect with the A21</td>
<td>This is a transformational corridor that will link Wiltshire with Hampshire, Sussex and Kent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“South Coast Relief Road”</td>
<td>This comprises a bypass to the M27 and A27 for traffic not wishing to access Portsmouth, Southampton and Brighton</td>
<td>This transformational corridor will enable drivers to bypass the already congested centres in Portsmouth, Southampton and Brighton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4-1 shows the geographical location of the corridors across the study area. The figure also shows how the corridors can combine to form a transport movement ‘network’ across the region and by implication, how important this will be in terms of supporting economic growth (at both the regional and national level).

Figure 4-1  Selected Corridors in the Study Area
5 PRIORITISATION OF CORRIDORS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to summarise the findings from the corridor analysis and to use the outcomes of this analysis to prioritise the corridors in terms of the economic benefits they generate.

This process uses the economic methodology described in Chapter 3 and covers the sectoral make-up of the individual economies (in this context, individual economies are those of the Local Authority Districts, LADs, in the study area).

In the final part of the chapter, we address how the movement corridors relate to each other to address issues across the South East and the wider area.

5.2 RESULTS

The results are presented in a series of tables that show the key economic metrics for each corridor.

In overall economic impact terms (ensuring there is no double counting of benefits across corridors serving similar geographies), total additional annual GVA would exceed £19.5 billion with over 100,000 additional jobs supported by this additional economic activity. Government would also gain annual additional revenue of £1.2 billion from personal income taxation and just under £1 billion per annum from corporation taxation.

The values shown in the tables below represent the additional benefits generated by the improvements in each corridor. These additional benefits cover the improvements in existing corridors as well as the transformative improvements associated with the new corridors.

The ‘headline’ impact is the additional GVA generated with the other monetary values shown not necessarily additive to this but nevertheless demonstrating the extent of potential additional revenues accruing to Government.

Before prioritising the corridors, the results for each corridor are presented in the order shown in Table 5-1 onwards. Short descriptions per corridor are also given.

It is also important to emphasise that the results shown overleaf represent those in a single year, i.e. they show what the net impact would be if the change in each corridor took place at the present time. These are powerful impact metrics and they demonstrate the magnitude of the potential benefits of each strategic corridor.
**A3 CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT**

Table 5-1  A3 Corridor Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£1.1 billion</td>
<td>6,000 jobs</td>
<td>£71 million</td>
<td>£55 million</td>
<td>£34 million</td>
<td>£19.6 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show the impact of a significant improvement in a long-distance corridor connecting not only two major conurbations (London / Surrey and Portsmouth) but also the intermediate local authority areas affected by the upgrade.

**A22 EASTBOURNE - LEWES - UCKFIELD - SURREY CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT**

Table 5-2  A22 Corridor Upgrade Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£250 million</td>
<td>1,600 jobs</td>
<td>£19 million</td>
<td>£12 million</td>
<td>£14 million</td>
<td>£5.7 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This corridor upgrade is based on improving the A22 corridor as far north as the M25 interchange near Godstone in Tandridge. The impacts are therefore concentrated in the boroughs of Eastbourne, Wealden, Mid Sussex and Tandridge. The improvement will also, however, enhance connectivity via the M25 and thus a much wider range of journey opportunities will be opened up.

**A27 CORRIDOR UPGRADE**

Table 5-3  A27 Corridor Upgrade Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£1.5 billion</td>
<td>9,300 jobs</td>
<td>£111 million</td>
<td>£75 million</td>
<td>£32 million</td>
<td>£31.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upgrading the existing A27 corridor between Brighton and Portsmouth has been a major regional objective for a significant period of time. By improving connectivity through eliminating the bottlenecks at Arundel and Chichester, for example, a large number of economic benefits will accrue. The upgrade also gives much needed connectivity improvements to the fast-growing Solent economic area.
A31 HOG’S BACK - FARNHAM - ALTON CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT

Table 5-4  A31 Corridor Upgrade Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£188 million</td>
<td>1,000 jobs</td>
<td>£12 million</td>
<td>£9 million</td>
<td>£19 million</td>
<td>£9.4 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to some of the other corridor improvements, this proposed upgrade has one of the lowest levels of impact. At this stage we have considered the benefits as accruing in the LADs of Guildford and East Hampshire given that these are the areas most affected by current congestion levels.

A33 BASINGSTOKE - READING CORRIDOR UPGRADE

Table 5-5  A33 Corridor Upgrade Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£728 million</td>
<td>3,400 jobs</td>
<td>£41 million</td>
<td>£35 million</td>
<td>£39 million</td>
<td>£42.8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The A33 connects two of the principal centres of economic activity in the South East and by upgrading this corridor, various benefits will accrue. These include GVA uplifts from increased agglomeration and firms’ production increases as well as the financial gains to Government shown in Table 5-5.

A34 CORRIDOR UPGRADE (SOUTHAMPTON - NEWBURY / M4 J13)

Table 5-6  A34 Corridor Upgrade Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£1 billion</td>
<td>5,900 jobs</td>
<td>£70 million</td>
<td>£50 million</td>
<td>£22 million</td>
<td>£23.9 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As well as having high traffic flows, the A34 corridor between Southampton, Newbury and Junction 13 of the M4 (and then points further north) has a very important strategic role to play. This strategic role encompasses the connectivity the corridor provides between Southampton (and its major port) and points north, including the Midlands and beyond. Given that this is one of the most important ‘north – south’ corridors in the region, its upgrade will not only improve north – south connectivity but will also help relieve the pressure on some of the more ‘east to west’-facing corridors.
A320 CORRIDOR UPGRADE

Table 5-7  A320 Corridor Upgrade Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£545 million</td>
<td>2,500 jobs</td>
<td>£29 million</td>
<td>£26 million</td>
<td>£20 million</td>
<td>£42.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although one of the shorter corridor upgrades in terms of distance, the A320 remains one of the most important (and most congested) routes in Surrey. As well as congestion coming on / off the A3 and on to the A320, traffic volumes are also very high on this main route to Woking and the M25. As Table 5-7 indicates, even in this comparatively ‘localised’ area, there will be significant benefits.

BRIGHTON MAIN LINE UPGRADE

Table 5-8  BML Upgrade Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£1.5 billion</td>
<td>7,500 jobs</td>
<td>£90 million</td>
<td>£70 million</td>
<td>£30 million</td>
<td>£21.9 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upgrading the Brighton Main Line (in the key “A23 / M23” corridor) will have significant benefits in Brighton, the Mid Sussex area, Crawley and Croydon. Agglomeration benefits will also accrue from improved access to the ‘high value’ jobs market in the City of Westminster.

MID-SUSSEX TO THAMES VALLEY NEW CORRIDOR

Table 5-9  Mid-Sussex to Thames Valley Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£3.6 billion</td>
<td>15,700 jobs</td>
<td>£189 million</td>
<td>£174 million</td>
<td>£85 million</td>
<td>£53.8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With such a major ‘transformational’ corridor, there will be significant economic benefits as workers will have much better connectivity with the Thames Valley area whilst workers will also be able to access high value jobs in the Gatwick Diamond area. Companies will also benefit from the transformational corridor as transport access and delivery times will be significantly reduced.
### NEWHAVEN - LEWES - BRIGHTON CORRIDOR UPGRADE

Table 5-10  Newhaven –Lewes – Brighton Corridor Upgrade Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£139 million</td>
<td>900 jobs</td>
<td>£11 million</td>
<td>£7 million</td>
<td>£7 million</td>
<td>£8.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown in Table 5-10 indicate the range and scale of the ‘localised’ economic impacts when the busy route between Newhaven and Brighton (via Lewes) is upgraded.

### NORTH DOWNS LINE UPGRADE

Table 5-11  North Downs Line Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£1.9 billion</td>
<td>8,000 jobs</td>
<td>£97 million</td>
<td>£89 million</td>
<td>£27 million</td>
<td>£32.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rail corridor upgrade will also generate substantial economic benefits as much better connectivity will be provided between Surrey (on an east – west axis linking Redhill, Reigate, Dorking and Guildford) and Reading / the Thames Valley. The route also connects with Gatwick Airport via the section of line south of Redhill. As with the Reading – Waterloo line, current journey times are comparatively slow and the step change provided by this corridor improvement will generate a range of benefits.

### READING - WATERLOO RAIL UPGRADE

Table 5-12  Reading to Waterloo Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£1.9 billion</td>
<td>7,500 jobs</td>
<td>£90 million</td>
<td>£90 million</td>
<td>£28 million</td>
<td>£43.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This upgrade of the existing rail corridor between Reading and Waterloo will have several benefits, not least by providing much better connectivity for those travelling between the Thames Valley area and the west London suburbs as well as central London. The comparatively slow journey times on this corridor have been recognised as having a detrimental impact on the economic potential of the area.
SOUTHERN ACCESS TO HEATHROW

Table 5-13  Southern Access to Heathrow Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£1.8 billion</td>
<td>8,200 jobs</td>
<td>£100 million</td>
<td>£88 million</td>
<td>£38 million</td>
<td>£70.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By upgrading existing lines and building new sections of line direct to Heathrow Airport, a large number of new journey opportunities will be opened up. Economic benefits will be generated as much needed access from key locations such as Guildford and Woking direct to Heathrow will be provided.

SOUTHAMPTON - NEW FOREST CORRIDOR UPGRADE (M27 / A31)

Table 5-14  M27 / A31 Corridor Upgrade Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£715 million</td>
<td>4,700 jobs</td>
<td>£56 million</td>
<td>£34 million</td>
<td>£20 million</td>
<td>£21.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corridor linking Southampton and the Solent area with points west is one of the most important corridors in the region and has been identified in current work being undertaken for Solent LEP. Given that congestion occurs regularly on the capacity constrained sections of the A31, a significant corridor enhancement will unlock significant economic benefits.

SOUTHAMPTON TO PORTSMOUTH CORRIDOR UPGRADE

Table 5-15  Southampton to Portsmouth Corridor Upgrade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£2 billion</td>
<td>12,300 jobs</td>
<td>£150 million</td>
<td>£95 million</td>
<td>£65 million</td>
<td>£89.8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This corridor upgrade focuses on a major improvement to the existing rail line between the two cities (both being key economic ‘powerhouses’ in the region). With current rail services characterised by comparatively slow journey times and several stops en route, a major upgrade will not only provide enhanced connectivity but will also relieve the pressure (and traffic congestion) on the nearby road corridors. To meet its economic growth trajectory, the Solent area needs significantly improved transport connectivity and an upgrade of this corridor will help achieve this.
“SOUTH SUSSEX WAY” – NEW CORRIDOR

Table 5-16 “South Sussex Way” Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£4.4 billion</td>
<td>29,000 jobs</td>
<td>£346 million</td>
<td>£211 million</td>
<td>£113 million</td>
<td>£38.2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By constructing a transformative corridor in an alignment to the north of the existing M27 and A27 corridors (and therefore bypassing existing points of congestion), significant economic benefits will be generated. This reflects both the transformative effect of the corridor as well as the scale of the impacts realised in all affected local authority areas. These impacts are summarised in Table 5-16.

“SOUTH COAST RELIEF ROAD” – NEW CORRIDOR

Table 5-17 “South Coast Relief Road” Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GVA</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>INCOME TAX GAIN</th>
<th>CORPORATE TAX GAIN</th>
<th>FIRMS’ PRODUCTION GAIN</th>
<th>GVA PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£5.9 billion</td>
<td>36,000 jobs</td>
<td>£430 million</td>
<td>£282 million</td>
<td>£65 million</td>
<td>£86.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This transformative corridor improvement demonstrates the highest level of economic benefits. There are several reasons for this: 1) the corridor covers a long distance and thus there will be benefits experienced across several local authority areas, 2) the transformative nature of the corridor means that compared to the present travel experience, significantly better connectivity will be generated. It is the scale of this differential (and the long distance nature of the corridor) that generates the large benefits shown in Table 5-17.
5.3 PRIORITISATION

Based on the analysis and results reported above, a ‘corridor prioritisation’ exercise has been undertaken. Based on the scale of high level economic benefits that have been estimated, the corridors are ranked as shown in Table 5-18 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEME / RANKING</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION / STATUS</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) “South Coast Relief Road”</td>
<td>This comprises a bypass to the M27 and A27 for traffic not wishing to access Portsmouth, Southampton and Brighton</td>
<td>This transformational corridor will enable drivers to bypass the already congested centres in Portsmouth, Southampton and Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) “South Sussex Way”</td>
<td>Salisbury (A36) – Winchester – Petersfield – Horsham - Tunbridge Wells to connect with the A21</td>
<td>This is a transformational corridor that will link Wiltshire with Hampshire, Sussex and Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Horsham - Reading New Road Corridor</td>
<td>A new ‘transformative’ corridor between mid-Sussex and the Thames Valley</td>
<td>Given the lack of north-south corridors in the region, this transformative corridor will link these two key areas – note that there is also some overlap with the proposed ‘North Downs Line’ upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Southampton to Portsmouth Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>A major upgrading of the existing rail corridor between these two key cities on the south coast</td>
<td>Current rail journey times are ‘uncompetitive’ compared to road (the road links themselves are heavily congested) – this transformative upgrade will thus provide much-needed connectivity enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Reading - Waterloo Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>An upgrade of the line between Reading, Bracknell and London Waterloo</td>
<td>Given continued economic growth in the Thames Valley area and relatively slow rail journey times in this corridor, these improvements will allow the key towns in Berkshire to be better connected to various locations on the line into Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) North Downs Line Upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrading the current diesel-operated line between Redhill (with onward connection to Gatwick Airport), Reigate, Dorking, Guildford and Reading</td>
<td>This upgrade would involve enhancing connectivity on this critical corridor – although this has some similarities with the proposed Mid-Sussex to Thames Valley corridor described above, the rail route travels on an east-west axis before heading north between Guildford and Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) ‘Southern Access to Heathrow’</td>
<td>A new rail link between Guildford and Heathrow (via Woking, Virginia Water, Staines &amp; Heathrow Airport)</td>
<td>This new corridor will open up new journey opportunities between Guildford, Gatwick - and points south of Heathrow - and the airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) A27 Corridor Improvement</td>
<td>Upgrade of the corridor between Brighton and Portsmouth</td>
<td>There are several ‘bottlenecks’ on the A27 (e.g. at Arundel and Chichester) – this is a major east-west corridor near the South Coast (note also that the ‘Coastway’ rail route parallels the A27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Brighton Main Line Upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrade of the main rail link between Brighton and London</td>
<td>This is one of the main transport corridors in the region (note that the parallel road corridor is the M23 via Gatwick Airport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) A3 Corridor Improvement</td>
<td>Upgrade of corridor between Surrey and the outskirts of Portsmouth</td>
<td>The corridor between London and Portsmouth – whether by rail or road – is a key transport artery and experiences severe delays at busy periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) A34 Corridor Upgrade (Southampton to Newbury and M4 J13)</td>
<td>An upgrade of this key road corridor linking the strategically important area around Southampton (including the major port) and points north</td>
<td>This is another busy, 'economically important' corridor in the region. The 'north – south' route linking Southampton with Berkshire and all points north (including Oxford and the Midlands) has a major national and regional strategic role. Traffic flows are also very high in the existing corridor and thus an upgrade will be very timely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) A33 Road Upgrade (Basingstoke – Reading)</td>
<td>An upgrade of this key road corridor</td>
<td>Traffic data shows how busy this corridor is between two of the key centres of employment in the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Southampton - New Forest Corridor Upgrade (M27 / A31)</td>
<td>An improvement on the M27 and A31 heading west out of Southampton and the Solent area</td>
<td>This is a busy transport artery connecting Southampton with the New Forest and all points west (such as Poole and Bournemouth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) A320 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>An upgrade of the A320 road corridor linking Guildford with Woking and M25 Junction 11</td>
<td>Based on previous WSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) A22 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>An improvement in the corridor linking Eastbourne on the South Coast with Surrey, the M25 and points further north</td>
<td>The existing A22 road corridor (and parallel rail routes) does not offer good connectivity between this part of East Sussex and points further north (including the M25 and London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) A31 Upgrade</td>
<td>An improvement to the Hog’s Back - Farnham - Alton road corridor</td>
<td>The A31 (and its intersection with the A3 near Guildford) is one of the main ‘bottlenecks’ in this part of Surrey and Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Newhaven - Lewes - Brighton Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>An upgrade of this important corridor between Newhaven and Lewes</td>
<td>The links between these major towns on the South Coast currently involves a time-consuming journey, including the very busy junction between the A26 and A27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 HOW THE CORRIDORS RELATE TO EACH OTHER

Although the impacts of the corridors have been assessed individually, there are clearly major synergies between the corridors. Similarly, when regarded as ‘clusters’ of corridors, they will have a significant local and regional impact.

The various relationships between the corridors are described below:

- **Enhancing connectivity along the South Coast:** There are several major conurbations and centres of economic activity along the South Coast. From Eastbourne and Brighton in the east to Portsmouth and Southampton in the west, these areas generate significant levels of economic activity and are forecast to grow in several different ways – not least in terms of new housing developments and continued growth in employment.

  Traffic levels and congestion on key corridors has reached a point whereby delays are commonplace. Corridor improvements along the A27, M27 and A31 will therefore enhance overall connectivity on an east-west axis whilst the transformational concepts of an ‘A27’ relief road bypassing the major centres of population (and congestion) will also enhance economic activity in this area.

  In addition, the cities of Southampton and Portsmouth in the Solent area are economic ‘powerhouses’ in their own right and will benefit significantly from enhanced connectivity between them. The improved connectivity between the two cities will then link in with the other improved corridors to offer a major regional enhancement.

- **Enhancing the links between the South Coast and points further north:** Due to relatively long journey times and the comparative peripherality of the South Coast, several of the corridors put forward will enhance connectivity to London and other major centres of economic activity away from the coast.

  The proposed upgrade of the ‘A3’ (Portsmouth – London) corridor as well as the upgraded Brighton Main Line and upgraded connection between Eastbourne and Surrey will all provide enhanced connectivity.

  In addition, there will also be considerable synergy between these ‘north – south’ corridors and those proposed on an ‘east – west’ axis. This will significantly enhance journey opportunities for those travelling into the area from the north and who then want to travel east or west on the South Coast to their final destinations.

  Examples include better access to Portsmouth and the Solent area from the A3 corridor and subsequent better connectivity to points east and west (using the upgraded A27 and M27 corridors). Improving the A34 between Southampton and points north will also help to take ‘pressure’ off some of the other corridors such as the M23 and A3 corridors;

- **Enhancing ‘north – south’ connectivity in the region:** In the Hampshire, Surrey and Mid-Sussex areas, historical transport corridor development has focussed on the main arterial routes into Greater and Central London. This applies to the main rail and road corridors (such as the main lines between Southampton and London and Portsmouth and London). Good north – south connectivity has therefore been difficult to achieve and this has been compounded in recent years by high levels of traffic on those north – south corridors that do exist.

  By proposing new corridors that link Mid-Sussex (Horsham) with the Thames Valley (Bracknell/Reading) as well as upgraded existing corridors (such as the upgraded North Downs Line), connectivity will be enhanced.

  This is essential for a variety of economic and growth reasons, not least the enhanced connectivity between major centres such as those in Berkshire and the ‘Gatwick Diamond’ area. Better north – south links will enable workers in these major centres to live further away as their commute will be significantly enhanced. ‘Knock-on’ benefits will include positive impacts on housing development.
Similarly, improved connectivity between Basingstoke and Reading as well as between Southampton and Newbury (and points further north as noted previously) will support growth in the region;

**Enhancing connectivity between the South West / West of the region and London:**

Although there are several major transport corridors linking the study area to London, there remain ‘pockets’ of population and economic activity that are comparatively poorly served. Examples include the Reading to London Waterloo route where journey times are much longer than those on other main line routes into London whilst major centres of economic activity (such as those near Bracknell) face long journey times into London.

By improving connectivity in these corridors, workers will be able to access a much wider array of employment opportunities in London, Reading and elsewhere. These improvements will be captured in the agglomeration analysis reported previously with productivity being enhanced and a range of economic benefits stemming from this.

The movement corridors therefore enhance connectivity across a range of complementary geographies with several of the east – west corridors having major synergies with the north – south corridors.

There is also potential for the corridors to provide strong linkages with neighbouring LEP areas and the wider South East / South West regions. For the main ports in Portsmouth and Southampton, good connectivity for freight traffic will be essential, especially given the forecast increase in containerised flows and the need to have good linkages between the ports and the Midlands / the North.
6

IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, a range of options is set out for each of the short-listed corridors. This covers the following:

- Identification of a range of options for addressing known problems in each corridor; and
- An assessment of ‘deliverability’ of each corridor.

For presentational purposes, the deliverability of a “Top Fifteen” of corridors has been assessed with the key issues covered including engineering, planning and other technical constraints. In reality, all the corridors selected will have different levels of ‘deliverability’ with the smaller schemes tending to be more deliverable in terms of the lesser amounts of physical works required.

This means that the deliverability “gradings” given in this chapter are independent of the extent of the likely economic benefits that will be generated. An analysis of high level costs and benefits is the subject of analysis in Chapter 7.

6.2 ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

To make this part of the work as clear and transparent as possible, the findings are reported in tabular format.

In Table 6-1, the range of options and deliverability issues is summarised for each corridor with the colour coding on the right-hand side indicating how the ‘grading’ of deliverability (i.e. green = achievable, amber = deliverable but with caveats / key issues and red = problematic).
### Table 6-1: Identification of Potential Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRIDOR</th>
<th>DELIVERABILITY ISSUES</th>
<th>PLANNING</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“South Coast Relief Road”</strong></td>
<td>A new transformative corridor situated on an alignment to the north of the existing M27 / A27 corridor (i.e. the new corridor would bypass all the major towns on the route)</td>
<td>This has been evaluated on the basis of a new road corridor being built (although rail could also be considered) – this is a major engineering undertaking passing through key areas</td>
<td>The corridor will pass through some areas of high environmental sensitivity, not least in the South Downs National Park (SDNP) area. This will therefore require careful planning consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“South Sussex Way”</strong></td>
<td>As with the ‘South Coast Relief Road’, this transformative corridor will require significant infrastructure works across a considerable distance</td>
<td>This will be a major engineering undertaking requiring a long term programme of construction works throughout the proposed corridor. The corridor has been considered as a road project although a rail corridor will also offer the same level of improved connectivity</td>
<td>As with any infrastructure of this scope and size, extensive planning will be required over a long term period. Environmental considerations and concerns will also need to be dealt with through accepted procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid Sussex to Thames Valley New Corridor</strong></td>
<td>A transformational corridor (considered as a road corridor at this stage). Would pass through an area of very high environmental sensitivity before accessing the Thames Valley area</td>
<td>This corridor will require significant works and significant investment (whether as a road of rail link). Given that there are very few such ‘north – south’ corridors in this part of the study area, the works will involve the forging of a new alignment</td>
<td>By taking a ‘direct’ route between Horsham and Reading, the corridor passes through the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (near Dorking etc.). This will require significant mitigation (such as tunnelling) as possible re-routing away from the ‘optimal’ corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southampton to Portsmouth Corridor Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>A major upgrade of the existing rail corridor between the two cities – to facilitate much faster journey times through faster journey times and fewer station calls</td>
<td>Will require significant works to a level similar to that scoped for the full Brighton Main Line (BML) upgrade – to enhance capacity, this could feature some form of ‘passing loops’ so that faster services could overtake ‘stopping’ services on the corridor</td>
<td>As with all major rail upgrades, significant time and expenditure would be needed for the planning and feasibility stages. A demonstration of very clear economic benefits could accelerate this process by placing the scheme higher in the DIT’s “list of priorities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Downs Line Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>A major upgrade of the existing diesel-only corridor linking Gatwick Airport, Redhill, Reigate, Dorking and Guildford with Reading (this has already been extensively evaluated by Surrey CC and their consultants),</td>
<td>From an engineering perspective, this is feasible given that no major new corridor construction is required – the technical aspects of what is proposed are covered in the extensive feasibility work undertaken by Arup.</td>
<td>Major rail upgrades require an extensive and time-consuming planning horizon that will mean this upgrade is likely to take several years before fruition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRIDOR</th>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
<th>DELIVERABILITY ISSUES</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESCRIPTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading - Waterloo Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>A number of engineering solutions could enable journey times to improve on this corridor although as with several rail enhancements in the South East, the very high capacity utilisation towards the London end of the route may make this difficult (and very expensive)</td>
<td>As noted for other rail corridor improvements, these types of enhancements require significant planning and evaluation before Government approval (and funding) is given</td>
<td>Although this does not involve the construction of new corridor infrastructure, the characteristics of the current service (i.e. several station stops and relatively slow journey times) are not easily enhanced without major works, disruption to existing services and expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Southern Access to Heathrow’</td>
<td>Although a significant undertaking, the use of several sections of existing lines will assist the feasibility and deliverability of the overall programme. Where new sections of line are required, however, extensive works will be needed</td>
<td>As with the North Downs upgrade, this corridor will require a significant amount of planning across a number of different stakeholders. Adherence to all current rail planning guidelines and procedures must also be followed</td>
<td>The proposed corridor passes through several densely populated areas and will therefore require a significant consultation programme before the proposals are accepted – previous initiatives such as the ‘Airtrack’ proposal did not proceed for a number of reasons, including issues surrounding the number of level crossings on the route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A27 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>The works proposed on the A27 corridor have been evaluated in detail in recent years, with the proposed works at Arundel, for example, being developed over several years. In general terms, the engineering aspects of this corridor upgrade are feasible</td>
<td>The A27 corridor passes through some relatively dense / well populated areas – there are also areas of environmental sensitivity with the Arundel Bypass, for example, being frequently opposed on environmental grounds in the past</td>
<td>Highways England has been developing plans for the A27 corridor over several years – work is currently ongoing. As one of the main east-west arteries in the region, its upgrade will be feasible and will generate significant benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Main Line Upgrade (A23 / M23 Corridor)</td>
<td>The Brighton Main Line is currently the subject of a major upgrade study by DfT (Coast to Capital are heavily involved with this). The line is currently operating at the limits of its capacity and any enhancement will require major infrastructure works</td>
<td>Planning for the BML upgrade will require lengthy procedures to be followed, including Network Rail’s full range of project feasibility analysis. There will also be several stakeholders who need to be consulted, including the local authorities and train operating companies</td>
<td>By requesting that the current BML study be undertaken, the Government (and the Treasury) have shown clear intent that the line’s upgrade will play a key part in generating economic growth in the region. The upgrade can also be linked to the plans to develop a secondary link between Brighton and London (“BML2”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>These works will require significant enhancement works, especially in the Guildford area where the ‘narrowness’ of the existing corridor will necessitate</td>
<td>Given that a significant proportion of the works will be in a relatively dense, urban area, extensive planning consent will be required</td>
<td>In the Guildford area, the A3 improvements will need to be accompanied by works on ‘feeder’ and connecting roads as current problems are not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRIDOR</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>OPTIONS</td>
<td>DELIVERABILITY ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34</td>
<td>Major corridor improvement on this section of the A34 – to include appropriate widening and junction works where required</td>
<td>Selected works have already commenced on sections of the A34 and this will continue this process, albeit throughout the whole section of the road. Key 'pinch points' and 'bottlenecks' will be addressed and suitable widening works / dualling will provide additional capacity</td>
<td>As well as passing through / near urban areas, the A34 also passes through areas of extensive countryside in both Hampshire and Berkshire – any planning of the upgrade works will therefore need to take account of these factors and the sensitivities associated with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke to Reading Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>Currently focussed on the A33 road corridor between these two centres of economic activity, the corridor is also served by a rail link (operated by both GWR and Arriva Cross Country)</td>
<td>The engineering works will focus on the enhancement of the existing corridor with any capacity constraints dealt with accordingly (such as carriageway widening and other works that will enhance journey times)</td>
<td>Planning of the works in this corridor can follow on from the consultation and preparation already undertaken for the &quot;Basingstoke A33 corridor improvements&quot; programme (being supported / promoted by Hants CC as well as EM3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M27 / A31 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>To upgrade this east - west road corridor to eliminate major bottlenecks and 'pinch points'</td>
<td>To implement widening / dualling works where necessary and to address locations where capacity is constrained (such as some of the major junctions, including that at Ringwood). The works would build on the proposals already developed by Highways England for this corridor</td>
<td>Several schemes in this crucial corridor (such as the Ringwood improvements) have already reached the planning / feasibility stage and the upgrading works could build on this to offer a complete strategic corridor upgrade (subject to environmental and related considerations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A320 Upgrade</td>
<td>Given the very high levels of traffic observed on this key road corridor linking Guildford with Woking and the M25, works will cover junction improvements as well as capacity enhancements where these improve travel times and journey reliability (through</td>
<td>The A320 corridor passes through densely populated, urban areas – this means that major upgrading works will be disruptive, time-consuming and expensive (although the subsequent benefits to local and regional traffic will be substantial)</td>
<td>Given the characteristics and location of the A320 corridor, the works will need to be carefully planned with consideration given to the disputiveness of the works and the potential environmental impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRIDOR</td>
<td>DELIVERABILITY ISSUES</td>
<td>DELIVERABILITY GRADING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESCRIPTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>OPTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(reduced congestion levels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>The A22 corridor between Eastbourne on the South Coast and the M25 intersection at Godstone in Surrey is a strategically important route – its upgrade (through capacity enhancements to improve journey times) will significantly enhance connectivity to / from East Sussex</td>
<td>The A22 would require significant works to enhance capacity through suitable widening and dualling (as well as a programme to address key junctions that cause delays and lengthen journey times)</td>
<td>This will be a major upgrade over a relatively long distance and will thus require extensive planning and feasibility analysis. Passing through both urban and rural areas, any environmental issues will also need to be addressed and mitigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31 Upgrade</td>
<td>The A31 Hog’s Back section of road and its intersection with the A3 near Guildford experiences considerable congestion and delays (and is also dangerous given the nature of the gradients and merging movements). An upgrade of this section of the A31 will thus make traffic movements considerably better</td>
<td>The A31 Hog’s Back improvement would require significant works, especially in terms of the topography of the area and the complex nature of the current intersection with the A3. However, this proposed upgrade is relatively short and is situated in an existing corridor – this will make the improvements easier to implement</td>
<td>A major planning and feasibility exercise will be necessary, including appropriate environmental impact assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhaven - Lewes - Brighton Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>This upgrade will provided much-needed better connectivity between Newhaven, Lewes and Brighton in East Sussex</td>
<td>The current junction between the A26 and A27 is a major ‘bottleneck’ in the area and its removal through suitable upgrade works will be a major undertaking</td>
<td>A major planning and feasibility exercise will be necessary, including appropriate environmental impact assessments given the characteristics of the local area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 MODAL OPTIONS AND ACCESS TO THE CORRIDORS

Table 6.1 shows that where new corridors have been identified as having a large positive economic impact, the deliverability of any modal solution will be challenging e.g. South Sussex Way and Mid Sussex to Thames Valley Corridor. The reasons for the new corridors having large calculated benefits are fundamental to understand when developing any proposed solution.

The existing transport infrastructure (any mode) that gives the current level of access and connectivity between the centres of population in the new corridors is either direct or convenient and the hypothetical transport infrastructure solutions assume that there would be significant improvements in journey times and direct access to and from the new corridor from residential areas and employment areas. This means that in the development of any modal options, the accessibility on to and off the corridor will be a key consideration.

The corridors identified are either a single mode or appear as a default choice for the given corridor. However, the access to and from the improved corridor will similarly need to be a key consideration when generating physical schemes to ensure that the improvements generate the desired outcomes.

In the course of writing this report, Highways England produced a complimentary report ‘Orbital Connectivity - Orbital Strategic Public Transport in the West and South Beyond the M25’. This report highlighted the current difference in modal share depending on the twin variables of inter-urban journey times and the provision of public transport services within an urban area. The report is appended as an Annex to this report.
7 PRIORITISATION OF POTENTIAL INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Based on the analysis of potential solutions identified in Chapter 6, this chapter contains a further prioritisation assessment whereby the overall financial and economic feasibility of the infrastructure investments is evaluated at a high level.

The term ‘infrastructure investments’ reflects the following:

- An ‘investment’ to cover the outline capital (and operating) costs that need to be incurred to realise the economic benefits over a specified period of time;
- The high level economic benefits likely to accrue over the appraisal timescale – in this case, up to both 30 and 60 years (similar to other appraisal timescales); and
- The particular characteristics of the corridor upgrade (its rationale and timetable for construction etc.).

To develop this high level economic and financial analysis, we have taken the ‘snap shot’ economic analysis reported in Chapter 5 and have extended this so that a 30 to 60 year forecasting period is covered. The estimated high level cost of each corridor also forms part of the analysis and is one of the key input assumptions. All costs and benefit values are subject to standard discounting methods. This is as follows:

- A discount rate of 3.5% per annum is applied for the first 30 years of the appraisal period; and
- A discount rate of 3% is applied for the remaining 30 years in the period.

For the purposes of this high level analysis, the calculations assume that the corridor upgrades take place in the near future with the stream of benefits following on after scheme opening. The metrics shown in Table 7-2 therefore reflect this assumption although in reality, the corridors are long term propositions and several years will elapse before construction / upgrade work can take place. The right-hand column in Table 7-2 therefore provides commentary on the realistic timeframes anticipated for each corridor.

The high level analysis is not a ‘conventional transport economics’ appraisal as we are not quantifying traditional benefits such as monetised journey time savings (to users of the corridors) nor are we calculating the economic benefit of reduced accidents due to transport improvements.

The monetised benefits included here are those described in Chapter 3 (such as GVA increases and various financial returns to Government). In a fully compliant DfT appraisal, it would be necessary to also include more ‘traditional’ transport economics impact as well as these wider impacts. This issue has also been addressed in Section 3.1.

These initial results do, however, show the extent to which high level scheme costs compare with forecast economic benefits.

We have evaluated both a 30 year appraisal time horizon as well as the longer 60 year period to give a broader range of feasibility indicators.
7.2 HIGH LEVEL COST DATA

For this high level cost benefit assessment, a series of cost estimates have been drawn from existing data sources. These cover both road and rail with differentiation between ‘upgrade’ and ‘new corridor’ schemes (and costs).

This is summarised in Table 7-1 below.

Table 7-1 High Level Cost Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST PER KILOMETRE (£ MILLION)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Road: Arundel Bypass</td>
<td>This comprises a major new section of dual carriageway constructed away from the existing A27 alignment. The cost shown here is based on Bypass Option B (and an average of the ‘low’ and ‘high’ estimates)</td>
<td>£37.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded Road: A303 / A358</td>
<td>This comprises upgrades of sections of the A358 and A303 (Ilchester – Sparkford) roads. The cost here is thus an average of the two</td>
<td>£17 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Rail Corridor: Brighton Main Line (BML)</td>
<td>This per km cost is based on the full upgrade cost (£15 billion) of the BML programme as recently evaluated on behalf of DfT</td>
<td>£174.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reopened / Upgraded Rail Corridor: Uckfield - Lewes</td>
<td>This is based on the estimated cost per km of reopening the Uckfield to Lewes line (this is a complete upgrade cost and includes a new tunnel). The estimate is also based on an average of a ‘low’ and ‘high’ estimates</td>
<td>£53.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These costs have also been augmented with additional data where this is available. For example, the North Downs Line upgrade cost estimate includes an ‘operating cost’ element covering the cost of additional train services and rolling stock.

In addition, some scheme cost estimates are a composite of the data shown in Table 7-1. To demonstrate this, the proposed new rail corridor between Guildford and Heathrow Airport incorporates elements of both upgraded existing lines as well as sections of new corridor.

Two economic output metrics are used to indicate feasibility: 1) a Net Present Value (NPV) and 2) what is termed a ‘high level economic benefit to cost ratio’.
### 7.3 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Table 7-2 below contains a summary of the infrastructure investments analysis. As well as the rationale for each corridor project, summary costs and benefits are indicated (in discounted form).

An indicative timetable for delivery is also shown in Table 7-2.

#### Table 7-2 Potential Infrastructure Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRIDOR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ECONOMIC METRICS</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“South Coast Relief Road”</td>
<td>A transformative, new corridor linking</td>
<td>A high capital cost of circa £4.1 billion (with annual operating expenditure of £3</td>
<td>The benefits are the highest of all the corridors evaluated and total £95 billion over 30 years and £145 billion over 60 years (both total are based on discounted amounts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southampton with Brighton (and providing a alternative corridor to the current M27 / A27)</td>
<td>million) could be supported by the very high economic impacts forecast. In high level economic benefit to cost ratio terms, these could be as high as:</td>
<td>This is a long term corridor concept and could take up to 20 to 30 years before fruition (reflecting planning and feasibility time horizons).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) 30 years: 24.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) 60 years: 38.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“South Sussex Way”</td>
<td>Another transformational, new corridor –</td>
<td>A high capital cost of circa £6.4 billion (with annual operating expenditure of £3</td>
<td>Forecast (discounted) benefits are also high:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this will cover a considerable distance and will link Salisbury in Wiltshire with Hampshire, Sussex and Kent</td>
<td>million) could be supported by the very high economic impacts forecast. In high level economic benefit to cost ratio terms, although not as high as the ‘South Coast Relief Road’, these could be as high as:</td>
<td>This is another long term, transformational corridor concept. Its total distance is likely to mean that it would need to be planned and built in phases / stages (20 to 30 years for full scheme implementation). Its construction will, however, relieve pressure on the M27 / A27 upgrade proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) 30 years: 12.1</td>
<td>1) 30 years: £71 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) 60 years: 18.6</td>
<td>2) 60 years: £110 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Sussex to Thames Valley Corridor</td>
<td>To provide a much-needed north-south corridor linking the Thames Valley with mid-Sussex</td>
<td>A capital cost of circa £3.1 billion (with annual operating expenditure of £1 million) would be supported by the forecast benefits to achieve the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios:</td>
<td>Although likely to generate substantial economic benefits, the environmental and engineering issues surrounding construction of this corridor mean it is a long term proposition (taking up to 15 to 20 years to deliver).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) 30 years: 19.8</td>
<td>1) 30 years: £56.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) 60 years: 30.6</td>
<td>2) 60 years: £87.9 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRIDOR</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>RATIONALE</td>
<td>ECONOMIC METRICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COSTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BENEFITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton to Portsmouth Rail Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>To radically improve connectivity between these two key cities in the Solent area by means of a major rail corridor upgrade</td>
<td>A capital cost of circa £5.2 billion (with annual operating expenditure of £0.5 million) would be supported by the forecast benefits to achieve the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios:</td>
<td>Total forecast (discounted) wider economic benefits are as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading to Waterloo Upgrade</td>
<td>Given relatively slow journey times between key towns in Berkshire and London (on the Reading to Waterloo route), this upgrade envisages significant capacity enhancements on the route so that faster journey times are possible</td>
<td>Even with a very high capital cost estimate of £8.4 billion (with annual operating expenditure of £2 million), the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios would be achieved given the extent of potential wider benefits in this key corridor:</td>
<td>Total forecast (discounted) wider economic benefits are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Downs Line</td>
<td>To greatly improve rail connectivity on this economically important artery linking the ‘North Downs’ area (and Guildford) with the Thames Valley</td>
<td>Depending on the scale of upgrade envisaged, a high capital cost (£4.3 billion) investment would still generate significant returns on investment as shown by these high level economic benefit to cost ratios:</td>
<td>Total forecast (discounted) wider economic benefits are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Access to Heathrow</td>
<td>To build on former proposals to build a new rail link into Heathrow Airport (via a spur off the existing Reading – Waterloo route). The proposed corridor would link as far south as Guildford and would use existing sections of line where necessary</td>
<td>Based on capital costs of £3.9 billion and £1 million p.a. operating costs, the resulting high level economic benefit to cost ratios based on the wider benefits generated would be:</td>
<td>Total forecast wider economic benefits are very similar to those of the proposed North Downs Line upgrade:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRIDOR</td>
<td>RATIONALE</td>
<td>ECONOMIC METRICS</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A27 Corridor Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>To bring to fruition long-standing plans to upgrade the A27 corridor between Brighton and Portsmouth (and to address key 'bottlenecks' in the corridor)</td>
<td>If the total upgrade cost was £1.4 billion, for example (with operating expenditure of £1 million per annum), the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios would be achieved:</td>
<td>Depending on the current work being undertaken by Highways England on the overall feasibility of the A27 corridor upgrade, it is possible that works could commence in the next 5 to 10 years. The Government stated in December 2014 that the corridor would receive investment as part of its Strategic Road Network (SRN) and this may mean that implementation could happen sooner compared to other corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brighton Main Line Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>The transport link between Brighton and London is of strategic importance to the region – although this proposal has focussed on the main Brighton to London rail link, the corridor is also served by the A23 / M23</td>
<td>Based on the &quot;full scale&quot; upgrade cost of £15 billion (with assumed £3 million annual operating expenditure), the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios would be achieved – these ratios could potentially be higher if some of the more 'intermediate' upgrade proposals were used as the basis for the corridor upgrade:</td>
<td>The BML upgrade is currently being assessed by DfT and depending on the results of this study, further work could be undertaken on this major upgrade. Timescales for implementation are likely to remain in the 'long term' category given the nature and scale of the works (next 10 to 15 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3 Corridor Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>To improve connectivity in the A3 corridor (Surrey – Portsmouth / Solent area) by addressing key sections where there are capacity constraints (such as the section near Guildford as well as adjoining feeder roads)</td>
<td>Based on a high level estimate of capital expenditure for total corridor improvement (£1.4 billion), the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios could be achieved:</td>
<td>Following on from the Hindhead Tunnel opening in 2011, further proposals for the A3 corridor include major widening works in the Guildford area as well as improvements near the Hog's Back junction. The scale of these (and the necessary planning requirements) will mean that it could be 10 to 15 years before scheme implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>COSTS</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>LIKELY TIMESCALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A27 Corridor Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>Based on this preliminary evaluation, total (discounted) wider economic benefits are:</td>
<td>1) 30 years: £25.0 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) 60 years: £38.7 billion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on this preliminary evaluation, total (discounted) wider economic benefits are:</td>
<td>1) 30 years: £23.4 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) 60 years: £36.3 billion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on this preliminary evaluation, total (discounted) wider economic benefits are:</td>
<td>1) 30 years: £18.4 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) 60 years: £28.4 billion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRIDOR</td>
<td>RATIONALE</td>
<td>ECONOMIC METRICS</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southamton to Newbury A34 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>To improve this key strategic route linking Southampton with Berkshire, Oxford and points north</td>
<td>Costs: With an upgrade cost between Southampton and J13 of the M4 of approximately £1 billion, the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios would be achieved: 1) 30 years: 17.4 2) 60 years: 26.7</td>
<td>Based on this preliminary evaluation, total (discounted) wider economic benefits are: 3) 30 years: £16.5 billion 4) 60 years: £25.6 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke to Reading Corridor</td>
<td>To improve connectivity between Basingstoke and Reading by upgrading the A33 corridor</td>
<td>Costs: Based on a high level capital cost estimate of £460 million, the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios could be achieved: 1) 30 years: 26.3 2) 60 years: 40.1</td>
<td>The evaluation of the A33 upgrade indicates the following wider economic benefits: 1) 30 years: £11.5 billion 2) 60 years: £17.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M27 – A31 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>To upgrade sections of the M27 – A31 corridor between Southampton and Dorset (Poole / Bournemouth) – to facilitate improved journey times and connectivity</td>
<td>Costs: Based on a capital cost estimate of just under £1 billion, the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios could be achieved: 1) 30 years: 13.6 2) 60 years: 20.9</td>
<td>Significant wider economic benefits would be generated: 1) 30 years: £11.9 billion 2) 60 years: £17.5 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A320 Corridor Upgrade</td>
<td>To provide significant capacity enhancements on this comparatively short but very highly used section of road</td>
<td>Costs: Given a capital cost estimate of approximately £335 million, the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios reflect the high level of agglomeration increase-based (and other) economic benefits that could potentially be achieved: 1) 30 years: 27.3 2) 60 years: 41.9</td>
<td>Significant wider economic benefits would be generated: 1) 30 years: £8.5 billion 2) 60 years: £13.3 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRIDOR</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>RATIONALE</td>
<td>ECONOMIC METRICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A22 Corridor Upgrade     | This corridor upgrade will enable Eastbourne and the East Sussex coast area to have significantly enhanced connectivity with Surrey, Greater London and other areas of economic importance in the region | Based on capital costs of £1.2 billion, the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios could potentially be achieved:  
1) 30 years: 3.6  
2) 60 years: 5.6 | The following wider economic benefits could be generated:  
1) 30 years: £4.0 billion  
2) 60 years: £6.2 billion | This is major corridor upgrade and given its length, could be upgraded in stages (over the next 15 to 20 years), with the key capacity ‘bottlenecks’ addressed first before other strategic widening and dualling works takes place. This is very much a long term corridor proposal |
| A31 Upgrade              | This upgrade is required given that this section of the A31 and its intersection with the A3 is the source of much congestion and delays (as well as being a major accident risk) | Based on capital costs of £550 million, the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios could potentially be achieved:  
1) 30 years: 5.7  
2) 60 years: 8.8 | The following wider economic benefits could be generated:  
1) 30 years: £2.9 billion  
2) 60 years: £4.6 billion | Compared to some of the other strategic corridors, this upgrade covers a comparatively short distance and could be implemented within relatively short timescales (10 to 15 years) |
| Newhaven - Lewes - Brighton Corridor Upgrade | This upgrade will facilitate much better connectivity between Newhaven and Brighton as well as providing better links to Lewes (both Newhaven and Lewes will also gain better access to jobs in Brighton) | Based on capital costs of £440 million, the following high level economic benefit to cost ratios could potentially be achieved:  
1) 30 years: 5.4  
2) 60 years: 8.3 | The following wider economic benefits could be generated:  
1) 30 years: £2.2 billion  
2) 60 years: £3.5 billion | As with the A31 upgrade, this is a comparatively short-distance corridor (although major works will still be required, especially in terms of addressing the existing ‘bottleneck’ at the busy A26 / A27 junction). This could take 10 to 15 years. |
HOUSING, GROWTH AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The analysis described up to this point has addressed the economic impact of developing strategic transport corridors in terms of key economic metrics such as additional GVA and employment opportunities.

In addition, and to reflect that the corridors will be developed in the future, several background factors need to be taken into account. These include:

- **Housing developments**: the study area is one of the fastest-growing in the UK with forecast growth in population putting increasing levels of pressure on the need to develop new housing;
- **Growth in key sectors**: as well as background economic growth, several “high tech” and “high value” sectors across the study area will continue to expand. Taking the information technology sector as an example, growth in this sector will not only generate higher levels of GVA but will also generate higher productivity levels as each worker will produce more GVA; and;
- **Other developments**: in addition to housing developments, other major developments are also planned across the region and these will be impacted by / have an impact on the strategic corridors proposed.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the types of developments taking place, the urgent need for these developments in the study area (particularly housing that is affordable to workers in the region) and ultimately, how the strategic corridors will have a crucial role to play in terms of 1) helping facilitate the developments in the first place and 2) how the developments themselves will support the impacts generated by the corridors.

8.2 KEY DEVELOPMENTS IN EACH LEP AREA

Each LEP area has clear, distinct objectives with respect to economic and housing development. By summarising the key objectives and aims of each LEP area, the types of developments proposed are made clear.

**THAMES VALLEY BERKSHIRE**

Berkshire and the Thames Valley has continued to display strong employment growth in recent years and this growth is likely to continue into the future given the concentration of employment in the key ‘high value’ sectors that continue to perform well. These include telecoms, IT, professional services and the utilities sectors. There are clusters of professional services activity within Bracknell Forest and Reading with workers very much reliant on good transport access (both rail and road) to access these high value jobs.

The impact of the different employment clusters on travel patterns in the TVB LEP area is demonstrated by the three broad ‘travel to work areas’ (TTWAs) defined below:

- **“Reading TTWA”**: this comprises all of Reading and Wokingham boroughs as well as the majority of Bracknell Forest (and includes parts of South Oxfordshire, West Berkshire, Windsor and Maidenhead and Hart);
“Slough and Heathrow TTWA”: as well as including all of Slough borough and parts of Windsor and Maidenhead, most of this area is situated towards the east of the LEP and covers Runnymede, Spelthorne, South Buckinghamshire and the London Boroughs of Hillingdon and Kingston upon Thames; and

“Newbury TTWA”: this area covers most of West Berkshire and parts of Wiltshire, Basingstoke and Deane and Test Valley.

These travel to work areas have a major influence on the housing market given that the location and development of housing in Berkshire reflects both household migration and travel to work patterns from surrounding local authority areas.

Given that growth in working age population is forecast to decrease across the majority of Berkshire authorities whilst growth rates increase across a number of nearby authorities, these anticipated trends are also likely to have an impact on travel to work patterns to, from and within Berkshire. The likely outcome that travel flows into Berkshire will increase over time as a result of these developments places even greater emphasis on the need to improve key movement corridors.

To accommodate future population growth in the LEP area and to ensure there is sufficient housing (at affordable levels) for the workers needed in the future, there are extensive plans for housing development across the various local authorities in the area.

At stated in the LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), it is crucial that housing availability and affordability do not constrain the future growth of Berkshire’s economy. The SEP also makes it clear that plans for housing growth must take account of wider infrastructure constraints. As evidence of this, the LEP’s Infrastructure Programme states that it is imperative to invest in transport to unlock some major housing developments.

Similarly, to ensure that economic potential is not constrained by labour supply issues, congestion problems must be addressed and planned housing - some of which is dependent on upfront infrastructure investment – must be delivered as quickly as possible.

Through the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Growth Deal, the LEP is supporting seven transport schemes in 2015/16 (out of 22 in the whole Growth Deal). The purpose of these investments is to unlock housing development sites (for example, there are over 16,500 houses linked to these schemes) and to increase the overall capacity of the network to deliver the level of reliable journeys the economy requires.

Although these are relatively small, ‘localised’ schemes compared to strategic movement corridors, they nevertheless provide clear evidence of the importance of transport infrastructure as a means of unlocking development and more importantly, the fact that these schemes are being strongly promoted indicates the urgency with which infrastructure is required.

SOLENT

The Solent LEP area is an internationally-recognised economic hub incorporating the Isle of Wight, the major cities of Portsmouth and Southampton, the M27 corridor and the Solent waterway. The area has particular strengths in key economic sectors and also has world-class universities, a strong base of high quality Further Education colleges and excellent transport links.

The continued economic success of the area is very much dependent on the communications inter-dependencies between the cities and the wider Solent area with the Solent economy’s significance extending considerably beyond the LEP area (and thus making an important contribution to the national economy).
Continued and improved transport access to the major hubs centred around Southampton and Portsmouth is critical given the economic importance of these hubs as well as the centres of economic activity within the LEP area.

In its evidence base to support the Solent Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), the LEP’s “Connecting Growth” initiative sets out how strategic (and local) transport links impact on the Solent economy both now and in the future. One of the key outcomes from the analysis is that new housing and employment floor space will support growth whilst transport infrastructure will perform a critical role unlocking these sites (and thus encouraging and accelerating inward investment).

There are already several examples of where strategic growth opportunities have been identified and some of these are shown below:

- In the Fareham and Gosport peninsula, there is a requirement for a package of transport investments that unlock opportunities for strategic housing and employment growth at the Solent Enterprise Zone at Daedalus and at the 6,000 home Welborne development (the transport schemes include an upgrade to Junction 10 of the M27, associated junction improvements on the local road network and new highway access to the Solent Enterprise Zone);
- To accelerate the delivery of the strategic housing site at North Whiteley (located near to Junction 9 of the M27), there is a requirement for a new highway to be constructed joining the existing Whiteley Way with the highway network to the north. This will unlock the 3,500 new homes proposed; and
- As well as road connectivity improvements, the rail corridor between Portsmouth and Southampton has a significant role to play enhancing movements across the sub-region whilst also providing better connections to Southampton Airport and points east.

Improvements to this rail corridor will 1) relieve pressure on the already busy M27, 2) improve labour and business interaction between the two cities (and the areas in between) and 3) provide improved rail access to the airport from the east. As rail journey times in this corridor are comparatively long, movements are still concentrated on the M27 corridor and this increases delays and congestion.

A more detailed list of sites where ‘unlocking’ is essential for development is provided below:

- **Welborne**: a planned 6,000 home development situated to the north of Fareham (112,000 square metres of employment floor space is also proposed). Unlocking the site will require infrastructure developments, specifically new and improved strategic transport infrastructure at Junction 10 on the M27 - this is essential to initiate the development;
- **North Whiteley**: as described above, this strategic growth area will provide 3,500 new homes and associated infrastructure. Support is required for a major new transport link serving both the proposed growth area and the existing community (which at present has only one main highway access on to the M27);
- **Marchwood military port**: the Sea Mounting Facility at Marchwood has been taken on by Solent Gateways Limited, who will be operating the site. There are opportunities for growth at this site through port-related activity other than the sea mounting facility that will continue to operate here;
- **Solent Enterprise Zone**: the first phase of development is already underway and further phases are being planned. Although road improvements are underway to enhance accessibility between the M27 and the Enterprise Zone, “transformational” schemes are also needed to provide an alternative route to the Gosport Peninsula (i.e. the current route from the M27 via the A32 is extremely congested at certain times of the day); and
Other sites, including the **Ford Site**, **Eastleigh Riverside** and **Southampton Airport** (the redeveloped site will provide a prestigious and attractive new gateway to Southampton), **Gosport Waterfront** (a priority site in the Solent Strategic Economic Plan) and **Itchen Riverside** (a regeneration project in Southampton covering an area of 105 hectares on both sides of the River Itchen - a draft Master Plan is currently being prepared).

Although this list is not exhaustive, it does provide an indication of the types of development sites that are needed to accommodate the area’s growth plans and the transport / infrastructure interventions necessary to unlock them.

At a more strategic level, the demands placed on the main transport networks, combined with the impact of planned housing and employment growth, will severely constrain the Solent economy if not addressed.

This is why strategic movement corridors will play a key role in an integrated transport network that enables forecast growth at the three International Gateways (the ports of Southampton and Portsmouth and Southampton International Airport) as well as at key housing and employment sites.

**ENTERPRISE M3**

Although the economy of the Enterprise M3 area is very powerful in its own right (e.g. Enterprise M3 is ranked second out of 39 LEPs in terms of the local business base), there is a relatively restricted employment market and when this is combined with a growing demand for higher level and Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) skills, along with an ageing population, high levels of out-commuting and low graduate retention, there is a strong risk that future economic growth will be impeded.

This will have both regional and national impacts given the strength of the economy in the area and how much it contributes in terms of GVA and productivity.

The labour market restrictions are being exacerbated by a shortage of housing and in particular, housing that is affordable to workers. This means that 1) the Enterprise M3 area cannot offer suitably priced housing to those workers who are needed to support economic growth and 2) the area is unable to compete effectively with the employment opportunities available in London.

It is for these reasons that the LEP and stakeholders in the region are supporting sustainable economic development solutions and the creation of more balanced communities. A series of focused sustainable transport measures are also being pursued to reduce the very high levels of congestion experienced in the LEP area.

To help facilitate economic growth and to realise the potential of the area, housing provision must be accelerated. The LEP’s strategic ambition is to therefore support and accelerate (via infrastructure provision) the delivery of housing by up to 25% above the baseline achieved between 2003 and 2013 (typical annual baseline delivery was approximately 920 units per annum). This means that with Government support, up to 11,500 new homes will be delivered over the next 10 years. This acceleration of delivery would be achieved without an increase in the Local Plan targets set by individual local authorities. There are two factors in achieving this goal:

- The infrastructure funding contained in the LEP’s Local Growth Deal submission; and
- Support for strategic transport interventions.

To help achieve these targets, a number of strategic development sites are in Enterprise M3’s **Growth Towns** and **Step-up Towns** whilst a series of targeted interventions – including transport interventions - will play a key part in realising their potential.
One key message from the LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan is that to facilitate the necessary housing growth, it is vital that Government not only invests in the infrastructure schemes set out within the Growth Packages and more widely, but also that it commits to working to help accelerate those strategic schemes being delivered by Highways England and Network Rail.

Specific projects include Junction 9 of the M3 and the A3 corridor improvements near Guildford.

The two largest sites in the Enterprise M3 area – Whitehill and Bordon (4,000 homes) and Wellesley in Aldershot (3,850 homes) were both due to start on site in 2014/15 and present a considerable opportunity for the area. Further examples of the Growth Towns and Step-up Towns (and their respective infrastructure schemes) are shown below:

**→ Growth Towns:**
- **Basingstoke:** includes packages of highways projects to improve capacity and support housing development such as the ‘Basingstoke North’ and ‘South West Corridors to Growth’ schemes
- **Farnborough:** includes a package of highway projects to address congestion in Farnborough such as the capacity improvements on the A325, A327 and A3011
- **Guildford:** includes a sustainable transport package for Guildford and a package of highways projects including improvements to the Guildford gyratory and a Sustainable Transport Package
- **Woking:** includes an investment package to tackle major congestion issues (such as Victoria Arch capacity improvements), a sustainable transport package and A320 / A322 road improvements to help progress plans to accelerate housing delivery, including the regeneration of Woking Town Centre

**→ Step-up Towns:**
- **Aldershot:** includes a sustainable transport package
- **Andover:** includes a sustainable transport package
- **Camberley:** includes highway improvement schemes to ease congestion on the A30 / A331 corridor and the approach to the M3 approach plus sustainable transport packages for Frimley and Camberley
- **Staines:** includes the Wider Staines-upon-Thames sustainable transport package - aimed at improving access to Heathrow and employment sites
- **Whitehill and Bordon:** includes an Inner Relief Road (to accelerate development and regeneration of the green town and development of housing and large scale commercial and retail development) plus a sustainable transport package

**COAST TO CAPITAL**

In its Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), Coast to Capital LEP states that essential infrastructure - particularly transport infrastructure - is reaching capacity and is no longer robust enough to support future growth. In addition, the housing market needs unblocking if there is to be sufficient capacity for economic growth.

In other words, there cannot be sustainable economic growth without housing growth since shortages of housing (at affordable prices) makes it difficult for employers to attract and retain the workers needed to grow their businesses.

As part of the Coast to Capital Transport Programme, three types of transport schemes have been identified. The aim of these is to unlock stalled economic growth across the LEP area:
→ **Connectivity and capacity schemes** to unlock new land by providing new and/or enhanced transport connections;

→ **Sustainable transport packages** which regenerate areas by tackling congestion and improving journey quality and reliability; and

→ **Resilience schemes** to help keep the network operating at all times of the day and week.

The LEP has also identified 20 schemes which would directly unlock new housing, jobs and/or employment floor space. These schemes provide the transport capacity or connectivity needed for one or more new developments to be viable. In many cases, these schemes would tackle problems that cause severance and delays.

There are thus several schemes already put forward to enhance connectivity and unlock new development. In several cases, schemes have been implemented and to the west of Horsham in West Sussex, for example, new junction and road links connect the A24 with new housing developments.

Coast to Capital’s Strategic Economic Plan also sets out how the LEP will invest in infrastructure (including transport) to bring forward existing housing permissions that are currently blocked and to also enable an increase in new permissions. Based on the LEP’s strategic ambitions for new housing, these initiatives will bring forward an additional 7,331 homes.

To demonstrate the magnitude of housing need in the Coast to Capital area – and thus the urgent requirement for improved transport infrastructure to unlock these sites - interim findings from ONS and the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) suggest that the LEP area will need to accommodate an additional 95,000 households between 2011 and 2021 to meet future demand. This is because an additional 190,000 residents are expected in the area.

The local authorities in the area have identified potential sites with a capacity to deliver 62,800 new homes over the first 10 years of the Local Plan period and 98,851 new homes up to 2031. Over an assumed 20 year period, this equates to approximately 5,400 new homes per annum. Given that a much smaller build rate was achieved over the previous ten years (4,350 new dwellings per annum), there is a clear role for new infrastructure to play in increasing this.

### 8.3 HOW THE STRATEGIC CORRIDORS WILL SUPPORT GROWTH

From the above, it is evident that there is

- **a)** an urgent requirement for new housing in the region to support growth and
- **b)** a need to increase the rate of house building so that this growth potential can be realised.

Provision of strategic transport corridors will help unlock much needed housing development as the enhanced connectivity between local authority areas will be one of the main enabling factors. This will be particularly applicable as the housing programme looks to gather pace and will reflect the polycentric nature of the study geography.

There will be a dynamic relationship between the corridors and the new developments as several of the proposed housing sites (such as Whitehill and Bordon) are of a significant size and scale - not only are the corridors therefore essential to help improve connectivity to these new sites in the first place, they are also necessary to accommodate to the increased movements generated by the developments.

To indicate how the strategic corridors interact with housing development plans in each local authority area, the figures below show the basic alignment of each corridor together with what level of housing development is required / proposed.
Reading requires 5,210 dwellings in 2016 - 2026

13,230 dwellings needed - for which substantial infrastructure investment will be required

At least 3,760 new homes needed in the District to 2026

Overarching Theme: the upgrade will help facilitate housing in the east-west Surrey corridor whilst also helping to unlock development in Berkshire

Oct 15 Housing Market Assessment indicates 1,729 dwellings per annum are needed

930 homes in urban Green Belt area + 1,610 homes in Reigate and Redhill

Reading requires 5,210 dwellings between 2016 & 2026

Overarching Theme: given growth projections, housing & development is required throughout this critical corridor and the A27 upgrade will help facilitate this

Provision made for additional 200 dwellings per annum (4,000 in total 20 years to 2026)

The City Plan specifies 11,300 by 2030 as well as essential infrastructure development

Provision made for the delivery of at least 10,500 net additional dwellings and associated infrastructure over the period to 2026

Overarching Theme: this is a key “growth corridor” where the upgrade of the strategic road link will help unlock the necessary number of new homes

Number of homes required = 850 each year (over 18 years), or 15,300 in total (15,527 already supplied by 2014)
The Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East requires Spelthorne to provide 3,320 homes in total up to 2026 (166 per annum).

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) indicates a need for 541 homes per annum - it is acknowledged that "other measures" - including infrastructure - need to be put in place to help achieve this.

Overarching Theme: as well as providing enhanced connectivity with Heathrow Airport, this strategic corridor provides much-needed improvements to this key north-south artery and will act as a catalyst for future development, including housing.

October 2015 Housing Market Assessment (HMA) indicates 1,729 dwellings per annum are needed.

Woking town centre alone requires circa 2,000 homes to 2027 with other developments in West Byfleet and "The Villages".

Overarching Theme: by improving journey times on this relatively "slow" rail corridor, connectivity will be enhanced and this is likely to help the housing and development targets.

Reading requires 5,210 dwellings between 2016 & 2026.

13,230 dwellings needed - for which substantial infrastructure investment will be required.

635 new homes required each year in Bracknell Forest.

Preferred Policy Option HOU 1 covers provision of 7,415 dwellings - this level of delivery can only be realised where development is not restricted and/or sites can be supported (through new infrastructure etc.).

Overarching Theme: by improving journey times on this relatively "slow" rail corridor, connectivity will be enhanced and this is likely to help the housing and development targets.

The Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East requires Spelthorne to provide 3,320 homes in total up to 2026 (166 per annum).
Population growth means that an additional 27,000 new homes would be needed by 2031 to meet demand.

Local Plan makes provision for the development of a minimum of 5,100 new dwellings over the 2015 - 2030 period (infrastructure constraints need to be overcome).

Mid Sussex DC is proposing to increase the number of homes to be delivered by the District Plan (from 650 to 800 per year) - this includes a new strategic development site for 600 dwellings at Hardriding Farm, Pease Pottage (proposals to be submitted for Examination in early 2016).

The City Plan specifies 11,300 new dwellings by 2030 as well as essential infrastructure development.

Overarching Theme: the BML (+ A23 corridor) is not only the main transport link between London and the South Coast but can also act as a catalyst to the key developments (including housing) in each segment of the corridor.

Draft SHMA (October 2013) estimates that 8,450 new homes are required between 2013 and 2031 (or 470 per year) - although this still needs to be verified, this level cannot be achieved under existing policies.

October 2015 Housing Market Assessment (HMA) indicates 1,729 dwellings per annum are needed.

Provision for 10,060 dwellings between 2011 and 2028 - Whitehill and Bordon Strategic Allocation = 2,725 homes.

Havant’s housing target includes a proportion of the 2,000 - 3,000 new homes at the Waterlooville MDA.

The strategic sites of Tipner, Port Solent & Horsea Island rely on provision of transport infrastructure.
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER WORK

9.1 SUMMARY OF WORK

We have developed a quantitative approach that uses recognised DfT “Wider Impacts” guidance as the main building block to establishing how strategic corridor improvements can generate a range of benefits. These impacts include those not typically captured in conventional transport scheme appraisals.

The approach has been developed so that different corridor concepts can be tested quickly and across different geographies (and distances) in the study area. Based on improvements in connectivity, a series of economic benefits have been calculated covering increases in GVA at a ‘local’ level (based on improvements in productivity), increases in employment (supported by the increased GVA) and increases in taxation-based revenue streams to Government.

The work has focussed on the impact of a change to current travel characteristics in each corridor. These impacts are then extrapolated forward over a 60-year appraisal period so that the high level cost-benefit assessment can be undertaken.

For the high level cost benefit assessment, a series of cost estimates were taken from existing data sources. These cover both road and rail schemes with differentiation between ‘upgrade’ and ‘new corridor’ schemes (and costs).

The initial findings have shown that large-scale ‘transformational’ corridors could generate a high level of wider economic impacts, especially when the corridor serves several Local Authority Districts (LADs). These benefits do, however, need to be traded off against the feasibility of the corridor, both in terms of cost (likely to be very high for major schemes) and deliverability. The latter reflects the various engineering and environmental characteristics of each scheme.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

9.2 ACCOMMODATING HOUSING GROWTH

Data from the local authorities, including Local Plan data on housing requirements across the region, were also collated. Where major housing developments are proposed (such as at Whitehill and Bordon near the A3 corridor), these have been placed in the context of the strategic corridors put forward. As shown in the series of figures in Chapter 8, there are major housing requirements at strategic points within each corridor.

Although the interaction between transport infrastructure, housing and economic growth is a complex one (with transport infrastructure often being a prerequisite for new housing development), there is no doubt that the South East region requires a level of housing provision significantly above what has been delivered historically.

The new corridors can therefore help unlock these developments and thus boost the rate of supply of new housing.
9.3 REFINING OPTIONS AND DEFINING SCHEMES

Having demonstrated the potential economic impacts of the new corridor proposals, further work will be required to investigate each option in more detail. This will include more detailed costing of the proposals as well as more in-depth analyses of land use impacts and the impacts on housing / employment sites.

The modal choice for improvement schemes needs careful consideration and will be highly dependent on the existing configuration of the transport network in each town or city along a corridor. This will necessitate a different local solution to ensure that any corridor improvement adds full value to each location.

9.4 STRATEGIC PLANNING – PAN PUBLIC SECTOR APPROACH

This report has highlighted the potentially large economic benefit from investing in transformational transport infrastructure schemes in the study area. By its nature, the work assumes that 1) the different transport infrastructure providers responsible for the proposed improvements would be the ‘deliverers’ of the schemes and that 2) the other important subsidiary issues that need to be addressed would be in place or planned by other infrastructure providers or planning authorities.

Each corridor identified in this study will therefore need a ‘Joint Investment Plan’ involving both national and local authorities. This joint planning approach will help identify the overall corridor improvement and the local changes necessary to accommodate and maximise its benefits. In undertaking such joint working, all options for solutions should be considered using the principal of ‘fundability’ (i.e. that investment capital is a single pot from the public and private sector) and that the most cost effective deliverable solutions are prioritised.

The joint working between national and local authorities will also encompass all issues that affect socio-economic well-being, including interdependencies and trade-offs between local authority areas.

The need for a pan-public sector approach to strategic planning would ideally also directly influence spatial planning policy in whatever arrangement (and in whose jurisdiction it manifests itself in the future). Some current transport demand, particularly on the highway network, is a result of uncoordinated planning and transport policy both between the local planning authorities and the planning authorities’ transport infrastructure providers.

A particular example is encouraging development and higher densities of residential development around existing or proposed public transport services and interchanges to maximise their use and create additional public transport services for neighbouring areas. This policy has reduced existing demand on the highway network and has freed up capacity for other uses in several examples in the UK and globally.

Joint spatial/land use planning across geography similar to this study area could also help refine the strategic infrastructure requirements and allow local authorities to trade housing and employment allocations so that new development can be located in the most economically advantageous areas and maximise the benefits of any transport infrastructure investment.
9.5 URBAN CONNECTIVITY AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROVISION

The four LEPs and transport authorities that commissioned this study consulted with interested parties and stakeholders before appointing WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff. As a result of this consultation, Highways England commissioned a complementary study that considered the existing differences in modal share depending on the twin variables of inter-urban journey times and the provision of public transport services within an urban area. This is the Orbital Strategic Public Transport in the West and South West beyond the M25 study referred to earlier.

The findings of the report should also be taken into consideration when considering the issues discussed in 9.3 and 9.4. The report was commissioned by Highways England to highlight that the investment and improvement in the Strategic Road Network (SRN) will not in isolation provide the enhancement in capacity and improvements in access necessary to realise the economic potential of the study area, and that consideration to all modal solutions and access to and from the strategic corridors was of equal importance.

A key finding was that where existing inter-urban journey times were better for rail compared to road, user numbers were markedly higher on rail than in similar areas. In addition, a high density of public transport provision within an urban area also increased the percentage of users using rail for inter-urban journeys. The reason for this is assumed to be that more people access rail stations by public transport making the end to end journey on public transport easier and more attractive (hence the higher model share).

To bring this into the context of the issues discussed in 9.3 and 9.4, urban areas need to be of a minimum size and population density to generate sufficient demand to have a dense public transport network that is financially sustainable for operators. This is to ensure long term planning policies enable the concentration of housing growth in existing urban areas, as opposed to distributing growth to smaller towns and villages where public transport provision cannot cater for the majority of new demand created.

In consultation with Highways England, the concept of parkway stations, park and ride and park share facilities is also an area they wish to be explored as part of any corridor improvement schemes. Such facilities constructed upstream of existing congestion “hot spots” could provide some degree of relief by allowing people to meet at convenient rendezvous locations and share onward journeys. Other options include 1) transferring to public transport for access to town and city centres and 2) when situated next to a rail line, provide a parkway interchange for people making longer distance rail journeys, particularly into London. It is appreciated that there needs to be spare peak time rail capacity to allow the concept to work in terms of parkway stations and that the infrastructure necessary could be costly.

The report is appended as an Annex to this report

9.6 RECOMMENDED FUTURE WORK – MODAL SHIFT

The existing highway and rail network in the study area serves to allow movements within the economic geography and through it. Although this is true of most areas in the UK, the presence of London, the Channel Ports and Heathrow and Gatwick airports makes the situation more extreme compared to other areas. Therefore it will also be important to consider investment in options and solutions further afield that could free up capacity on the existing network.

An example would be for the LEPs and local authorities to influence the recently commissioned M25 SW Quadrant Study to look at traffic using the network to access Heathrow and Gatwick airport that has to travel through the study area and to investigate options for modal substitution that result in demand reduction. The previously mentioned Heathrow Southern Rail access could also be evaluated in terms of creating direct access from the Great Western Main Line and the Basingstoke to Woking Line.
The North Downs Line improvement would encourage some modal shift for accessing Gatwick Airport but could also be enhanced by the creation of direct interchange at Farnborough between the North Downs Line and the Basingstoke to Waterloo Main Line. The interchange will also help connectivity between Basingstoke and Guildford.

9.7 RECOMMENDATIONS – STRATEGIC TRANSPORT MODELLING

This study has deliberately not considered the monetised journey time savings and accident reductions of standard transport economic benefits and has focused on the wider benefits. This means that the value of the corridor improvements in terms of a Benefit Cost Ratio (HIGH LEVEL ECONOMIC BENEFIT TO COST RATIO) will be higher than has been estimated in this study. In addition, any new corridor or improved corridor will attract strategic traffic passing through the area and this economic impact has been not been calculated. Transfer of strategic traffic could also reduce the available capacity for movement in the area.

These three issues could be broadly calculated by a Strategic Transport Model which is a recommended next step in prioritising the corridors for scheme development and investment across the study area. Highways England’s Regional Transport Models may be suitable for this purpose when they are available later this year.
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This industry base and its supply chains stand out for their highly skilled workforces and growth driven by the adoption of digital technologies driving marketable innovation and raising productivity.

This knowledge, design and innovation-based economy is rooted in an area which by driving strong growth also supports growth across the rest of the UK and also has an exceptional international focus. Our unique offer to business is easy access to London, the UK’s largest airports at Heathrow and Gatwick and to the major South coast ports as well as critically an eco-system and culture which supports a highly-competitive and successful track record on exports and international trade.

The sum of these economic characteristics is that growth and investment in this part of the UK is a powerful enabler for growth across the UK.

Digital technologies are increasingly the single biggest enabler of economic growth and global competitiveness. Our work linking local SMEs to the advances coming out of the internationally renowned 5G Innovation Centre at the University of Surrey, means the Enterprise M3 area is among the best for high growth companies interested in digital innovation.

Adrian Braine

Adrian Braine is Entrepreneur in Residence at SETsquared’s Basing View Incubation Hub on our enterprise zone, EZ³ in Basingstoke, and is helping to turn the Basing View hub into a vibrant tech community. SETsquared is an enterprise collaboration between the universities of Bath, Bristol, Exeter, Southampton and Surrey and has industry recognition as the world’s Top Business Incubator.

For more than a decade the economy in the Enterprise M3 area has been growing fast. Our ambition at this time of change is now to go faster. Looking back our average growth over the past 12 years, has been at 2.9% p.a. So looking forwards, we are uniquely placed to set our sights on even greater economic success.

In the next 12 years we aim to grow our economy by 4% p.a. on average. This increase in growth would add £39bn of GVA to the UK economy. We recognise this is an ambitious target given that the average rate in 2016 for the UK as a whole was 1.6% (ONS 2016). We strongly believe we offer a unique combination of characteristics to achieve this. Harnessing the natural innovation potential around the industrial challenge areas, driving existing high growth digital-technology sectors and nurturing, through our proven entrepreneurial ecosystem of support, the high growth businesses for the future.

FOREWORD & INTRODUCTION

The Enterprise M3 area is a national asset. It is an economic powerhouse, a significant net contributor to the UK economy, a powerful incubator of future focused high growth sectors and an area that has attracted the highest number of foreign owned firms of any LEP outside of London, chosen as the ideal location for major employers including BAE, Gulfstream, BP, GAME, Fujitsu, British Gas, Eli Lilly and Company.

Dave Axam
CHAIR, ENTERPRISE M3 LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP
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This knowledge, design and innovation-based economy is rooted in an area which by driving strong growth also supports growth across the rest of the UK and also has an exceptional international focus. Our unique offer to business is easy access to London, the UK’s largest airports at Heathrow and Gatwick and to the major South coast ports as well as critically an eco-system and culture which supports a highly-competitive and successful track record on exports and international trade.

The sum of these economic characteristics is that growth and investment in this part of the UK is a powerful enabler for growth across the UK.

Digital technologies are increasingly the single biggest enabler of economic growth and global competitiveness. Our work linking local SMEs to the advances coming out of the internationally renowned 5G Innovation Centre at the University of Surrey, means the Enterprise M3 area is among the best for high growth companies interested in digital innovation.
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For more than a decade the economy in the Enterprise M3 area has been growing fast. Our ambition at this time of change is now to go faster. Looking back our average growth over the past 12 years, has been at 2.9% p.a. So looking forwards, we are uniquely placed to set our sights on even greater economic success.

In the next 12 years we aim to grow our economy by 4% p.a. on average. This increase in growth would add £39bn of GVA to the UK economy. We recognise this is an ambitious target given that the average rate in 2016 for the UK as a whole was 1.6% (ONS 2016). We strongly believe we offer a unique combination of characteristics to achieve this. Harnessing the natural innovation potential around the industrial challenge areas, driving existing high growth digital-technology sectors and nurturing, through our proven entrepreneurial ecosystem of support, the high growth businesses for the future.
The Government’s National Industrial Strategy, published in Nov 2017, outlined four Grand Challenges for the economy: The Ageing Society; Clean Growth; Future of Mobility and Artificial Intelligence, and Big Data. These are areas of massive global change giving rise to the industries of the future.

Rightly the Government wants to see the UK at the forefront of these trends. At Enterprise M3 we recognise the importance and understand the need for Government, businesses and local economic organisations to work together harnessing this change to make a real difference to people’s lives.

We believe that Enterprise M3 is ahead of the game. Our extensive consultations on this strategy highlighted to us, very early in the process, many of these areas as priorities, and, yes, these are significant Grand Challenges, but when we consider them from the perspective of our unique economic areas we approach them from a mindset of Grand Opportunities.

Why are these natural opportunities for the Enterprise M3 area? Our highly skilled, knowledge and digital technology-led sectors are already using new and emerging technologies to drive innovative design, development and growth in these Grand Opportunities.

For example, the South East aerospace and defence industry, a significant part of which is rooted in Farnborough, has been outstripping the UK industry as a whole. Regionally the sector has grown by an average 5.6% per annum since 2011. To compare, the UK’s aerospace and defence sector grew by just 2.2% in 2016.

Our high growth, high productivity digital technology clusters are another example. The 2018 TechNation report suggests this UK sector is growing faster than the rest of the economy.

Basingstoke and Guildford/Aldershot are among 16 UK towns identified in the report as so-called Digital Suburbs – towns which show a higher proportion of digital tech business density and employment than the UK average.

The same report draws on 2017 ONS figures to show these digital tech hotspots are also productivity hotspots. The Guildford tech cluster, for example, has a turnover of almost £1.7 m per employee and an economic GVA of £3.42 billion. In Basingstoke the figures are a turnover of almost £2.6 m per employee and a GVA of £1.74 billion.

Economic growth and high business productivity go hand in hand, and the LEP has made strategic investments in enabling infrastructure such as housing, transport and digital connectivity, together with investment in talent, training and re-skilling, are where we add value and help enable productivity and growth.

Add to this, nurturing an entrepreneurial ecosystem of support, finance and access to the latest technology test beds, and Enterprise M3 is a LEP which consistently delivers results.

Our plan, underpinned by our strengths in digital technologies and a commitment to drive a clean, low carbon economy, will step up to the Grand Challenges.

For the prosperity of the people who live, work and run businesses in our area, and to cherish our natural environment, the Enterprise M3 LEP is unashamedly aspirational.

Our message to partners and to Government is we have talented people, excellent universities and colleges and a powerful digital and knowledge-led economy which will not only drive productivity and growth across our region, but will generate exports, international investment and prosperity to be shared across the UK.

In short, the Enterprise M3 region, has exactly the advanced knowledge-based, digital economy that for public and private investors will deliver a high return. We are a uniquely placed economic area that will react first, innovate with and use knowledge to release the potential of the Grand Challenges.

These are exciting times, full of change and fantastic opportunities for our economic area and I very much look forward to being part of it.

Dave Axam, Chair, Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership.

---

1. See Enterprise M3 – led BEIS sponsored Science and Innovation Audit “A Powerhouse of World Class Strengths in Digital Enabling Technologies” 2017
2. Farnborough and Southern Aerospace Cluster study 2018
3. Market Line Industry profile Nov 2017
Surrey and Hampshire are known for their rich natural environment. They are characterised by many rural towns and villages, two national parks and sites of outstanding natural beauty and heritage.

Enterprise M3 is one of the most successful LEPs in England and a national economic asset. It is the sixth largest LEP in terms of GVA. It contributes 2.9% of the UK's annual economic output, clearly punching above its weight.
From the New Forest to Staines-upon-Thames, the Enterprise M3 area has no large conurbation. It does combine a rich natural environment, including two national parks and sites of outstanding natural beauty. Rural landscapes represent almost 55% of the area with many villages and, what we have dubbed our Growth Towns, of Guildford, Woking, Farnborough, and Basingstoke.

Our so-called Step-Up Towns are Staines-upon-Thames, Camberley, Whitehall and Bordon, Aldershot and Andover. The area also includes the historic cathedral city of Winchester, which is also one of our university towns. Enterprise M3 has the fourth highest GVA per head of population and is among the four fastest growing LEPs in England.

The area is entrepreneurial and innovative, with 4.5 businesses per 100 residents (21% higher than the national average), and the 3rd highest number of registered patents per head of population of all LEPs.
Exports are one of the LEP’s strongest assets.

Enterprise M3 has an internationally-facing business base. Exports from Enterprise M3 based firms are significantly higher relative to neighbouring parts of the country, representing £14.6bn worth of goods in 2015. Almost 60% of these goods are headed to non-EU countries, especially USA and China.

Enterprise M3 benefits from very good transport connectivity.

The area is located at the heart of a regional and national, indeed international, transportation hub connecting UK businesses to the rest of the world via key airports, ports and markets such as Heathrow, Gatwick, Southampton and Dover, the Channel Tunnel and London.

The efficient functioning of this strategic transport network is a priority for businesses, communities and visitors to our area, as well as the UK’s economy.

These vital arteries and transport hubs connect markets, help people access jobs, enable businesses to connect with each other and their customers, drive international trade and help unlock planned development. The network plays a crucial role in supporting wider economic prosperity and competitiveness.

AEROSPACE COMPANIES
Enterprise M3 has important sector specialisations.

With clear strengths in high value sectors including digital, defence/aerospace, satellite technology, business services, and the creative industries, Enterprise M3 is in the front line of the new economy.

The LEP is home to internationally significant defence and aerospace clusters, for example Farnborough and Aldershot, which include some of the world’s largest firms such as BAE Systems and QinetiQ. It has strong digital and createch sectors with a growing international reputation in towns including Guildford, Aldershot, Farnham and Basingstoke which excel in gaming, software development, electronic equipment, creative arts and software sales.

Compared to the rest of the UK, defence and aerospace are strong areas of economic specialisation in Enterprise M3. This is supported by the presence of important MoD facilities in the region, such as the Aldershot Garrison, RAF Odiham, and several highly specialised companies producing commercial goods and services in aerospace, space and the defence-related economy, such as the manufacturing of aircraft and naval components, consulting, aviation software development and cyber security.

The map opposite shows the location of some of the large companies working in industries related to aerospace. Although there is a clear relationship between the aerospace industry and defence, analysis suggests there is an established concentration of aerospace companies which are not solely dependent on military or defence supply chains. The sector spreads across our geography, not only including the military towns of Aldershot and Farnborough, but also Basingstoke and Guildford. Similarly, there are several other large companies in the defence and cyber security sectors which are not related to aerospace industries (not featured on the map) but play a crucial role in Enterprise M3’s sectoral specialisation.

Productivity levels in our area are high.

Productivity, a priority for the Government and the UK economy, is further strong evidence of the value of this area to the UK. Productivity levels here have been growing since the recession and are above the UK rate and that of most other LEPs. The GVA per hour worked was £37.0 in Enterprise M3 in 2015, against £31.8 in the UK as a whole.

This chart shows productivity growth (measured by GVA per hour worked, as a share of the UK) for Enterprise M3 and comparator areas, Cheshire and Warrington, Coast to Capital and Thames Valley Berkshire (TVB).
Higher productivity levels in Enterprise M3 mean, for example, the average worker would have to work 5 more hours in Cheshire and Warrington and 3 more hours in Coast to Capital to achieve the same output as in Enterprise M3. Conversely, productivity levels in Enterprise M3 still fall short of the most productive areas in the UK, such as London and TV Berkshire. Productivity has been growing since the recession, although only slightly above the UK rate, which is roughly in line with other high-performing areas.

**The LEP has a very qualified population and a good education system.**

Enterprise M3 has a highly educated population, with many working in managerial positions and top professional occupations. 43.5% of our residents have NVQ 4 + skills (beyond A levels) far higher than the national average of 37.9%. The proportion of residents employed in more managerial and technical positions also beats the national average (54.4% compared to 45.8%).

The Enterprise M3 area enjoys a very low unemployment rate and a high level of labour force participation. Enterprise M3 pupils have consistently performed above the English and South East averages in GCSE results.

**Enterprise M3 is an attractive place for people to live and work, particularly for young people to work.**

London is overheating and Enterprise M3 is taking advantage of the opportunities provided by its close proximity to London’s economic area. Enterprise M3 has a very mobile population, and considerable commuting in and out of the area. There is a net outflow of commuters, with London the main destination. But there is a high number of young people (25-34) coming into Enterprise M3 every day for work. There is also a net inflow of people moving to Enterprise M3 from other areas in the UK.

**Working in Partnership**

Working closely with our partners is the Enterprise M3 way. Extensive work and consultation with our partners, is the bedrock of this strategic plan, and has driven the identification of the areas of strategic action and intervention which will encourage investment and help the area achieve its 4% growth target.

The process for this extensive consultation is represented in the diagram below and has been critical to determining the content of this Strategic Economic Plan.
Our Growth Ambition

The evidence of our high performing economy underpins our confident belief the Enterprise M3 area can and should be competing with other high productivity regions around the world. We believe the main aim for the LEP should be to focus on achieving that globally competitive position, and our businesses and other stakeholders strongly agree.

In consultation with partners, we have agreed our growth ambition should be an average growth rate of **4% per year** to 2030. This is equivalent to GVA average growth p.a of **£39.4bn**.

This is deliberately not a ‘business as usual’ target.

Excluding the aftermath of the recent financial crisis, Enterprise M3 has grown on average 2.9% every year since 1997. This is an ambitious and challenging goal - higher than previous growth rates in Enterprise M3. However, the potential prize for the area and the UK is substantial. Increasing the annual growth rate to 4% would put Enterprise M3 among the fastest growing regions in the developed world.

However, as we set out in the next section, our high performing economy has not reached its peak compared with other parts of the South East, and importantly, for our people, opportunities and prosperity are not shared evenly throughout our area.
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SECTION 3

AREAS OF FOCUS TO ENHANCE PERFORMANCE IN THE ENTERPRISE M3 ECONOMY

The evidence is clear, the Enterprise M3 area has an economy which punches above its weight and can be in the front line of growth in a national, digital, high exporting economy.

We want to go further and we know improvement goes hand in hand with self-awareness. As part of our determination to deliver, we have identified the areas of our economic performance which need to be addressed in order to unlock greater growth.

The economic activity in our area is uneven with employment concentrated, unsurprisingly in the towns, but especially in the north east of our area around the M25 and closer to London, as the following map shows.

The chart above shows some of the key growing and declining sectors in terms of employment. The factors driving employment growth are mixed. There is important growth in digital sectors, yet some high value sectors are declining, in employment terms at least.

* See Appendix 1 for further evidence on the Enterprise M3 area economy
Whilst the economy is strong, it is clear that Enterprise M3 is not achieving as much growth in high value sectors as it could.

Much growth is being driven by consumer services. These may contribute to a higher quality of place, but not a higher value economy. Growth in digital sectors is lower than in other parts of the country.

One key to improving this is make sure the area is attractive to so-called “Young Urban Residents”.

These are typically highly mobile and qualified 25-34 year olds with potential to create the jobs of tomorrow and enable future wealth.

The population map below shows distinct concentrations of Young Urban Residents, particularly in the area extending north from Aldershot to Farnborough, covering a number of co-terminus areas of relative deprivation.

Population Clusters

- Young Urban Residents
- Established wealthy
- Middle earners
- Just about managing
- Most deprived

There are also large groups of Young Urban Residents in Guildford and Winchester, and smaller groups in Staines-upon-Thames, Woking, Camberley, Basingstoke, Farnham, Haslemere, Bordon, Petersfield and Lymington.

Young Urban Residents are sought after as a key to growth in developing places, and their potential for substantive transformative change means they are a group to be encouraged to settle and stay within the area.

Although younger people are working in our area, many are commuters not residents, and a look at the age profile of the Enterprise M3 population shows we have a relatively older population when compared to the UK.

The highest concentration of population in Enterprise M3 is between the ages of 40 and 55, with a peak at 50. More than half of Enterprise M3’s population (52.0%) is older than 40, which is above the average in the UK (48.8%).

---

10 Metrodynamics analysis of ONS Population estimates
But most notable is the gap in the 20-35 year old cohort (17.7%, against 21.5% in the UK).

A lower share of residents in their early 20s is not unexpected because Enterprise M3 does not have a high student population. However, the lower share in the 26-35 cohort (11.2% in Enterprise M3 against 13.5% in the UK) is perhaps more surprising for a region that is economically successful and strong in the digital sector.

The cost of housing is an important factor here.

House prices are high and increasing rapidly, and affordability is a challenge. London overspills and the attractiveness and economic success of Enterprise M3, combined with relatively low provision of new housing, makes buying a house in the Enterprise M3 area very expensive. The affordability index (the ratio of median prices to gross median income) for the Central Southern area is 10.6 compared to 9.8 in the South East and 7.9 for England. The Gross Disposable Household Income (2014) for the Enterprise M3 area was £23,217 compared to Coast to Capital of £20,951.

Median house prices are significantly higher than the UK median in the vast majority of the LEP area and are going up. The median house price in the Central Southern area (which includes Enterprise M3) is £337,000 compared to £310,000 in the south east and £230,000 in England.

This, and the significant gap between housing costs and incomes, results in low housing affordability for the Enterprise M3 population and a deterrent to potential future residents.

As local policies stand, housing need is expected to be higher than planned. In some local authority areas, public resistance to development impedes the provision of new homes. More generally there is also an under delivery of new dwelling completions compared to that identified in local authority Local Plans, and a decline in the rate of new affordable homes being delivered.

Increasing and accelerating the supply of new housing, including affordable family homes, will be key to continuing growth without increasing the strain of affordability. An important role for the LEP and its partners is to help increase public support and confidence by identifying and bringing forward enabling infrastructure, including roads and healthy education facilities, and community engagement work with residents to communicate housing and growth benefits for them and the next generations.

An exemplar of this approach is the Manydown housing development on the Western side of Basingstoke of 3,400 new homes. Enterprise M3 is working with local authority partners, Hampshire County Council and Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council to ensure amenities including new schools and higher education and skills training accompany this growth.
Disparities across the LEP are significant. Prosperity and equality of opportunity are not shared evenly.

Enterprise M3 covers a very large area across different economic geographies. Despite our positive performance overall, there are considerable imbalances across the LEP which are apparent for most of the economic and socio-demographic indicators analysed.

The map above, is an analysis of Enterprise M3's population clusters identified by predominant socio-economic groups.

It shows there are relatively large swathes of established wealthy and middle earners living here, particularly in our rural areas. There are also dispersed areas of high deprivation and people described by the ONS as “just about managing” in most of our towns, including significant groups in Guildford and Winchester, Basingstoke, Andover, Staines-upon-Thames, Camberley, Bordon and the New Forest. Our future strategy must seek to engage all in the future of our economy.

Enterprise M3 towns can play a stronger role in the LEP’s economy.

Our Growth towns and Step-up towns have not performed to their full potential. These towns, together with the city of Winchester, contain just over one third of the LEP’s population but have been stagnant in job growth between 2010 and 2015, contrasting with high growth in Enterprise M3 overall.
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JOBS AND POPULATION GROWTH

Population Growth
Job Growth 2010-15
EM3 Average
Bringing back these places as centres of employment and dynamic, attractive and affordable areas for younger workers and families to live will be key to ensuring continuous, sustainable and inclusive growth in Enterprise M3. This can also help increase numbers of workers living closer to work which can improve productivity, reduce long rail and private car journeys, contributing to less congestion and a better environment.

**An analysis of productivity by sector**

shows that Enterprise M3 is performing well in business services, finance and insurance, public services, and real estate activities. However, there is a productivity gap in manufacturing, distribution and ICT when compared to other LEPs, particularly Thames Valley Berkshire. Closing this gap, particularly on ICT, is an important challenge for the Enterprise M3 economy going forward. Businesses often cite skills as a significant factor in raising productivity.

**Although residents in Enterprise M3 are relatively highly skilled, there are considerable skills gaps in the economy.**

These appear to be widening, with businesses increasingly reporting skills shortages as a barrier to growth.

According to the survey, 12% of Enterprise M3 businesses reported having at least one vacancy that was hard to fill in 2015. This represents a 4% increase from the previous survey (2013). It is also the highest amongst all 38 LEPs (together with Coventry and Warwickshire LEP), and clearly above the English average (8%).

Enterprise M3 also has the highest proportion of any LEP of businesses reporting skills shortage vacancies (9%, against 6% average in England); and a high proportion of staff considered not fully proficient: 15%, 1% percentage point above the national average.

Nearly 70% of businesses in Enterprise M3 said that skills gaps impacted on how their establishment performed, but only around half of businesses had a training plan or budget for training.

The skills shortages in Enterprise M3 are partly a consequence of the area’s economic success and the high demand for skilled workers from local business. But it also a sign that more effort needs to be put into providing adequate training and vocational education (particularly in STEM subjects). There is also a need to continue to attract qualified and skilled residents to the LEP, as well as a strategy for upskilling and reskilling the existing older workforce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UKCES Employer Skills Survey 2015</th>
<th>EM3</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of businesses that have at least one vacancy that is hard to fill</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of businesses that have skills shortage vacancy (prompted or unprompted)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of staff considered not fully proficient</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in the table above was extracted from the latest UKCES Employer Skills Survey (2015), for Enterprise M3 and England. This is the largest employer survey on skills carried out in the UK, and covered more than 2,000 businesses in Enterprise M3.
A high quality transport infrastructure connecting markets, people and goods within our area to London, and internationally is critical for attracting and retaining businesses and highly skilled residents, and improving productivity.

Transport is key to delivering connectivity across the Enterprise M3 area; there are clear synergies and interdependencies between transport investment and innovation, skills and productivity.

Transport is a necessary ingredient to securing productivity benefits. An effective and efficient transport system enhances economic interactions between markets and businesses, which are also able to reach wider markets, enabling them to expand, gain economies of scale and develop specialist skills.

We need to address congestion in order to increase productivity and enable growth. Currently congestion acts as a major barrier to growth in key centres, such as for example the impact it has on Guildford, in the town centre and around the University of Surrey and its Science Park.

Transport is essential to ensuring that a skilled workforce can access appropriate jobs. In some areas there is a mismatch between residents and jobs, where the skills of the local workforce don’t meet those of the employer. Whilst the LEP is working hard to address this by providing transport solutions that will deliver housing growth and affordable housing, we are also ensuring that new transport links are in place so that the appropriate workers can reach the higher value jobs easily and maximise their productivity. There are a number of niche sectors, with high productivity employers who wish to promote the Enterprise M3 area to existing and future employees.

Nearly 60,000 people per day commute from Enterprise M3 to London, and whilst links to London are good in some parts of the LEP, in parts of the LEP peak journey times are long.

The focus of our approach to transport is therefore to:

- enable economic growth within the Enterprise M3 Area
- create an environment for digital solutions to connectivity such as smart mobility, autonomous and connected vehicles, mobility as a service to flourish
- support planned housing development, and increase the attractiveness of the area as residential locations
- enable the sustainable development of business growth, town centre regeneration and housing development, through the support of low carbon solutions and addressing poor air quality
compared with other parts of the South East. Specifically, none of our Growth or Step-Up towns has a peak rail journey time of half an hour or better to London except for Woking.

This means that many of our towns compare poorly in terms of rail journey times to comparable places such as Reading. Congestion and unreliability of the highway network remain a significant inhibitor to business growth.

Transport congestion erodes the potential for economic growth in an area by increasing journey times and reducing the efficiency of the transport network.

The impact of congestion is driven principally by corridor demand and this is borne out in analysis carried out as part of the Transport for the South East Economic Connectivity Review. This identified the financial impact of delay on key corridors in our area as well as the potential impact of transport intervention targeted at congestion relief on commuters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Impact of Delay /km</th>
<th>Impact of Commuter Delay /km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A33/CrossCountry</td>
<td>£414,000</td>
<td>£739,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A322-A329/North Downs Line</td>
<td>£238,000</td>
<td>£557,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M25</td>
<td>£114,000</td>
<td>£433,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3/Portsmouth Direct Line</td>
<td>£85,000</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3/South Western Mainline</td>
<td>£86,000</td>
<td>£149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34/CrossCountry Manchester-Bournemouth</td>
<td>£47,000</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Transport for South East Connectivity Review, 2018)

Improved transport links are therefore essential for the Enterprise M3 economy and yet they could be better. The transport network needs to accommodate the hundreds of thousands of people who use it every day, as well as the extensive movement of business traffic and freight.

The Enterprise M3 economy also depends on strong links to the UK’s international airports. We are therefore fully supportive of the proposed expansion of Heathrow but are pushing hard for the essential infrastructure that is needed to ensure the benefits spread out across the area. Improved connectivity is therefore needed through new western and southern rail accesses to Heathrow.

The benefits of all this investment will be clear in economic terms. They will ensure corporate retention; make the Enterprise M3 area a global centre of Sci/Tech and related industries as well as being a great place to locate new business as skills are available, accessible and connected.
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SECTION 4

FIVE PRIORITIES FOR GROWTH IN AN ADVANCED DIGITAL AND LOW CARBON ECONOMY

Evolving from the thorough review of the evidence and our extensive consultations, Enterprise M3 LEP has identified five strategic priorities underpinned by two major stimulants of growth for our area. These priorities will inform and direct our Strategic Economic Planning.

The underpinning and cross cutting nature of digital technologies and clean growth mean they are important not only for directly related sectors, but also for delivering higher productivity across the wider economy.

STIMULANT 1
Digital and Data Technologies

The Enterprise M3 area plays a key part in the UK’s successful digital economy. A distinguishing feature of the area is it combines world class Research and Development with globally significant corporates and innovative SMEs who are commercialising digital technologies into globally competitive products and services.

An outstanding asset is the 5G Innovation Centre (5GIC), based at the University of Surrey, and a significant driver for regional growth. The total project cost was £65.2m million with Enterprise M3 agreeing to contribute £5m. The 5GIC is the largest open innovation centre for 5G development in the world. The centre has 26 corporate members, including Vodafone, Huawei, O₂ and EE together with 250 small and medium-sized enterprises in its wider network. In 2016 5GIC was recognised by G7 nations as a global leader driving the growth and promotion of a digitally-connected world. 17

Supported from its inception by the Enterprise M3 LEP, 5GIC established the UK’s first dedicated SME small scale 5G test facility at the Basingstoke Hub, and more recently the world’s first 5G digital creative hub for the internationally renowned Guildford and Aldershot digital games cluster. We plan to extend these test beds out further starting with installing in each of our enterprise zone sites.

5GIC is also leading the £16m collaborative Hub 5G project for DCMS, with the University of Bristol and King’s College London, as part of a larger four year, £200m DCMS programme.

There is also a regional specialism in cyber security rooted at Royal Holloway University. As set out in the Innovation South Science and Innovation Audit, published in Sept 2017 18.

Founded in 1990, the Royal Holloway Information Security Group (ISG) is a GCHQ/EPSRC recognised Academic Centre of Excellence for Cyber Security Research (ACE-CSR). It hosts one of only two UK, National Cyber Security Centre (NCSC) supported Centres for Doctoral Training in Cyber Security (CDT), and its MSc in Information Security (launched 1990) is recognised by GCHQ/NCSC.

The Enterprise M3 area is home to the UK and the European headquarters of some of the world’s most important and innovative companies in a range of technology-focussed sectors. In digital we host the UK bases of major multinational firms including Siemens, Ericsson, IBM, Electronic Arts, Sony and Ubisoft.

There is also a strong base of SMEs. Work carried out by the LEP identified 8,500 digital businesses, employing 50,000 people in the Enterprise M3 area, many of these will be SMEs, accounting for 7.4% of all businesses within the region.

Our partnerships include investigations with Airbus and Portsmouth University to create a Satellite/5G and Big Data Innovation Centre, which would enable innovations in multiple sectors including the future of mobility and health care.

---

17 Joint Declaration by the G7 ICT Ministers, Takamatsu, Japan (April 2016). See also notes from G7 ICT officials meeting, Brussels, 2nd December 2016 (meeting convened by Japan G7 Presidency. Chaired by Vice Minister Shigeki Suzuki and moderated by Yoshiki Iida Director for International Research and Policy Coordination.

A STRATEGIC ECONOMIC PLAN

Looking forward we will work and invest to:

- Be a trail blazer in the adoption and commercial exploitation of 5G technology
- Become Europe's first 5G Region – a leader in wide access to 5G technology by building a world class digital infrastructure linked to our 5G test beds
- Deliver access to digital skills and increase the number of people with high level digital skills
- Encourage research and innovation in enabling digital technologies, take advantage of Sector Deals and support the commercialisation of AI and technology opportunities

STIMULANT 2

The Clean Growth Economy

We see Clean Growth as a key opportunity for places to succeed without putting pressures on the environment, and importantly a focus on Clean Growth will showcase market and product opportunities for businesses to grasp.

Recent research has estimated that the low carbon economy could grow by an estimated 11% per annum between 2015 -2030, four times faster than the rest of the economy, and could deliver between £60bn and £170bn of export sales by 2030.

To date Enterprise M3 LEP has successfully helped create an environment for Clean Growth, particularly in the area of sustainable transport, and Enterprise M3 has the lowest carbon emission profile compared to South East and Coast to Capital LEPs.

It is imperative our economy develops an energy supply which solves the trilemma of ensuring security, affordability and sustainability. We intend to improve our carbon emission profile further and contribute to the UK Government’s 2015 target to reduce emission by 80% of 1990 level and domestic emissions by 3% a year.

We are working with central Government and South East and Coast to Capital LEPs towards a vision for our region's low carbon economy.

Our South2East Energy Strategy being developed by Siemens will direct activity to major interventions in the five themes of: Heat networks and move away from oil; big push on renewables and biofuels; industrial and domestic energy efficiency; smart energy systems like batteries and enabling a transport revolution.

To address global environmental challenges and create clean growth we will:

- Embed a Clean Growth approach in all that we do taking forward actions emerging from our Energy Strategy due to be published in Autumn 2018 and developing a Clean Growth Fund to encourage the implementation of clean growth ideas into demonstrators and projects on the ground
- Advance a Greater South East Energy Hub to promote and accelerate delivery of new energy infrastructure
- Strategically invest in new mobility and support a move towards a low carbon emissions transport system that encompasses automated vehicles, connected vehicles, electric vehicles and mobility as a service
- Support the inclusion of low carbon technologies in new housing developments and encourage existing homes and industrial premises to improve energy efficiency
- Invest in businesses developing low carbon technologies
- Balance our support for appropriate economic development and growth in the countryside to sustain local communities and jobs, with our respect for those landscapes with special protected status

19 See Appendix 1 Research & Data for Energy South2East Strategy
20 Draft BEIS funded Energy South2East Strategy written by Siemens on behalf of Enterprise M3, C2C and SE LEP
FIVE PRIORITIES FOR GROWTH

The application of digital technologies and the pursuit of Clean Growth, will sit underneath what emerged from the consultations with our partners, as our Five Strategic Priorities for Growth:

1. **High Value Sectors for a Globally Facing Economy**
2. **Enterprise and Innovation for Scaling Up High Productivity SMEs**
3. **Skills for a High Value, High Growth Economy**
4. **Connectivity for a 21st Century Advanced Digital and Low Carbon Economy**
5. **Dynamic Communities and Sustainable Growth Corridors**

The rest of this section sets out these priorities in more detail along with our plans for strategic interventions and actions for driving growth.

**PRIORITY 1: High Value Sectors for a Globally Facing Economy**

The Enterprise M3 area has strengths that mark it out nationally and internationally. We have an internationally focused business base, with the highest number of foreign owned firms of any LEP outside of London. For example, our defence and aerospace clusters at Farnborough and Aldershot include some of the world’s largest firms such as BAE Systems and QinetiQ. There are also strong digital and createch sectors with a growing international reputation in towns including Guildford, Aldershot and Basingstoke which excel in gaming, software development, electronic equipment and software sales.

Other high value areas include space and satellite technology, life sciences, especially Med Tech and professional services. There are significant opportunities for growth and enhanced productivity where these sectors intersect with digital technologies such as 5G, cyber security, and AI.

- We will use our evidence base, such as the work done on aerospace, life sciences, and the low carbon economy and energy sector to identify those factors critical for growth and where specific actions can be taken to support business.

- As examples, this could include activities to develop the specific skills needed for business; business productivity actions to support growth, including adoption of digital technologies; measures to stimulate commercial space for companies wanting to scale up; facilitating access to expertise on increasing exports. This approach will underpin our detailed work in support of our Local Industrial Strategy.

- We will intensify our international activity and boost efforts by those companies in our area, already exporting some £14.6bn worth of goods, to reach new international markets, working with organisations such as our Chambers of Commerce, our Growth Hub and the Department of International Trade. Our firms export high levels of goods and 60% of these are to countries outside of Europe. Additionally, we plan to launch a campaign with partners to encourage companies to export.
A STRATEGIC ECONOMIC PLAN

We will encourage High Value Sectors for a Globally Facing Economy by:

- Identifying effective interventions to stimulate growth in our high value sectors. For example, in each of the aerospace, space and screen and film sectors, we are working with industry and research-intensive universities on projects to deploy digital technologies to drive innovation and growth.

- Working with DIT and the Innovation South consortium on ways to maximise the efficiency and impact of DIT services by working across LEP boundaries to achieve economies of scale. The ultimate aim would be to increase the value of exports from the Enterprise M3 area and the whole of the South.

- Broadening our approach to drawing in investment from overseas by expanding our joint international team with local authorities and DIT expertise to help us pitch for capital investments in projects which support our Strategic Economic Plan.

- We plan to keep the number of foreign direct investments at least at a level comparable to this last year at 47, despite the challenges ahead. However, we will look to improve the targeting of investments with more focus on our key sectors and high-quality projects.

There are, though, significant geographical differences in economic output, and we want to reduce that inequality. We will:

- Grow digital employment by 3.5% per year, creating over 40,000 new jobs by 2030. We will achieve this by investing in both our underlying digital infrastructure and our digital based industries.

- We will support digital businesses to start up and grow by providing expert help through our Growth Hub and partners and through the further development of our £10m Expansion and Equity fund for innovative businesses. By 2030 we will have doubled the number of micro digital businesses to over 21,000 and created 250 new medium-sized digital enterprises.

- Launch our 5G Scale up Programme through our Growth Hub and work alongside other scale up programme offers. This will enable our high growth SMEs to grow faster and bigger by offering a unique blend of business and technology support services. In 2017/18 we helped 346 SMEs through our Growth Hub.

- Enhance our culture of innovation and enterprise by continuing to work with universities and innovation accelerator partners (e.g. SetSquared) to fund and develop marketable ideas for enterprise and innovation. For example, we are working with the University of Surrey and globally significant satellite companies to link 5G and satellite technologies, which will lead to innovation in many sectors including transport and health. Another example is work being carried out by the Enterprise M3 led Innovation South consortium to use digital technologies to drive productivity in health and social care sectors.

- Continue to support the ambitions and recommendations set out in the Innovation South Science and Innovation Audit, developing a knowledge-to-market accelerator; linking innovation hotspots; developing the quantum technology supply chain; increasing SME engagement with the 5G Innovation Centre and developing advanced digital skills in growing innovative enterprises.

PRIORITY 2

Enterprise and Innovation for Scaling Up High Productivity SMEs

Productivity is high in the Enterprise M3. In 2015, GVA per hour worked was £37.0 here against £31.8 in the UK (ONS data 2016). However, there is a productivity gap in manufacturing, distribution and ICT when compared to some other LEPs, particularly TV Berkshire. Closing this gap, particularly on ICT, is an important challenge for the Enterprise M3 economy.

See Appendix 1 Research and Data for evidence and details of strengths in Creative Industries in Enterprise M3 area.
- Support development of nationally significant innovation centres linked to cybersecurity and the screen and film industry at Royal Holloway, Aerospace in Farnborough, Gaming in Guildford and Farnborough, and Satellite and Space at Surrey Science Park

- We will look for further opportunities to support the digital and creative centres that are in close proximity to London such as Runnymede, Elmbridge and Spelthorne as well as those located in our rural areas

- We recognise the importance of supporting projects that support our strategic aims across our whole area recognising that these may not be located in our Growth or Step Up Towns. Our proposed Centre 4 Social Innovation (C4Si) project in the New Forest is a business based, open innovation centre that will provide an affordable, flexible workspace and provide ultrafast broadband in a rural environment

- Gather intelligence on the economy to assess the impact of changes, such as economic shocks and Brexit, and working with our Growth Hub and other business groupings to develop approaches to help business adapt and maximize opportunities in changing circumstances

We will continue to press for advances in higher apprenticeships (level 4 and above). This will build on the 360% growth in higher level apprenticeships over the last 5 years in our area, from 150 to 690 (EASFA 2016), and will increase productivity through improved skills, leadership and management.

**PRIORITY 3**

**Skills for a High Value, High Growth Economy**

Development of people’s skills and talents are critical to achieving our ambitious GVA figure of 4% per annum. Our challenge is to help ensure a secure supply of skills needed for our digitally advanced economy.

We are building on an existing highly skilled workforce – 47.1% of our workforce are qualified to Level 4 and above, compared to 38.6% of the UK (ONS Data 2017). This is in conjunction with a high economic activity rate – 81.3% compared to the UK’s 75.4% (ONS Data 2017).

However, technology is changing the nature of jobs, and the impact of job automation, AI and other enabling technologies, coupled with the challenges of a tight labour market will increase pressure to reskill and upskill existing staff using innovative approaches. These pressures, alongside significant skills shortages - 15% of staff reported by employers in our area as not fully proficient, that’s 1 percentage point above the national average – are impacting on the productivity of our area, and will impede growth unless addressed.

We will:

- Lead new ideas and ways of responding to the future skills challenges our businesses face. Our own Skills Action Group will follow the principles set out in the Industrial Strategy of supporting employers, education providers and local government to identify current and future local skills needs, in preparation to work with the framework defined by the emerging Skills Advisory Panels

- Explore future scenarios, with our businesses, to shape specific interventions to support both our future workforce and our key high growth sectors

- Work with employers to create innovative models for delivering technical, higher level skills, including leadership and management, in line with future business needs, and in partnership with universities, colleges, and training providers. Examples include the development of the Innovation South Virtual Campus

- Develop an understanding of the need for and support reskilling of our workforce to take advantage of our highly skilled but ageing workforce and meet the technological changes impacting on our businesses. This includes working with the National Retraining Partnership and the CBI, TUC and Government
- Extend the network of business Enterprise Advisers to all 127 schools and educational institutions across Enterprise M3 and support a high-quality service for work experience, work encounters and careers advice. This will be both forward looking, engaging businesses in the needs of our future economy; and inclusive, for example, catering for students with special education needs

- Increase the number and quality of apprenticeships and higher apprenticeships, in particular, by increasing higher apprenticeship take up by 5% year on year until 2030, especially in our key sectors. We will support our businesses to maximise the opportunities afforded by the apprenticeship levy

A 21st century Enterprise M3 transport network must address three major challenges facing our area and the wider region: congestion, capacity and air quality.

Efficient, high quality transport connectivity is essential to growth in our towns, cities and rural areas. Access to London, Heathrow and sea ports attracts talent and business to our area.

However, our road and rail infrastructure is congested, overloaded and is not keeping pace with demand. By 2040 large stretches of the transport network of the South East will be severely congested. Cutting journey times by just one minute on one of the busiest transport routes in the South East could add as much as £4.5 million a year to the national economy.

Our global competitors are making important investments in their supporting infrastructure and it is vital we continue to upgrade the infrastructure of the Enterprise M3 area to protect its status as a superb destination for investment and successful businesses.

The clean growth and environmental agenda is linked to the transforming improvements needed in our transport system in order to promote further economic progress.

An important priority for our area is to establish environmentally friendly, high capacity access to Heathrow airport. The Enterprise M3 economy depends on strong links to the UK’s international airports. Improved connectivity, coupled with enhanced aviation capacity will serve to enable local, regional and national economic growth, and market competitiveness.

The LEP is therefore in principle supportive of the proposed expansion of Heathrow. Nearly 10,000 Enterprise M3 LEP residents work at Heathrow, including 3,500 from Spelthorne alone (7% of the employed population). Through airport expansion, this is expected to increase to 25,000 jobs. Improved local public transport connectivity to Staines-upon-Thames, across Spelthorne, and north Runnymede will be an essential element of any expansion, allowing residents to access employment via rail and bus. Importantly, we are keen to see this expansion accompanied by improved, low carbon connectivity with the airport through the proposed western and southern rail accesses to Heathrow.

We support the new Southern Rail access to Heathrow proposal whether funded by public or private sector investment, for which Government is currently seeking proposals. However funded, this facility should provide not only an enhanced southern access to Heathrow but also offer the potential for a transformational impact on Spelthorne, Runnymede and Elmbridge, whilst also enhancing movement across the whole of the south-east.

In rail, the LEP expects to see substantial investment in digital signalling as we consider it offers the most effective means to improve rail capacity allowing more trains to travel safely on lines, preventing delays and downtime and encouraging less reliance on private cars and the reduction in carbon emissions that could follow.

The LEP is also supportive of technological changes likely to reduce the polluting impact of cars over the next decade. We are in the process of producing a new mobility strategy and intend to allocate funding to areas where we consider we can add the most value.
Most immediately, electric vehicles (EVs) will become increasingly prevalent on roads as this technology matures. Over the longer term, autonomous vehicles (AVs) will create new opportunities to maximise efficiency on roads and for sectors such as logistics. 24

In all of these cases, there is an important role for the LEP and partners in creating the conditions for these technologies to be successful.

Our approach links to the Industrial Strategy’s emphasis on a broad definition of infrastructure and echoes the importance of investing in digital, broadband, mobile connectivity and smart mobility as well as transport infrastructure.

This strategy combined with investment in infrastructure will support improved productivity and enable local, regional and national economic growth combined with market competitiveness. In order to deliver transformational connectivity, we support a number of key interventions, which will alleviate congestion hotspots on the road and rail network where they are a significant barrier to growth.

To help deliver infrastructure to drive digitally enabled clean growth we will:

- **Aim to create Europe’s first 5G Region by exploiting international opportunities in key sectors including Space, Aerospace and Defence, Health and Ageing Society and Financial Services.** We will achieve this through exploring the potential for an advanced digital infrastructure, providing low latency connectivity across our area and exploiting the region’s 5G capability at the University of Surrey 5G Innovation Centre 25

- **Work with strategic partners to achieve a new southern and western rail access to Heathrow to improve connectivity, enhance capacity, reduce congestion and air pollution and unlock further development opportunities associated with airport expansion**

- **Work with Transport for South East, local authorities and neighbouring LEPs on an infrastructure priority plan for the area**

Our area is made up of a series of small cities and large towns, some surrounded by rural villages and countryside, others bordering London and strong economic areas such as Reading and Southampton. Activities to stimulate growth have focused around the Enterprise M3 “Growth Towns” (Guildford, Woking, Basingstoke and Farnborough) and our “Step Up Towns” (Staines-upon-Thames, Camberley, Whitehill and Bordon and Aldershot).

We do not wish to abandon this approach, which has added value and is supported by partners. We would, however, like to respond to analysis and their feedback suggesting our future focus should extend to sustainable growth corridors.

These approaches will not only embrace these key economic centres, but also reach out along transport links connecting high growth, dynamic places with new communities that attract people, skills, businesses and creativity that make areas flourish.

**three key priorities set out below:**

- Support South West main line capacity improvements, including the introduction of digital enhancements to railway, the implementation of Woking Flyover and Crossrail 2

- Create new capacity on the A3 around Guildford where congestion affects the economic performance and profile of this important growth town

- Develop a New Mobility Strategy focused on where the LEP can help enable the transport revolution, working with our contacts from industry and linkages to business
The success of sustainable growth corridors depends on a sensitive and integrated approach to people’s needs, suitable, affordable housing, digital and transport infrastructure, economic development and the environment. Critical ingredients are civic leadership, engagement around a “single voice and vision” and a political will for action. Sometimes these corridors will extend across administrative and geographic boundaries and Enterprise M3 will leverage our excellent relationships with neighbouring LEPs to develop this corridor approach for the wider economic benefit.

Our five priorities underpinned by digital technologies and our commitment to Clean Growth position our area in an ideal place to rise to the four Grand Challenges set out in the Government’s Modern Industrial Strategy: Artificial Intelligence & Data; Ageing Society; Clean Growth; and Future of Mobility. Our early analysis suggests we are well advanced in these areas and some first thoughts are set out in Appendix 2, Opportunities & Challenges.

These areas are of global change which are already stimulating the growth of wide-ranging applications of technology and will see new industries and innovation in products and services – many unimagined today.

The evidence points to our area as one which already has outstanding strengths and an existing track record in work to overcome these Grand Challenges and the five foundations of productivity of Ideas, People, Infrastructure, Business Environment and Places.

The work on this SEP has established a firm foundation from which to develop our Local Industrial Strategy. We have gained further knowledge and understanding of our economy and can see the alignment to the Industrial Strategy Grand Challenges.

---

Clean Growth will underpin all our investments in our growth corridors and we will:

- **Evaluate the impact of an integrated approach to investment along strategic corridors encompassing our Growth and Step-Up Towns, with a particular emphasis on the development of digital and clean growth solutions, for example, in transport and mobility solutions**

- **Invest in the future of our town centres to create imaginative, dynamic places that draw in young people, support flourishing communities and address the needs of an ageing population**

- **Invest in approaches that accelerate the building of homes including affordable homes, in line with local plans and low carbon principles. Building the right homes in the right places. Having well designed and appropriately located homes in sufficient numbers to meet the needs of our residents and support the economic future of the Enterprise M3 area. We will support our local authorities to deliver their housing priorities ‘building the right homes in the right places’**

- **Work with our public sector partners to secure investment from the Housing Infrastructure Fund and facilitate the development of housing deals for the area**

- **Stimulate an increase in quality grade A office space, incubators and accelerators to support our key sectors and enterprise zones. We will build on our approach to extend our 5G test bed capability across the area to support SMEs to grasp market advantage**

---

26 Rushmoor Strategic Housing

27 See Appendix 1 Research & Data for evidence and details on Commercial Property needs in Enterprise M3 area
FIVE PRIORITIES FOR GROWTH

TARGET
4% GVA GROWTH PER ANNUM BY 2030

PRIORIT 1
Enterprise & Innovation Scaling Up High Productivity SMEs

PRIORIT 2
High Value Sectors for a Globally Facing Economy

PRIORIT 3
Skills for a High Value Economy

PRIORIT 4
Connectivity for an Advanced Digital & Low Carbon Economy

PRIORIT 5
Communities & Sustainable Growth Corridors

CLEAN GROWTH
DIGITAL & DATA TECHNOLOGIES

STIMULANTS FOR GROWTH
CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS: FOUNDATIONS FOR A LOCAL INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY

This is not a Strategic Economic Plan for “business as usual”. It sets out an ambitious vision and target for growth for the Enterprise M3 area up to 2030 of 4% GVA growth per annum. We know what we have to do, and we have the support and commitment of regional partners to deliver.

Digital innovation in a low carbon economy is where the Enterprise M3 area stands out, where we can drive economic growth in our area, and benefit the whole of the UK.

Our strengths make our area a natural partner to industry and Government in the delivery of the Industrial Strategy and its Grand Challenges. This, combined with a relentless focus on encouraging even better performance on exports and foreign investments, will be high priorities.

Skills are our businesses number one concern and we will act to help ensure skills investment is targeted at employers’ requirements and meets the need of the existing workforce, as well as college and school leavers.

This strategic economic plan clearly demonstrates and provides evidence of where we have economic strengths, challenges to maximising those and sets out interventions to unlock growth. We are mindful of the importance of digital and transport infrastructure and housing as both enablers and inhibitors of economic growth. Digital innovation will not realise the ambition for our region if our entrepreneurs can’t afford to buy or rent a home.

We have a solid foundation for our next steps forward: working with Government to shape our Local Industrial Strategy. Importantly, it throws light on areas where a deep dive into the evidence would be valuable.

An investigation into the readiness of SMEs to adopt new technologies is one example; an enquiry to identify our low productivity businesses and sectors and effective and inclusive interventions is another.

Understanding the role of housing costs on business decision making will also help inform our local industrial strategy and provide valuable evidence when it comes to asking for/making difficult investment decisions.

Enterprise M3 has been recognised by Government as a high performing LEP. An essential part of our success is the way we work. We are always collaborative and place a very high value on working with partners. Businesses often do not recognize boundaries and we will look to develop deep alliances across our LEP boundaries to support businesses when that is in the interest of our region’s growth.

The key messages from this strategic economic plan are that Enterprise M3 is an advanced digital and low carbon economy ready for Grand Opportunities. We are already going fast; we want to go faster. The Enterprise M3 LEP is determined to work with local and national partners to make sure the area and the UK pick up that speed.
This Strategic Economic Plan sets out our direction of travel and provides a firm foundation to develop our Local Industrial Strategy.

Our plan now is to strengthen our evidence base and probe deeper into those areas that are holding back business growth.

We will be working with government as we take this plan to its next stage and will hone our responses and solutions in light of the findings.

This work will ensure that our plans are ready by 2020 in order to tap into the newly shaped UK Shared Prosperity Fund as well as other Industrial Strategy Challenge Funds.

Our mission now is to take forward with vigour the priorities and activity set out within this SEP.
Enterprise M3
Providing the vision, ambition & leadership for the area. The catalyst to build on partners programmes & successes

Co-ordinate
Bringing partners & local authorities together to focus on issues and opportunities for the area

Advocate
Making the case for the EM3 area and providing a voice for our businesses & partners

Deliver
Working through Local Authorities & partners to deliver the best solution for the area as a whole

www.enterprisem3.org.uk
Enterprise M3 would like to thank all partners who have contributed to this Strategic Economic Plan.

Connect with us:

Driving prosperity in the M3 corridor

Enterprise M3 Programme Funding is provided by:
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Strategic Housing Market Assessment, November 2015: Please see document SD_006B on the Council’s Runnymede 2030 Submission Local Plan webpage at:
https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/16139/Runnymede-2030-Submission-Local-Plan
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Partial Update of the Runnymede-Spelthorne Strategic Housing Market Assessment, January 2018: Please see document SD_006C on the Council’s Runnymede 2030 Submission Local Plan webpage at: https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/16139/Runnymede-2030-Submission-Local-Plan
Runnymede Draft Site Selection Methodology and Assessment, June 2016: This document can be viewed on the following web page: https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/15831/Site-selection
Dear Sirs

I write in my capacity as the local Member of Parliament for Runnymede and Weybridge in support of the joint bid for Housing Infrastructure Funding (HIF) between Surrey County Council (SCC), Runnymede Borough Council (RBC), Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC) and Woking Borough Council (WBC).

As I am sure you will be aware, the proposed bid, if successful, will be used to forward fund nine highway improvement schemes on the A320 corridor between Chertsey and Ottershaw. These improvements are of great importance, with around 3,400 net additional dwellings dependent on the works. RBC estimate that 35% of the net additional dwellings will be affordable.

Not only will improvements to the A320 support the existing communities already experiencing traffic delays, but it will be vital to support the new communities that result from future development.

Finally, RBC estimates that approximately 34% of the costs of the works will be recoverable through S106 contributions, enabling this funding to be recycled for future infrastructure investment in the area.

I hope that you will see fit to support this HIF bid.

Yours faithfully

PHILIP HAMMOND
Dear Sirs,

Further to your request made at our meeting on 28th February, for a letter of support from the Ottershaw Future Group, in your Housing Infrastructure Bid regarding works to the A320, I confirm that we have consulted within the OFG and some representatives of other Ottershaw residents groups. A wider Residents consultation has not been possible in the timescale available to meet your HIF bid submission on 22 March.

The problems of current severe congestion, environmental pollution, and noise along the A320, and particularly through the village of Ottershaw, are well recognized and understood by residents. The
significant additional traffic volume burden on the A320, to be imposed by proposed, and in progress, new housing and commercial development in the Draft Runnymede Local, Woking and Surrey Heath plans, will cause major further congestion, pollution, and road safety issues.

It is therefore recognized that action must be taken to seek to minimize and/or alleviate the existing problems on the A320, and to avoid/minimize the issues which the additional traffic burden which will arise.

To this extent, we support action being taken to raise funds to enable appropriate design solutions to be developed and implemented, to mitigate the A320 problems, including your bid for HIF funds.

However, this support is highly conditional on there being full, transparent and timely consultation with ourselves and other Residents groups, which facilitate the integration of appropriate design solutions, and recognition and resolution wherever possible of legitimate residents’ concerns to both reduce and/ minimize/or accommodate damage to community facility, environment, and commercial well-being. This includes, relating specifically but not exclusively to Ottershaw, in particular, Car Parking for the Village Hall and shops, severance of the Village, and minimizing of side road congestion as a consequence of any Ottershaw A320 junction design, noise and air pollution, and road safety, and should include proper consideration of bypass and/or partial link road solutions. The Arcadis Feasibility Study proposal for the Ottershaw roundabout is widely condemned as being wholly unrealistic, unviable and destructive.

If this letter is to be used to indicate support to the HIF bid, it should be submitted in whole, or the content reported as a whole.

We understand that the existing A320 proposals and HIF bid do not incorporate any direct consideration of the traffic issues existing and likely to arise in respect of the side and feeder roads entering the A320. This is considered to be a serious omission.

There appears to be no proposals by either by Surrey CC or Runnymede BC to address these issues. We will be seeking to secure proper consideration of these issues in due course through your Authorities.

Yours faithfully

M J Freshney

On behalf of Ottershaw Future Group
Dear Mr Millin,

Re: Housing Infrastructure Fund

The Ottershaw Society supports, in principal, Surrey County Council’s HIF Bid which will secure funding for the A320 North of Woking to Chertsey and in particular the Ottershaw Roundabout section.

The Society welcomes the prospect of improvements to the roundabout that is long outstanding and overdue. However, we cannot support the Arcadis design of the roundabout which we understand is being submitted in support of this bid. We have serious concerns regarding that proposal for the Otter Roundabout which totally removes the village car park which is a life line for the Village (Brook) Hall and the local shops.

Traffic levels along the A320 corridor has grown significantly but with very little infrastructure improvements to deal with this increase in traffic. Drivers face delays and congestion during peak traffic hours. The longer journey times has resulted in an amount of rat-running along local roads creating inconvenience and a road safety hazard for local residents living along the A320 corridor and adjoining roads.

The Ottershaw roundabout lies near the heart of Ottershaw village. The increased congestion and emissions generated by vehicles queuing at this roundabout is a major concern of the Society.
The Society welcomes the commitment by Surrey County Council that the highway authority will consult, and work with, the local community and this must include the Businesses, Shops, Schools, Church, Social Club as well as other resident/social groups ("the Ottershaw Community"). We believe this is essential to ensure that the proposals for improvement would not only relieve congestion along the A320 but also be sensitive to the needs of local residents and Ottershaw Village as a whole.

Due to time constraints, we have been unable to consult with our members so we are only able to conditionally support this HIF Bid for Homes England to provide the requested funding to enable Surrey County Council to deliver improvements that will benefit local residents as well as drivers using the A320 corridor. We stress that our support is conditional upon full consultation with the Ottershaw Community and entirely conditional upon their views being taken into account when redesigning the Ottershaw Roundabout and any other proposals.

Yours Faithfully,

Brian A Williams

Brian A. Williams

On Behalf of the committee of the Ottershaw Society