

CONSULTATION STATEMENT YORKTOWN LANDSCAPE STRATEGY SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Prepared under Regulation 18(4)(b) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. The Yorktown Landscape Strategy SPD was formally adopted by the Council's Executive on 15 April 2008.

1. Consultation on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document

Before adopting the Yorktown Landscape Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the Council undertook a six-week consultation exercise on the Draft SPD. This was in accordance with Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. The Draft SPD was accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal Report (SAR). The consultation exercise took place between 13 November 2006 and 5 January 2007. As part of this consultation exercise, the Council:

- a) Consulted 118 organisations identified on the Council's Local Development Framework database. These are listed in Appendix 1.
- b) Sent a letter to all businesses and residents (1,245 addresses) in the area covered by the SPD, and not already identified in part (a), notifying them where copies of the documents could be read.
- c) Publicised the consultation exercise in Heathscene, the Council's newsletter, in its Winter 2006 edition, which was distributed to all residents of the Borough in November 2006.
- d) Issued a press release about the consultation exercise in the week ending 17 November 2006.
- e) Published statutory advertisements about the consultation exercise in the Camberley News on 10th November 2006 and the Woking News and Mail and Chobham and Windlesham News and Mail on 9th November 2006.
- f) Copies of the documents and response forms were made available:

At the Council Offices, Knoll Road, Camberley.

At Bagshot, Camberley, Frimley Green and Lightwater libraries.

On the Council's website www.surreyheath.gov.uk

Large print, braille or foreign language versions of either the SPD or SA were available on request.

2. Responses made to the consultation exercise

18 responses were made to the consultation exercise. The full consultation responses are shown in Appendix 2. This includes Officer comments setting out how the issues have been addressed in preparing the final versions of the SPD and SAR. No changes were made to the SPD as a result of the Sustainability Appraisal Report as it was considered that generally the SPD will have positive sustainability effects.

3. Consultation prior to the publication of the Draft SPD

In July 2006 the Council's Local Development Framework Working Group and Executive were advised of the forthcoming consultation on the Yorktown Landscape Strategy Draft SPD and Sustainability Appraisal Report (SAR).

Early stakeholder work was carried out involving the Yorktown Business Association. A Scoping and Screening Document was prepared in support of the Sustainability Appraisal Report.

APPENDIX 1 – Those organisations and individuals consulted

3G UK Ltd; 02(UK) Ltd; Orange PCS Ltd; T-Mobile UK Ltd; Vodafone Ltd	Airey Miller Partnership (Architects)
Airtek Safety Ltd	Alfa Laval Ltd
Alfred McAlpine Homes Ltd	Alliance Environment & Planning
Andreas Stihl Ltd	Annington Homes
APM Services Ltd	Arriva
Ash & Ash Vale Parish Council	ATIS Real Weatheralls
BAE Systems Properties Ltd.	Baker Davidson Thomas
Bancroft Developments	Barker Parry Town Planning
Barratt Southern Counties	BBG Commercial
Bell Cornwell Partnership	Bellway Estates
Bengali Welfare Association	Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit
Bisley Parish Council	BJZ – Bryan Jezeph Consultancy
Blackwater Valley Enterprise Trust	Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth
Blackwater Valley Recreation & Countryside Partnership	Bovis Homes Ltd
Boyer Planning	Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Broadway Malyan Planning	BT
Business Link Surrey	Cala Homes
Camberley & Frimley Police & Community Group	Camberley Islamic Association
Camberley Islamic Welfare Association	Cathedral Holdings Ltd.
CBRE	CDHA/HYDE HA
CEL Planning	Centrica
Chancellor & Sons	Charles Church (Southern) Limited
Chetwood, Lawton & Morrison	Chobham Parish Council
Christian Leigh – Chartered town planner	Confederation of British Industry
Crest Estates Ltd.	Crest Nicholson
Crest Nicholson & Morley Fund Management	CSJ Planning
Cunnane Town Planning	Cushman & Wakefield / Healey & Baker
DPDS Consulting Group	David Hicken Associates Ltd.
Derek Horne & Associates	DevPlan
DevPlan UK	Dimon International Services Ltd.
Dolphin Head Group	DPP
EDF Energy	Edwards Elliott
English Heritage (South East Region)	Environment Agency
Fairview New Homes Ltd.	Farnborough Fleet & Aldershot Friends of the Earth

Firfield Glyn	First Beeline Buses Ltd
Flavia Estates	Fluor Ltd.
Foy Planning Consultancy	Freightliner
Friends of Surrey Heath Museum	George Wimpey Southern Ltd.
George Wimpey West London Ltd.	GOSE
Government Oil Pipelines	Great Western Trains Company Ltd.
Gregory Gray Associates	Guildford Borough Council
GVA Grimley	Hampshire County Council
Hanover Housing Association	Hart District Council
Hawthorne Kamm White Young Green Planning	Herrington & Carmichael
Highways Agency	Home Builders Federation
Howard Hutton & Associates	Howard Sharp & Partners
Humberts Chartered Surveyors	Hutchinson & Co. Ltd.
Institute of Directors	Jim Guest Design
Julian Brown Consultancy	Kier Property Limited
Kingfisher Housing Association	Kingsoak Southern Counties
Knight Frank	Laing Homes
Laing Homes Thames Valley	Land & New Homes
Local Transportation Service – Surrey Heath	London Clancy
Lovell Partnerships	MBH Partnership
Mackenzie Smith (Estate Agents)	Malcolm Judd & Partners
Mansard Country Homes Ltd.	Matthew Pellereau Limited
Maurice Lillie Architects	McCarthy & Stone Ltd.
Meir Associates	Merrill Lynch
Michael Cox Associates	Miller Homes
Montagu Land	National Express
National Grid	National Power
Nationcrest	Natural England
Network Rail	Normandy Parish Council
North Surrey Water Co	NTL
Parkside Housing Group	Passenger Transport Group
Paul & Company	Paul Dickinson and Associates – Town Planning & Development Consultants
Pavilion	Peacock and Smith
Persimmon Homes South East Ltd.	Pirbright Parish Council
Planning Issues	Potter Organisation
Powergen Retail Ltd	Premier Properties Plc

Prova Ltd	Rapleys
Rethink Hants Borders areas	Richard Bonny Architectural Design
Rippon Development Services	RMA Sandhurst
Roger Tym & Partners	RPS
RSPB (South East Office)	Runnymede Borough Council
Rural Housing Trust	Rushmoor Borough Council
Sandhurst Town Council	SecondSite Property Holdings Ltd.
SEEDA	SEERA (South East England Regional Assembly)
Sentinel Housing Association	SHA Estates – South East
SHM Group	Shurgard Self-Storage
Slough Estates Plc	Sony Centre
Strategic Health Authority – South East Coast	South East Water
South West Trains Ltd.	Southern Gas Networks
Southwell Park Residents Association	Stagecoach
Steve Brighty Associates	Stonham Housing Association
Sunningdale Parish Council	Sunninghill Parish Council
Surrey Chamber of Commerce	Surrey Community Development Trust
Surrey County Council	Surrey Economic Partnership
Surrey Heath Borough Council – Community Services	Surrey Heath Division – Camberley Police
Surrey Heath Division – Camberley Police Architect Liaison Officer	Accent Peerless Housing Group
Surrey Heath Housing Association Tenants Federation	Surrey Heath Local History Club
Surrey Heath Neighbourhood Watch Support Group	Surrey Police
Surrey Waste Management Services	Surrey Wildlife Trust
Swan Hill Homes Ltd.	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd.
Telecom Plus Plc	Terence O'Rourke
Tetlow King Planning	Thames Valley Housing Association
Thames Water Property Services	The Camberley Society
The Countryside Agency	The D&M Planning Partnership
The Mall Corporation Ltd	The Parish Church of St Michael Yorktown
Three Valleys Water PLC	Toshiba Electronics Europe
UK Land Investment Group	Vail Williams LLP
Verdant Group PLC	Vickery & Company (Estate Agents)
Watchetts Residents Association	Waterers Landscape Ltd
Waterfords Estate Agents Ltd	West End Parish Council

West Indian Association – Aldershot & District	Westbury Homes (Holdings Ltd.)
Westwaddy ADP	Whadham Isherwood
Wilky Property Holdings	Windlesham Parish Council
Winkfield Parish Council	Woking Borough Council
Woodland Trust	Yorktown Business Association

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>may include some areas outside Surrey Heath. This unfortunately includes the junction of the BVR with Riverside Way which is a key focal and crossing point. 2. I consider a key design principle not mentioned in para 5.5 would be to maintain and strengthen the rural aspect of views within the Blackwater Valley strategy area (or views from the BVR). 3. I support the proposal for a footpath/cycleway along the side of the BVR and would seek to link this to the Blackwater Valley path which runs alongside the river. We know this section of path has potential for increased cycle and pedestrian use with its good links to the railway stations at Blackwater and Frimley. We have already received enquiries from businesses in the Watchmoor Business Park seeking to improve the link over the BVR for cyclists and pedestrians and would hope any future project would include this amongst its aims.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Surrey County Council intends to improve the cycle network in the Yorktown area once sufficient funding allows. The Yorktown SPG (2003) identifies desired cycle links through the Yorktown Business Park and along the Blackwater Valley Road. Improvements to the crossing for pedestrians and cyclists between Riverside Way and the Blackwater Valley would need to be taken forward by SCC.</p>	<p>Remove references to the continuous tree lined avenue along the Blackwater Valley Road to ensure that the rural aspect of views across the Blackwater Valley are not compromised. No Change.</p>
Mr D Chesneau	Camberley Society	03/01/2007	<p>I refer to the above document. The Council is to be congratulated on the analysis on page 7 of the document. It is an accurate picture of the current major shortcomings of the Yorktown Business Park. In general terms, the Camberley Society supports the proposals to improve the area. We are less-convinced that the document adequately deals with residential areas</p>	<p>The SPD is intended to facilitate the provision of environmental enhancements in the commercial areas of Yorktown and adjoining residential area. Guidance regarding appropriate design for buildings in residential areas is</p>	<p>No change</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>within Yorktown. The high population density roads of Surrey Avenue and Avenue Sucey are challenging, and they merit individual study, yet they are never mentioned by name. Also, referring generically to residential areas within Yorktown is too-broad a brush. In particular, the 'artisan terraces' in the Brook Road area have a distinctive nature and a rather overlooked charm - this character requires sympathetic and appropriate measures to conserve and reinforce it.</p>	<p>addressed in the Residential Development in Settlement Areas SPG (2002) and the Surrey Design Guide SPG (2002).</p>	
Mr JC Chaney	Chobham Parish Council	03/01/2007	<p>Chobham Parish Council considered the above consultation at its meeting on 21st November, at which it decided not to make any specific comments on the Draft SPD. Members felt that the subject matter of the document was remote from its area of responsibility and would have little impact on its affairs, apart from the financial and resource demands it placed on the Borough Council.</p>	Noted.	
Mr Ian Davie	Environment Agency	02/01/2007	<p>The Environment Agency note and are pleased that comments relating to flood risk and a sustainability objective on this topic have been included in the sustainability appraisal (SA). We appreciate that your draft SPD and SA were presented for public consultation prior to 7th December 2006. However, 'Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk' (PPS25) was published on this date. Therefore we recommend that all references to</p>	<p>Noted. Agree.</p>	<p>Amend Table 1 and Appendix 2 of the SAR to remove reference to PPG25 and draft PPS25 and replace with PPS25.</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			PPG25 are removed from the sustainability appraisal and that those referring to PPS25 as a draft are altered to reflect its new position as government policy. If you have any further queries, please contact me, quoting the reference at the beginning of this letter. Yours faithfully Marie Raison (Planning Liaison Officer)		
Mr J Cheston	GOSE	03/01/2007 & 05/03/2008	Other than to note that it is generally consistent with national and regional planning policy, we do not have any detailed comments to offer you on the content or drafting of the SPD. Whilst certain saved policies in the Local Plan are referred to in the SPD, we do have a concern, however, that it is neither clearly cross-referenced to these policies nor is it genuinely supplementary to them. To this extent, the document does not accord with the advice for preparing SPDs in PPS12: Local Development Frameworks. You may wish to bear this in mind as you take the document forward to adoption. The closer referencing used has now been agreed by John Cheston at the Government Office for the South East: "We are now content that the changes which you intend to incorporate would provide a clearer link between the document and certain saved policies in the Local Plan, which the former would supplement."	Agree. Improve cross reference to saved Local Plan Policies.	Amend cross-referencing to the "saved" policies of the Local Plan 2000 in paragraph 2.3 and Appendix 1 to demonstrate the SPD is supplementary.
	MNOFP Trustees Ltd.	08/01/2007	Comments from Wilky Fund Management Ltd. on behalf of: MNOFP		

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>Trustees Ltd Thank you for the invitation to comment on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Sustainability Appraisal Report (SAR). The aim of creating a high quality structured landscape in Yorktown for the benefit of residents and businesses is to be commended. Comments It is noted that the highway authority determines actual road layout (YK1) although the visual analysis of Yorktown (Appendix 3) reflects the current road layout. The objectives of the Yorktown Landscape strategy should be measured against the existing road layout. Future road improvements, the application of road hierarchy (YK2) and building set back requirements (YK3) will combine to reduce the developable area of any major site. Where flood risk is also indicated, the viability of redevelopment could be threatened and should be noted as a constraint of landscape improvement . Redevelopment is a common trigger for major highway and landscape improvements and releases funds to enhance the local environment. The objectives of the Landscape strategy may be impossible to meet if redevelopment is uneconomic. We are aware of existing agreed contributions, and the schemes they are intended to fund, if development projects in Yorktown that already have consent are implemented.</p>	<p>Make clearer reference to flood risk in Yorktown.</p> <p>It is recognised that the Landscape Strategy needs to be flexible to the nature of the specific development proposed.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to add Principle YK6 which identifies that some potential development sites are either fully or partly within Flood Zones 2 & 3 (as identified by the Environment Agency). State that the requirements for landscaping around watercourses will take into account the impact on any proposed operations within the development site.</p> <p>Make clear that the extent to which landscape designs are required will be</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>It is not clear how further landscaping objectives are to be achieved and additional information would be welcomed. The Sustainability Appraisal comments that the Yorktown Landscape Strategy SPD will support existing business structure and businesses by creating an area attractive to investment and growth. If the effect of the SPD is to stifle regeneration, the sustainability of Yorktown as a core employment area is also undermined.</p>		<p>proportionate to the scale of development. Add Implementation section to the SPD stating that only redevelopments, extensions or minor development proposals will be required to include landscape designs. Add that extensions will be determined on the merits of the case.</p>
Mr J Pounder	South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA)	08/01/2007	<p>Further to your letter dated 10 November 2006, I can confirm that under the provisions of Section 24 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Act) the South East England Regional Assembly has assessed, against the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (RPG9 and Alterations) and also the emerging RSS (the draft South East Plan, submitted to the Secretary of State on 31 March 2006) the general conformity of Surrey Heath Borough's Consultation on Yorktown Landscape Strategy Draft Supplementary Planning Document. The Assembly is of the opinion that the Supplementary Planning Document is in general conformity with adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (RPG9 and Alterations) and also the emerging RSS (the draft South East Plan), submitted to the Secretary of State on 31 March 2006. The Borough Council may,</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Add references where</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>however, find it useful to emphasise how biodiversity in the Yorktown area can be protected and enhanced by development and the landscape strategy, in line with Policy NRM4 of the draft South East Plan. If you require any further information, please contact Katie Brett on 01483 555226 or katiebrett@southeast-ra.gov.uk.</p>		<p>appropriate to the enhancement of biodiversity where appropriate and as an integral outcome of landscape design.</p>
Mr R Evans	Surrey County Council Environment Department	03/01/2007	<p>I am responding to your request for comments on the above draft SPD documents, received under cover of your letter dated 10 November. We have completed an online comments form and returned. The following are informal officer comments. Previously, the County Council gave informal comments on the draft SPD Scoping and Screening Statement. Our response was returned on 12 June 2006. We had no particular strategic concerns. We accepted that the objectives of the SPD as a reasonable context for the Blackwater Valley Recreational Project could be married in as the Valley is also subject to landscape and physical improvements. We had no transportation concerns. Yorktown Landscape Strategy Draft SPD - The current draft document is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal Report. We note that the objectives for the SPD are to create a structured landscape setting for the Yorktown area, including the approaches to Camberley along the</p>	<p>It is agreed that acknowledgement be given to the wider importance of the Blackwater Valley. It is recognised that where landscape design schemes face the Blackwater Valley the opportunity exists for enhancing biodiversity.</p>	<p>Amend Principle YK4 to acknowledge the context of the Blackwater Valley. Include reference to the consideration of biodiversity where development is proposed on sites facing the Blackwater Valley.</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>A30 and the Blackwater Valley Road. Such a structured landscape would include the local commercial areas and business park, as well as the residential area to the west of Frimley Road. We SUPPORT this approach. We note from the Sustainability Appraisal that there is a commitment to ensure that social, environmental and economic concerns are addressed and subject to a balanced approach within the SPD. We SUPPORT this approach. We would advise that, in consideration of this approach, the Borough should be satisfied that the draft SPD is fully 'proofed' in respect of the general contribution towards sustainable development and energy conservation measures contained in the adopted Surrey Structure Plan 2004, as well as policies of the Surrey Heath Local Plan, 2000. We would therefore also advise that the Sustainability Appraisal should ensure that the SPD is fully proofed against the Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1994 (the Habitats Regulations), as well as flooding issues indicated by the recent Government policy under PPS25 (Development and Flood Risk) through appropriate assessment. We would not anticipate that the draft SPD would create significant issues in this respect. We note the detailed Landscape Treatment Measures for the various areas of Yorktown. We SUPPORT such</p>	<p>Sustainable development and energy conservation measures will be considered as part of the Council's "Core Strategy & Development Management DPD."</p> <p>The SPD will seek to address flood risk where appropriate. It is recognised that suitable forms of landscape design can reduce the risk of flooding.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Amend SPD to include Principle YK6 explaining the circumstances in which landscape design may be used to mitigate flood risk in the Yorktown Strategy area.</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			measures.		
Mr Jason Gosden	Surrey County Council West Area Transportation Team	08/01/2007	Surrey County Council fully supports the objectives set out in the Yorktown Landscape Strategy Draft Supplementary Planning Document. However, as the Highway Authority, Surrey County Council (SCC) must have detailed input concerning proposals relating to the public highway. Listed below are some initial thoughts about some of the issues that need to be considered in developing and progressing the Yorktown Landscape Strategy: - In October 2002 Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Surrey Heath approved a revised Highway and Transportation Strategy for Yorktown, which was developed following consultation with Surrey Heath Borough Council, the Yorktown Business Association and local residents. The principal aim of the strategy is to improve transportation, access and circulation in and around the Yorktown area. The strategy proposes a series of measures including the closure of the roads connecting the residential and business areas of Yorktown. These closures are due to be implemented once all the new link roads have been constructed to provide improved access to the business area. However, it is likely to be a number of years before this is completed. Surrey Heath Local Committee has therefore allocated	Noted. Noted.	

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>funding to undertake a feasibility study to consider introducing measures to address road safety and traffic issues in the residential part of Yorktown in the interim. An initial consultation has been undertaken with residents and businesses to seek their views about the type of traffic problems that currently exist and the measures that should be considered to address them. In response to the views expressed, SCC is currently developing traffic management proposals for further consultation. Progression of the scheme will be dependent upon the outcome of further consultation, the views of the Local Committee and statutory processes. However, at this stage it is anticipated that any agreed measures will be implemented during the second half of the 2007/08 financial year. Whilst the funding available is only likely to allow the progression of a basic scheme using standard materials, there may be opportunities to consider incorporating environmental enhancement measures into the works if additional sources of funding can be identified. However, this will obviously be dependent upon the type of measures that are progressed. - It may be helpful to consult the local Disabled Access Forum when progressing the environmental enhancement proposals. They may have a view relating to accessibility issues for the mobility</p>	<p>Agree that timeframes and methods of implementation should be made more explicit. Landscaping schemes will be funded directly by developers.</p> <p>Access for people with reduced physical mobility or disabilities will be considered when detailed schemes for the residential area are worked up.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to make timeframes and methods of implementation more explicit by the addition of Section 4. Principle YK5 to explicitly state that redevelopment proposals in the business areas will be required, where appropriate, to make a financial contribution towards environmental improvements in the residential area west of Frimley Road.</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>impaired (who, for example, may experience difficulties if metal grills are introduced in some of the narrower paved footways). · As a result of existing pressures on budgets, SCC is unlikely to be able to contribute to the costs of implementing any agreed environmental enhancements. These would need to be funded through alternative sources. · Various maintenance issues need to be considered when choosing the type of materials and plants to be used as part of environmental enhancements (including cost and ease of maintenance for both the highway authority and statutory undertakers, obstruction of light from lamp columns, generation of leaf litter, sightline issues etc). · Maintenance costs – the limited finances available for highway maintenance are only sufficient to allow for use of standard materials. Some additional provision for maintenance would have to be considered where higher cost/quality products are used as part of enhancements on the public highway. The above comments are far from an exhaustive list and there will be other relevant issues that need to be considered. As such, it would be helpful if more detailed discussions could be held either before the document is finalised or before work commences on progressing the suggested measures.</p>	<p>Please see comments above.</p> <p>The choice of plant species and hard landscape materials and street furniture in Section 5 have been selected where possible for durability and ease of maintenance. In normal circumstances applicants would be required to maintain landscaping up to 5 years following the commencement of works. It is not believed that the hard landscaping materials or street furniture identified are likely to incur significant levels of additional expenditure compared to materials commonly used elsewhere. The initial purchase cost of materials or street furniture would be financed through developer contributions.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
Mrs J Sauter	Surrey Wildlife Trust	05/01/2007	<p>Thank you for consulting with the Trust on the above strategy. The Trust welcomes the Strategy and congratulates Surrey Heath District Council for having produced a document which will make a clear improvement to the local environment. We have the following comments on the plan in general and on some specific details: The area of land focused on in the strategy lies in an important position ecologically within the Blackwater Valley corridor. The Blackwater Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) lies along the river to the north forming a corridor with the Hawley Meadows Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) south of the river. The Landscape Strategy should reflect policies such as PPS9 and the more recent Biodiversity Duty (Section 40, Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006). These seek to enhance biodiversity and promote a creation of new features and corridors. Great gains can be made for biodiversity in this area. Very generally, biodiversity is promoted by using native plants local to the area, appropriate management techniques and creating connectivity with nearby habitats. Equally, especially in urban settings, exotic plants can provide valuable feeding especially for birds and invertebrates, whilst equally being attractive landscape features. It is</p>	<p>It is agreed that acknowledgement be given to the wider importance of the Blackwater Valley. It is recognised that where landscape design schemes face the Blackwater Valley the opportunity exists for enhancing biodiversity.</p> <p>The creation of new features and corridors for wildlife will be considered within the Core Strategy & Development Management DPD. The SPD necessarily focuses on landscape improvements within the Study area. It is considered though that on balance the Landscaping Strategy will have positive effects on biodiversity and offset any adverse impacts on</p>	<p>Amend Principle YK4 to acknowledge the context of the Blackwater Valley. Include reference to the consideration of biodiversity where development is proposed on sites facing the Blackwater Valley.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>important that the landscaping scheme particularly along the A331 and near to the river reflects the adjacent semi-natural habitat as this would enhance the wildlife corridor in this area and strengthen the landscape character. Section 7. We welcome the inclusion of features such as wildflower strips, verges and access for pedestrians and cyclists. However we are unclear as to how the wild flower strips will be managed. In order for the wild flower areas to be successful, it will be important that they are allowed to flower and set seed. Ideally the areas should be managed with a single hay cut in late August or early September. Arisings should be left in situ for 48-72 hours so that the seed can fall through and be retained in the grassland and should then be removed off site. No detail has been provided as to what species will be included in the wild flower mix. Thought needs to be given as to whether the species used reflects the local ecology. Section 8. It is important that the native species used for the planting scheme are of local provenance. Such species will maintain the natural balance of flora in the region. They will also be better adapted to local conditions and more able to adapt to any future changes in climate. Whilst the use of non-native species within the built-up area may be appropriate, it is important that no non-</p>	<p>biodiversity arising from new development. It is recognised there is potential for alternative planting regimes outside of Yorktown Business Park and around watercourses. . Agree. Clarification is needed as to how wildflower areas would be managed. The exact composition of the wildflower mix would be determined at the time of the planning permission. It is agreed that a wider range of planting should be allowed in certain parts of the Strategy area.</p>	<p>Amend Principle YK4 to allow a wider range of planting on sites facing the Blackwater Valley subject to consideration on a case-by-case basis. Include reference to enhancement of biodiversity where a development site includes a watercourse in Principle YK6. Add guidance on wildflower strips would be managed in the Specification for Soiling and Planting Works in Appendix 2 (Point 42). Add additional tree and hedge species to the Proposed Schedules of Plants in Section 5 in order</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>native species are used near to the SSSI and SNCIs along the Blackwater River as this may lead to the spread of these species into the adjacent semi-natural habitat. Section 8.1 Current planting proposals for along the A331 are disappointing. Quercus robur (Pedunculate Oak) is the only tree species listed for planting. Using a variety of different tree species would enhance the wildlife value of the planting. In addition, Forest Research recommends that the use of a diversity of species provides insurance against the effects of climate change as different species will be affected differently. Additional tree and shrub species which are found on the adjacent Hawley Meadows SNCI and Blackwater Valley SSSI sites and which should be considered depending on soil conditions include Silver Birch, Ash, Elder, Grey and Goat Willow, Alder, Field Maple, Rowan, Holly, Hazel, Spindle and Alder Buckthorn. Para 292 The Trust would remove the use of peat in compost and specify a peat alternative. This reflects concern about the environmental impact of peat extraction. General In addition to the north-south corridor along the River Blackwater, there is also the opportunity to create a woodland corridor along the northern boundary of the site to link to woodland to the north east to areas of woodland along the</p>	<p>It is recognised that there are concerns about the sustainability of peat extraction.</p> <p>The comprehensive improvement of the Blackwater Valley is outside the scope of this SPD.</p>	<p>to “future-proof” against the possible effects of climate change and enrich visual amenity. Allow other plant species on sites facing the Blackwater Valley. Add reference to the Implementation section of the Strategy (Section 6) that the Maintenance Specification in Appendix 2 may have to alter over the course of time.</p> <p>Replace references to peat in The Specification for Soiling and Planting Works in Appendix 2 to a suitable non peat based planting medium (eg. Point 58).</p> <p>No change</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			Blackwater Valley. This would create a continuous landscape linking Hawley Common to the woodland north of Camberley. This would not require any changes to the Landscape Strategy but might involve changes to the planting mix and seeking the opportunity to create some groups of trees.		
Ms Georgie Cook	Thames Water Property Services	03/01/2007	Thames Water recognises the environmental benefits of Landscaping, however the indiscriminate planting of trees can lead to the premature failure of our underground assets and create access problems. We would therefore request that no trees be planted within 3 metres of our network. I trust that our comments will be considered in the development of this SPD and when dealing with forthcoming development proposals.	Agree. It is not considered that any of the potential planting locations will be within 3 metres of water pipes. However the SPD should seek to safeguard underground networks using mitigation measures such as tree root barriers.	Add statement within Section 6 on Implementation concerning avoidance of utility networks. Amend Principle YK1 to include acknowledgement in the supporting text that in some instances the precise siting of trees and other landscape features may need to be altered in order to avoid underground utility networks. Add reference to "Tree Root Barriers" in the Specification for Soiling and Planting Works (Appendix 2).
Mr T Stansfeld	Woking Borough Council	14/11/2006	Thank you for your letter dated 10th November 2006 regarding consultation on the Yorktown Landscape Strategy draft SPD. We do not wish to make any comments.	Noted.	No change.
Cllr D Ivison		13/11/2006	I pay due respect to the comprehensive research and bibliography associated with the above draft planning	Noted.	

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>documents sent to me for comment on 10 November. It must have taken a very long time to research and produce and it would perform well in any survey of bureaucratic literature. The documents cover such diverse areas as how to prune recommended trees using recommended hand tools , to the wider issues of strategic route and development planning in the Yorktown area. No mention is made of recommended street furniture nor the important issue of street lighting. Can I suggest that the Borough should be considering environmentally friendly (an cost saving) eco-friendly LED street lighting? A good contemporary PR measure. The largest trading estate in the country (Slough Trading Estate) is just adopting such economical lighting systems. Obviously no mention is made of time frames or how the wide range of proposed measures is going to be funded or implemented. Are we expecting businesses in the area to volunteer to implement or fund the recommended and welcome measures? I doubt whether there would be adequate Council funding to ever put these measures into effect! A single Pyrus calleryana 'Chanticleer' (Bradford Pear) would cost £100 plus planting and maintenance costs as specified in Appendix 4. My strong recommendation is to have a radical review of the draft proposals - establish</p>	<p>Section 5 of the SPD makes reference to various types of street furniture such as bollards, street lighting and cycle stands.</p> <p>Surrey County Council currently do not have any plans to replace 'conventional' lighting with this technology although the use of solar power for street lighting is being evaluated.</p> <p>Agree that timeframes and methods of implementation should be made more explicit. Landscaping schemes will be funded directly by developers.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to make timeframes and methods of implementation more explicit by the addition of Section 6.</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>what the Aim of the paper is and reduce it to a more intelligible and coherent document which would have more credibility and impact. The above views are not meant to be destructive - but try to remove this important project from the Civil Service/local government/bureaucratic gobbledegook which is described in the above draft documents. Make them more understandable to our citizens and therefore more acceptable. There is considerable scope for presenting a more readable and credible document.</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD has been reviewed to enable it to be more easily understood. However, a balance has to be struck between readability for the general public and incorporating information needed for planning and technical professionals.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to make more readable.</p>
Mr Dean Lister		05/01/2007	<p>As a resident for many years in Alexandra Avenue which is included within your scheme to environmentally enhance the residential area to the west of Frimley Road I would like to comment as follows: 1. The proposal to upgrade and introduce much needed improvement to the area is a great welcome provided your design intent is followed through 2. The introduction of much need trees and creating a tree street scene such as already exists in part of Queen Mary Ave would be welcomed in Alexandra ave and through-out all of the other streets within the residential area that is zoned for upgrading the landscaping. 3. I note that the strategy fails to go as far as to identify the specie of tree despite having done so for the industrial side and other major roads and therefore have doubts over how serious and or</p>	<p>The support is noted.</p> <p>Agree that timeframes and methods of implementation</p>	<p>Amend SPD to make timeframes and methods of</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>genuine the intent really is to follow through with it. 3. As item 2, traffic calming measure are needed throughout before a child gets run over. Speeds down alexandra ave (people cutting through using as a rat run to the industrial estate and residents themselves)are unbelievably dangerous. 4. The road surface in alexandra ave as with many other streets have deteriorated to the point that any traffic calming / hardlandscaping / tree planting / new improved signage, that are being introduced should simultaneously deal with the resurfacing of the road and with much needs new road markings 5. As part of upgrading the residential area there is no strategy to improve the street lighting. Currently it is a mix of different street lamp styles throughout the various streets and the various levels of the lighting etc being poor. A new and consistent street lamp / lighting would be welcomed and should form part of the scheme and strategy. 6. Through traffic to the industrial estate must be completely eliminated in order to enhance and provide any success to the strategy measures that are being proposed otherwise it will all have been in vain! 7. What does the strategy intend doing about the run down / dilapidated state of the high rise building that looks unfit for accommodation (although currently and</p>	<p>should be made more explicit. Redevelopment proposals on sites within the Yorktown Strategy area will be expected in appropriate circumstances to make financial contributions to environmental improvements in the residential area, in addition to landscaping being sought on-site.</p> <p>Highway concerns are not a matter to be addressed by this SPD. The Yorktown Supplementary Planning Guidance (2003) sets out proposals for improving transportation, access and circulation in and around the Yorktown area. Street lighting for the residential area will need to be considered once detailed proposals for this area have been generated.</p> <p>The objectives of the SPD are relevant to this site as it is within the Study area. However the eventual type and form of any proposed development will be subject</p>	<p>implementation more explicit by the addition of Section 4. Add Paragraph 4.7 to explain that environmental improvements in the residential area will be achieved through financial contributions.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No Change.</p> <p>No Change.</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>no doubt illegally occupied by tenants at the A30 / London Road end of Victoria Ave 8. What does the strategy intend doing about the remainder of unattractive trading shops fronting the A30 / London Road from Victoria ave down to McDonalds Drive Thru ? I'm sure that I speak for most of the residents who would welcome all measures being taken to environmentally enhance our residential area and all would welcome being kept informed and updated on decisions that are required on any developments involving our area.</p>	<p>to wider planning guidance including the Local Plan 2000 (as saved) or as subsequently replaced by new policies in the Local Development Framework.</p>	
Ms Kate Kennedy		15/11/2006	<p>Generally I think the proposals set out are good, however there is little detail regarding the residential areas. I feel this would be a great opportunity to combine looking at on road parking issues and landscaping. For example, Queens Road is a wide road, if it was made one-way (which it is almost exclusively used as anyway) there could be the opportunity to introduce angled parking and this could be interspersed with trees, which would result in a much improved environment for all without decreasing the amount of parking available to the residents. Also, any changes to the cycleways around here has got to be good. The current 'network' of cyclepaths is a complete mess, doesn't link up in the slightest and is actually more dangerous for cyclists than just cycling on the road.</p>	<p>Highway concerns are not a matter to be addressed by this SPD. The Yorktown SPG (2003) sets out proposals for improving transportation, access and circulation in and around the Yorktown area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council intends to improve the cycle network in the Yorktown area once sufficient funding allows. The Yorktown SPG (2003) identifies desired cycle links through the</p>	No change

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>Can I suggest that those responsible for cycle paths could actually get onto a bike and see just how difficult life is for cyclists around here with the current incoherent approach to cycle paths. Even the ones which are slightly user-friendly are usually used as parking zones for cars. Finally, any attempt to beautify the Yorktown Industrial area will be wasted without tackling the severe parking issues which plague it. As a pedestrian it's very frustrating to have to walk on the road through the estate because the footpaths are completely occupied by cars, cranes and trucks. Not only is it an eyesore, it's very dangerous for both traffic and pedestrians.</p>	<p>Yorktown Business Park and along the Blackwater Valley Road.</p>	
Mr S Quinlan		13/11/2006	<p>To me it still seems as though it is assumed most vehicles entering Yorktown Industrial Estate via Vale Road or Queen Mary Avenue are just visiting the estate. Just by my visual observations stading near bollards at the Queen Mary Road entrance into the industrial estate I have seen most vehicles go all the way to the Blackwater Valley link Road, opposite the gas holders. I note the highest usage being when the A30 is very busy. My personal conclusion is it is used as a shortcut (ratrun) to avoid A30 and to connect to M3 and the Blackwater Valley. I would also prefer there to be no connection between the residential and industrial areas by</p>	<p>Highway concerns are not a matter to be addressed by this SPD. The Yorktown Supplementary Planning Guidance (2003) sets out proposals for improving transportation, access and circulation in and around the Yorktown area.</p>	No change.

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>vehicle.</p> <p>It will be nice to see more greenery as it feels like a concrete jungle sometimes as the houses near the industrial estate feel more like part of an industrial estate than a residential area. It might even be away to help clear off some of the social ills, yobs, vandalism, by making it more pleasant to live in the area. More private housing would not go amiss. Generally like most of the proposal. Thank you.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Providing more private housing is beyond the scope of the SPD.</p>	
Mr Richard Young		12/11/2006	<p>All I can see from this proposal is that you want to plant some trees to make the place look better. Where are the concrete plans stating how you plan to cut the speed of traffic through the area, to cut down the number of rat run traffic that uses local roads and prevent accidents at the blackspot at the junction of Victoria Avenue and Edward Avenue? Fix the obvious issues first before worrying about what types of trees to plant in an area that you probably can't plant them because of gas/water/electricity.</p> <p>I find it hard to believe that it's taken you 50 pages to say absolutely nothing at all about the issues that actually matter to the residents in the area. If these issues are covered in a different document perhaps you'd be kind enough to provide obvious links to these rather than things like the</p>	<p>Highway concerns are not a matter to be addressed by this SPD. The Yorktown SPG (2003) sets out proposals for improving transportation, access and circulation in and around the Yorktown area.</p> <p>Agree that closer reference is made to the Yorktown Highway and Transportation Strategy SPG (2002).</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Amend SPD so that closer referencing is made to the Yorktown SPG (2003), in paragraph 2.4.</p>

Name	Company	Response Date	Response	Officer comments	Council Response
			<p>"Yorktown Landscape Strategy SPD is intended to add further detail to Policies E2, E6, G4, G23 and UE5 of the Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000 and supplement the Yorktown Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 2003 which to be honest are of little practical use to me in finding out what's actually happening.</p>		