

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

LIGHTWATER VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT 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.

1. Consultation on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document

Before adopting the Draft Lightwater Village Design Statement 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 **16 July to 28 August 2007**. As part of this consultation exercise, the Council:

- a) Consulted those organisations and individuals listed in Appendix 1.
- b) Sent a letter to all the 3,106 residential and commercial properties in Lightwater notifying them where copies of the documents could be read, and inviting them to the exhibition and meeting
- c) Undertook an exhibition and public meeting about the SPD on 9 August 2007 at All Saints Church Hall, Lightwater. Appendix 2 records the views put forward at the exhibition and meeting. Posters were placed in key locations in the village.
- d) Publicised the consultation exercise in Heathscene, the Council's newsletter, in its Summer 2007 edition which was distributed to all residents of the Borough in July 2007.
- e) Issued a press release about the consultation exercise in the week ending 13 July 2007.
- f) Published statutory advertisements about the consultation exercise in the Woking News and Mail and the Chobham and Windlesham News and Mail on 12 July 2007 and the Camberley News on 13 July 2007.

Copies of the documents and response forms were made available:

At the Council Offices, Knoll Road, Camberley.
At Lightwater, Bagshot, Camberley and Frimley Green libraries.
Lightwater Leisure Centre, The Avenue, Lightwater.
On the Council's website www.surreyheath.gov.uk.

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

2. Responses made to the consultation exercise

29 responses were made to the consultation exercise. These responses, and how they have been addressed by the Council in preparing the adopted version of the SPD and SAR, are set out in Appendix 3.

3. Consultation prior to the publication of the Draft SPD

Appendix 4 sets out how the Council engaged with stakeholders and the community prior to the formal consultation on the Draft SPD.

APPENDIX 1 – Those organisations and individuals consulted

3G UK Ltd; O2 (UK) Ltd; Orange PCS Ltd; T-mobile UK Ltd; Vodaphone Ltd	Carers Support Office
Age Concern - Frimley & Camberley	Cathedral Holdings Ltd.
Airey Miller Partnership (architects)	CBRE
Alfred McAlpine	CDHA/HYDE HA
All Saints Church, Lightwater	CEL Planning
Alliance Environment & Planning	Centrica
Annington Developments Ltd	Chancellor & Sons
APM SERVICES LTD	Charles Church (Southern) Limited
Arriva	Charles Church Southern
Ascot Contructions Ltd	Chetwood, Lawton & Morrison
Ash and Ash Vale Parish Council	Chobham Parish Council
ATIS REAL Weatheralls	Chobham Poor Allotment Charity
Bagshot Rural District Old Peoples Welfare	Christ the King Church, Bagshot
Baker Davidson Thomas	Christian Leigh - Chartered town planner
Bancroft Developments	Churches @ GU16
Barker Parry Town Planning	Churches Together in Camberley
Barratt Southern Counties	Citizens Advice Bureau
BCDTA	Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
Bell Cornwell Partnership	Commission for Racial Equality
Bellway Estates	Connexions Centre
Bengali Welfare Association	Council for the Protection of Rural England
Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit	CPRE Surrey
Bisley Parish Council	Crest Estates Ltd
BJZ - Bryan Jezeph Consultancy	Crest Nicholson
Blackwater Valley Enterprise Trust	Crocus Co Uk
Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth	Crown Estate Office
Blackwater Valley Recreation & Countryside Partnership	CSJ Planning
Bovis Homes Ltd	Cunnane Town Planning
Boyer Planning	Curley Hill Residents Association
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	Cushman & Wakefield / Healey & Baker
British Airports Authority	D.P.D.S Consulting Group
British Institute of Innkeeping	David Hicken Associates Ltd
British Wind Energy Association	Dental Practice
Broadway Malyan Planning	Derek Horne & Associates
BT	DevPlan UK
Business Link Surrey	Disability Initiative
MBH Partnership	Disabled Access Surrey Heath (DASH)
Cala Homes	Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
Camberley & Frimley Police & Community Group	Dolphin Head Group
Camberley Islamic Welfare Association	DPDS Consulting Group
Camberley Natural History Society	DPP - Development Planning Partnership
CAMRA/Surrey	Dreweatt Neate (Agents for Defence Estates)
EDF ENERGY	Jim Guest Design

Edwards Elliott	Jobcentre
Emmaus Project	Jonathon Barow Partnership
English Heritage (South East Region)	Jones Day
Environment Agency	Julian Brown Consultancy
Equal Opportunities Commission	Kier Property Limited
Estate Development	King Sturge
Fairview New Homes Ltd	Kingfisher Housing Association
Firfield Glyn	Kingsoak Southern Counties
First Beeline Buses Ltd	Knight Frank
Flavia Estates	Laing Homes
Ford Mears & Partners	Lambert Smith Hampton
Forestry Commission	Land & New Homes
Foy Planning Consultancy	Liberal Catholic Church St Francis Of Assisi
Freight Transport Association	Lightwater and Windlesham Practice
Friends of Surrey Heath Museum	Lightwater Business Association
Friends, Families and Travellers	Lightwater Darby And Joan Club
Frimley Park Hospital NHS Trust	Lightwater Police & Community Partnership Group
Future Energy Solutions	Lightwater Surgery
George Wimpey Southern Ltd and West London Ltd	Lightwater Village School
Gondala Holdings	Lin Blakely Property Management
Government Office for the South East	Local Transportation Service - Surrey Heath District
Government Oil Pipelines	London Clancy
Greaves Project Management Limited	Lovell
Gregory Gray Associates	Mackenzie Smith (estate agents)
Guide Dogs for the Blind Association	Malcolm Judd & partners
Guildford Borough Council	Mansard Country Homes Ltd
GVA Grimley	Matthew Pellereau Limited
Hammond Junior School	Maurice Lillie Architects
Hampshire County Council	The Planning Bureau (Agents for McCarthy and Stone Ltd)
Hanover Housing Association	McKay Securities Group
Hart District Council	Meir Associates
Health & Safety Executive	Michael Cox Associates
Health Promotion Service	Miller Homes
Help the Aged	Montagu Land
Highways Agency	MOTest
Home Builders Federation	MW Facility Management Limited
Hospital & Community Friends National Assoc.	N W Surrey Police
Housing Corporation	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
Howard Hutton & Associates	National Express
Howard Sharp & Partners	National Farmers Union
Humberts Chartered Surveyors	National Grid
Iceni Projects	National Playing Fields Association
J Higham Associates	National Power

Nationcrest	South East Regional Play Association
Natural England	South East Water
Normandy Parish Council	Southern Gas Networks
NTL	Spelthorne Borough Council
NW Surrey Assoc. of Disabled People	Sport England
Parents Encouraging Parents	St John the Baptist Church, Windlesham
Parkside Housing Group	St Mary's Church - Youth Leader
Passenger Transport Group	Stagecoach Hants & Surrey
Paul Dickinson and Associates - Town Planning & Development Consultants	Steve Brighty Associates
Pavilion	Stewart Ross Associates
Peacock and Smith	Stonham Housing Association
Persimmon Homes South East Ltd	Sunningdale Parish Council
Pirbright Parish Council	Sunninghill Parish Council
Planning Committee of Showmen's Guild LHC	Surrey Chamber of Commerce
Planning Issues	Surrey Community Development Trust
Potter Organisation	Surrey County Council
Powergen Retail Ltd	Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
Premier Properties Plc	Surrey Heath & Woking PCT
Quorum Corporate Services Ltd	Surrey Heath Arts Council
Royal Association of Disability & Rehabilitation	Surrey Heath Borough Council Community Services
Rapleys	Surrey Heath Community Learning Partnership
Regional Housing Board	Surrey Heath Housing Association - Peerless Housing Group Limited
Richard Bonny Architectural Design	Surrey Heath Housing Association Tenants Federation
Rippon Development Services	Surrey Heath Local History Club
Roger Tym & Partners	Surrey Heath Muslim Association
RPS Planning	Surrey Heath Neighbourhood Watch Support Group
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (South East Office)	Surrey Heath Talking Newspaper For The Blind
Runnymede Borough Council	Surrey Learning and Skills Council
Rural Housing Trust	Surrey Playing Fields Association
Rushmoor Borough Council	Surrey Police
Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Surrey Traveller Community Relations Forum
Sandhurst Town Council	Surrey Wildlife Trust
Scammell Securities PLC	Swan Hill Homes Ltd
SecondSite Property Holdings Ltd	Taylor Woodrow
South East England Development Agency	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd
South East England Regional Assembly	Telecom Plus plc
Sentinel Housing Association	Terence O'Rourke
SHA Estates - South East	Tetlow King Planning
SHM Group	Thames Valley Housing Association
Silicon Valley Group	Thames Water Property Services
Slough Estates Plc	The Camberley Society
South East Coast	The Countryside Agency
The Gypsy Council	The D & M Planning Partnership

The Royal Association For Deaf People	West End Village Society
The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	West Indian Association - Aldershot & District
The Showmen's Guild Of Great Britain	Westwaddy ADP
Three Valleys Water PLC	Whadham Isherwood
Tribal MJP	White Young Green Planning
UK Land Investment Group	Windlesham Community Home Trust
Vail Williams LLP	Windlesham Parish Council
Vickery & Company	Windlesham Village Pre-School
Voluntary Association For Surrey Disabled	Winkfield Parish Council
Voluntary Services Surrey Heath	Woking and Surrey Heath Community Legal Service Partnership
W Donald Ltd	Woking Borough Council
Waterfords	Women's National Commission
Waverley Borough Council	Woodgrade Ltd
West End Parish Council	Woodland Trust
	YMCA Charity Shop

APPENDIX 2 – Record of Public Meeting and Exhibition: 9 August 2007 at All Saints Church Hall, Broadway Road, Lightwater

Attendance: 32 members of the public.

The public meeting was hosted by SHBC Cllr Stewart Stevenson, Paul Barrow (Local Steering Group), John Dawson and Sarah Veasey (SHBC officers).

Issues Raised at the Public Meeting: 7.30pm

Issue	Officer Response
Why are so many retirement homes being built?	Partly due to demand and partly due to care homes not being constrained by the SPA
Infrastructure is required in new developments, particularly drainage.	The Council does require new development to provide infrastructure where necessary. Surface water flooding is a problem – better drainage measures including soft landscaping are required. However, new development, if it includes flood mitigation, will not necessarily increase the risk of flooding.
Can the Council put pressure on infrastructure providers or developers to improve drainage?	The Council cannot force existing landowners to provide new drains. Better drainage solutions can be required in new development. The Council is currently examining what new measures can be undertaken to alleviate flooding.
Will the Notcutts development of 182 dwellings in Bagshot have an effect on flooding in Lightwater?	The application included a drainage strategy which is being assessed by the Council. Water is drained towards the Windle Brook and then into the Bourne and not towards Lightwater.
Lightwater is surrounded on four sides by heathland – there is no mention in the SPD of protecting these areas?	These areas are heavily protected by European legislation and the Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000. Protection for these areas is also mentioned in the SPD under the Landscape section.
Fly-tipping takes place to the rear of High View Road on the Country Park. The Council should put in place an educational programme to encourage people to respect the countryside and surrounding environment.	Noted. This comment will be passed onto the Environmental Services and Leisure Team of the Council.
If a planning application is turned down and then goes to appeal, will the Inspector take local objections into account?	Yes.
Why do appeals take so long?	The Planning Inspectorate have a lack of inspectors which leads to delays in undertaking Inquiries. Some appeals in Surrey Heath have also been delayed due to clarification being sought on the SPA issue.
Policies should protect the commercial centre of the village (from Post Office to Vickerys) as this provides local employment.	The Local Plan 2000 already protects the retail and employment uses in the commercial centre of Lightwater. However, government guidance advises to be more flexible over the loss of employment uses. The Council is currently undertaking an Employment Land Review as part of the Local Development Framework to look in more

	detail at this issue.
Care homes – not seen as an appropriate use for Lightwater.	There is a growing population of older persons, so care homes can provide a useful service.
Public toilets should be provided in the village centre.	This point is being passed onto the Council's Environmental Services. However, there is a difficulty with a lack of public owned land.
There is a need to improve the connectiveness between facilities and services within the Village through signposting etc.	Agreed. However, most of the examples raised involve encouraging private landowners to allow access through their land and erect signs.
The area of greenspace outside the library could be a useful area to create a meeting place	This is a matter for the landowner. These comments will be passed onto the County Council.

Issues Raised Verbally at the Exhibition: 2.00 - 7.30pm

Attendance: 41 members of the public.

Issue	Officer Response
On-street parking should be better managed in the centre of the village.	This comment will be passed onto the Council's Parking Services.
Speeds should be reduced e.g. MacDonald Road, Red Road, Ambleside Road.	This comment will be passed onto the County Council's Transportation Team.
There should be more cycle routes.	This comment will be passed onto the County Council's Transportation Team.
2 Ambleside Road – 2 huge potholes since January 2007.	This comment will be passed onto the County Council's Transportation Team.
Guildford Road/Lightwater Bypass junction on way to Guildford is dangerous.	This comment will be passed onto the County Council's Transportation Team.
Yellow lines in front of Budgens should be enforced.	This comment will be passed onto the Council's Parking Services.
Traffic calming is required on Ambleside Road.	This comment will be passed onto the County Council's Transportation Team.

APPENDIX 3 – Responses to the consultation exercise on the Draft SPD and SAR and Officer Comments

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
Mr J Maclean	<p>Section 3.3 - The shops, restaurants in the commercial area will be subject to supply/demand. There have been restaurants in the past but failed because of lack of support. Section 3.4 - As for para 3, but note that there is a con-club and working man's club both of which I believe are licensed, there is no need for another pub. Section 4 - Landscaping. I endorse the recommendations L1/2/3/4 in full. Section 5 - Built environment. I endorse the recommendations in full. Particularly I would like to veto any more blocks of flats/apartments including the knocking down of existing houses and replacing with high density buildings. Provision of a public car park needs to be a serious priority for development planners and must come before further offices or residential development in the village centre. The recent practice (as in Ambleside) for double garages being built between a house and front road should be stopped. It looks hideous! Why not incorporate garage into house? The commercial area is tatty and scruffy but this is down to poor maintenance mostly by owners/tenants - can pressure be put on them to raise their standards? Section 6 - Transportation. I agree with recommendations. Focus for me has to be public car parking (again) plus access points to Red Road. Are roundabouts or lights possible? Section 6.1E - Pedestrians are reasonably well catered for and public transport is available but poorly used. There is however little facilities for cyclists. I cycle quite a lot and it is possible to get to Heatherside and West End fairly easily on a mountain bike and possibly Bagshot but to get to Windlesham or to join the Camberley cycle routes at the 'Old Jolly Farmer' is impossible without mixing with fast traffic. I believe there is an old byeway from Lightwater which goes through the country park, under the M3 and then towards the Jolly Farmer but it is impassable because of the army high speed track. I may not have all the facts on this one though. Anyway, cycling facilities are not good in Lightwater.</p>	<p>Noted. The level of shops, restaurants, community facilities and car parking are not a matter for the Design Statement. These issues will be addressed in due course through the preparation of other Local Development Documents as part of the Local Development Framework. It is currently difficult to achieve additional public parking through a lack of public land available on which to locate parking. The potential to improve public parking will be examined in the event that any significant redevelopment proposal comes forward. Further Initiative H9 refers to encouraging a further study to examine car parking in the village.</p> <p>Comments regarding cycle routes, roundabouts and other highway matters have been passed onto the Surrey County Council Transportation Department.</p> <p>The improvement of the commercial area in the centre of the village is currently the responsibility of the landowners, although improvements could be achieved through any redevelopment proposals which come forward in the future. The County Council controls highway rights over some of the village centre. The County Council will be requested to consider improving these areas in coordination with landowners.</p> <p>The Village Design Statement Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) does not seek to resist flats in principle. Indeed there is a need to provide more small unit accommodation. However, the SPD does provide planning policies which will ensure that any flatted development is in keeping with the smaller scale character of the village.</p> <p>The siting of garages between the road and the front of a house is resisted by Design Principle B4 of the SPD where the house is obscured.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Mr & Mrs Playford	<p>Lightwater has never been a 'pretty' village but with improvements to the village centre over the years it has, in this respect, at least</p>	<p>Comments regarding car parking, traffic and highway safety have been passed onto the Surrey County Council Transportation Department.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>improved. As stated (5.5) car parking is a problem which should be addressed urgently and (5.4) whilst redevelopment of the village centre would be excessive, perhaps the Deepcut Garage area could be beautified. The issue of traffic will not disappear but over the years 'traffic calming' causes more problems than it solves i.e. more noise and pollution from the need to slow, accelerate or even stop, and more unsightly large flashing signs. In the 31 years of residing in Lightwater I have never had a problem entering Red Road apart from delays caused by the traffic taking short cuts which should be addressed preferably without inconvenience to residents. The improving of flood defences is a real priority (4.8 & L4) but with all the development in Lightwater over the years it is perhaps too late for anything but drastic, expensive action. What is needed is an unimpeded watercourse, more open space and trees to soak up the excess rainfall, and less concrete! Now all that can be done is the installation of balancing ponds and swales, the bunding and cleaning of water courses and the improvement of drainage - all continued further than the Lightwater boundaries to prevent a backlog. Last year Thames Water inspected the drainage from the village and declared the pipes too small for purpose and in addition 1/2 filled with fat from the restaurants etc. You requested comments not solutions so finally I will ask is this not too little, too late? The overdevelopment of the village over the past 20 years has put pressure on the infrastructure and certainly the drainage of this essentially 'wet' area and whilst the Design Statement is a laudable idea all the points require massive funding which, from the meetings I have attended, is in very short supply!</p>	<p>Comments regarding flood defences have been passed to the Council's Drainage Engineer, Thames Water Utilities and the Environment Agency. The Council is actively considering what measures can be put in place to alleviate the future risk of flooding. Mitigation measures to control the risk of flooding are required for new development when determining planning applications where appropriate.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Mr I J Muzzall</p>	<p>We broadly endorse the principles within the draft document, particularly regarding limiting building height to two storeys and in maintaining the character of the village. The village centre must be a priority - to improve the aesthetic appeal & to rectify the current dangerous and untidy parking situation. Before any further development is considered, the existing infrastructure must be reviewed and upgraded, particularly with regard to drainage and capacity of both surface and foul water systems, we endorse the relevant statement from Mr Iain Leslie of The Environment Agency on</p>	<p>Noted. Comments regarding flood defences have been passed to the Council's Drainage Engineer, Thames Water Utilities and the Environment Agency. The Council is actively considering what measures can be put in place to alleviate the future risk of flooding. Mitigation measures to control the risk of flooding are required for new development when determining planning applications where appropriate. The potential to require Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) in new development is being considered as part of the preparation of other Local Development Documents in the Local</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	p36 of the SA report - it would be preferential to employ SUDS techniques where possible on any new build. With this in mind, why has the All Saints Church car park been surfaced with tarmac - more runoff of water! Finally, should developers who wish to build not be obliged to contribute to the cost of any infrastructure improvements required to support their development - perhaps through the planning process?	Development Framework.	
Ms Marie Raison, Environment Agency	<p>Comments on the draft SPD:</p> <p>Section 1.4 - We would recommend that this objective be strengthened to reflect both the built and natural environment. This is due to the presence of a number of watercourses within the village, its location near to SSSI's, SPA's and SAC's and the requirement of PPS9 for enhancement.</p> <p>Section 4.8 – We note that you propose to improve the value of watercourses for nature conservation and the prevention of flooding by enhancing their landscaping, by providing buffer zones and deculverting where possible. The Environment Agency requests that a 5m buffer zone is maintained alongside non-main rivers and that 8m are maintained along main rivers. We support your intention to deculvert wherever possible, this is in line with the Environment Agency's own policy as it reduces the risk of flooding and creates a river corridor for biodiversity.</p> <p>We would also recommend that an additional paragraph is included in this section to ensure that only native species are used and that they are managed in an appropriate way to ensure that biodiversity is enhanced as a result of the SPD e.g.</p> <p><i>'To ensure the conservation and enhancement of the water environment a buffer zone should be established along watercourses. This buffer zone should be managed so as to foster a natural character, with native species of trees and shrubs used; and any grass areas left un-mown or mown only later in the season to enhance their floristic and habitat value.'</i></p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>It is agreed that a reference to the benefits of introducing natural species alongside watercourses should be made in para 4.8. However, this should be qualified as, depending on the site characteristics, it may not always be appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Amend.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>Landscape Design Principles L4 – We would recommend that the wording of this is strengthened so as to incorporate the buffer zones which the Environment Agency require as stated in our response to section 4.8. e.g. <i>‘Development adjacent to a watercourse should incorporate a buffer zone This will ensure: that watercourses are kept open: the provision of an area in which flooding can occur; and that a wildlife corridor is provided to enhance biodiversity.’</i></p> <p>Section 6.2 – PPS25 states that <u>ALL</u> forms of flooding should be considered during the planning process and that development should be steered sequentially to those areas of lowest flood risk. Therefore we recommend that this section be altered to reflect PPS25 and to direct new development to sites within flood zone 1 before flood zones 2 or 3 are considered. If development is proposed for flood zone 2 or 3 then the local planning authority may need to demonstrate to the Environment Agency that the sequential and exception test have been passed. This section also highlights groundwater flooding as a potential issue in parts of Lightwater. Any information on groundwater flooding within the village should be included within the SPD, to ensure that development is located in areas at the lowest risk of flooding. This could be incorporated into Plan 6, which could be retitled to ‘Potential Flood Risk Areas in Lightwater’.</p> <p>We support the Transportation, Access and Flooding Principle H4 although would suggest that it be expanded to include ‘or put additional residents at risk’.</p> <p>Appendix 2 – Policy Framework Relevant to the Village Design Statement: Preferred Options Version of Core Strategy of Surrey Heath LDF (2005). As principle H4 of the SPD is to not impede flow or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere we recommend that Core Policy 2 on environmental protection is also included. As one of the aims of the SPD is to enhance the value of watercourses for their nature conservation value we would also recommend that Core</p>	<p>Agreed. Landscape Design Principle L4 should be amended to take account of the buffer zone and enhancement of biodiversity.</p> <p>Not agreed. The SPD focuses on design and does not address the principle of where housing should be located.</p> <p>Agreed. Principle H4 to be amended to include “or put additional residents at risk”.</p> <p>Not agreed. The SPD is supplementary to design policies.</p>	<p>Amend.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Amend.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>Policy 3A on biodiversity is included.</p> <p>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA):</p> <p>Table 1 – PPS25 is not called ‘flooding’, but development and flood risk. Section 4.40 – We note that you highlight the issue of fluvial and surface water flooding within the village in this section. However, section 6.2 of the SPD also states that groundwater flooding affects part of Lightwater. The potential for groundwater flooding should therefore be included within this section of the sustainability appraisal. Section 4.41 – We are pleased that both the SPD and SA seek to deculvert watercourses wherever possible. The deculverting of watercourses and the provision of buffer zones not only provides opportunities for enhancing ecological diversity but also reduces the flood risk. We recommend that the additional benefit of deculverting is also included within section 4.41. Table 2 – ‘The role of the SPD in encouraging design to reduce the risk of flooding’ we support the fact that the SPD will address the risk of flooding. However, avoiding flood risk is one of the main goals of PPS25, not merely the reduction of flood risk. PPS25 requires that the sequential approach be applied to any new development to ensure that it is within an area at the lowest risk of flooding from ALL sources.</p> <p>Table 3 – For sustainability objective 8, we recommend that the wording of the detailed indicator on SUDS is altered so that it can be more measurable e.g. ‘Number of new developments with SUDs installed.’ Sustainability Objective 10 – the wording of the detailed decision making criteria should be altered to reflect PPS23 as ‘contaminated land’ refers to part IIa legislation not planning policy. It could be altered to ‘will it reduce the area of land affected by contamination?’ We would also recommend changes to the detailed indicator e.g. ‘The area of land affected by contamination brought back into beneficial use’. Sustainability Objective 11 – The detailed indicator proposed for this objective only refers to the biological/chemical quality of rivers and canal, as the objective is for water quality as a whole we recommend that this indicator is expanded to include groundwater quality. Appendix 2 - PPS25 should</p>	<p>Agreed that the Table 1 of the SA of the should be amended to read PPS25: Development and Flood Risk.</p> <p>Agreed that the potential for groundwater flooding should be included within section 4.40 of the SA.</p> <p>Agreed that the additional benefit of deculverting is included within section 4.41 of the SA.</p> <p>The sequential approach in PPS25 to locating development will be addressed through policies within the DC Policies DPD guided by the outcome of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessments currently being undertaken.</p> <p>Agreed that the wording of the detailed indicator on SUDs in the SA is altered to read “Number of new developments with SUDs installed”.</p> <p>Agreed that the wording of the detailed decision making criteria for SA Objective 10 in the SA be amended to “will it reduce the area of land affected by contamination?” and the detailed indicator be amended to “the area of land affected by contamination brought back into beneficial use”.</p> <p>Agreed that the detailed indicator for SA Objective 11 is amended to include reference to groundwater quality.</p> <p>Agreed that PPS25 should be included in Appendix 2 of the SA as a</p>	<p>Amend.</p> <p>Amend.</p> <p>Amend.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Amend.</p> <p>Amend.</p> <p>Amend.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>be included as a relevant policy particularly as there are sustainability objectives relating to the reduction of flood risk within the SA. Flood risk is also identified as a development principle in the SPD so PPS25 should be referenced within the SA of this document. PPS23 is not referenced yet the reduction of contamination in soils is one of the sustainability objectives being used within the SA. Core Policy 2 and 3a from Surrey Heath Borough Council (2005) Core Strategy Preferred Options Document should also be considered as part of the SA due to the proposed enhancements to biodiversity and the SPD aims relating to flood risk.</p>	<p>relevant policy.</p> <p>Agreed that reference to PPS23 should be made in Table 1 and Appendix 2 of the SA report.</p> <p>It is not agreed that these policies in the Core Strategy Preferred Options should be included as any references to flood risk in the SPD reflect national policy and do not provide supplementary policy.</p>	<p>Amend.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>Mr R Evans, Environment Department Surrey County Council</p>	<p>The following are informal comments. The County previously commented on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. Our letter dated 3 January 2007 refers. We supported the approach on the Scoping Report. We advised that the Borough should be satisfied that the draft SPD would be fully proofed in respect of the general contribution towards sustainable development and energy conservation policy measures contained in the adopted Surrey Structure Plan, 2004, as well as policies of the Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000. We also advised that the Borough should also ensure that the SPD accords fully with the Government policy as expressed in PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development), PPS3 concerning housing, as well as considerations under the Habitat Regulations, and flooding issues under PPS25 through appropriate assessment. We did not anticipate that these matters would create significant issues for the Lightwater Village Design Statement. We note that the draft SPD, now to hand, deals with a Village Design Statement detailing local initiatives and providing detailed planning guidance for development control purposes. We note that the objective for policy is to protect and enhance local distinctiveness of Lightwater in respect of built environment and landscape. We support this approach. We do not have concerns over the detailed wording of policies. We note that the section on Transportation, Access and Flooding takes due account of the need to improve traffic conditions and allow for improved accessibility for the community, in line with the policies and advice of the County's Local Transport Service for</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>the Borough. Overall, provided that the Borough is satisfied that policies concerning the principles of sustainable design and build, and sustainable drainage schemes, comply with national policy guidance and the principles of the Surrey Structure Plan, 2004 and the emerging regional plan, then the County have no strategic planning objections to the draft Lightwater Village Design Statement SPD. We have no comments on the Sustainability Appraisal Report. I understand that the County's Local Transport Service for Surrey Heath may respond separately with detailed views on the draft SPD. I trust these comments are useful to you.</p>		
<p>Ms H Dennison, RSPB (South East Office)</p>	<p>1. The Design Statement does not adequately highlight the relationship of the village to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA or the planning implications of this relationship. Paragraph 4.2 acknowledges that the majority of Lightwater Country Park, situated to the west of the village, is designated as an SPA. Similarly paragraph 4.4 highlights that Turf Hill Park, to the south of the village, is designated as a SSSI, SPA and SAC. There is no mention within the document that these sites form part of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Furthermore, there is no reference to advice from Natural England, which prescribes that any residential development within 400 metres of the SPA is likely to cause unacceptable harm to its interest features and, other than in very exceptional circumstances, will be refused. Natural England also advises that that housing schemes at a distance of 400m to 5km from the SPA, are only likely to prevent harm to the SPA if disturbance from people and their pets is mitigated. Mitigation will therefore be required to be in the form of alternative open space. The map below illustrates the relationship of Lightwater village to the SPA. It also highlights that the majority of the village lies within 400 metres of the SPA and consequently new residential development in that location will be almost certainly be refused. The north western part of the village falls outside the 400metre zone, however it is still subject to the 5km requirement to provide adequate mitigation. It is very concerning that this key information has been excluded from the SPD, particularly given that at paragraph 1.1, it states that the purpose of the SPD is to "help shape future development, reinforce the local distinctiveness of the</p>	<p>Agreed that the references to the SPA in para 4.2 should mention that it forms part of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.</p> <p>Not agreed that the SPD should refer to the constraints on housing development from the SPA. The SPD does not address the principle of development but its design. The SPD is programmed to cover the period up to 2026, and it is currently uncertain as to how significant the constraint of the SPA will be to housing development in the future. These issues are best addressed in other LDF documents.</p>	<p>Amend.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>Village and provide a framework for future physical changes". The RSPB therefore recommends that an additional section be included in the design statement, which describes the planning and environmental constraints associated with the location of Lightwater Village adjacent to part of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.</p> <p>2. Paragraph 1.4 of the SPD states that the objective of the SPD is: To protect and enhance the local distinctiveness of Lightwater, in respect of its built environment and landscape, through guiding new development and other changes to the environment. The RSPB would welcome the following minor amendment to this objective: To protect and enhance the local distinctiveness of Lightwater, in respect of its built and natural environment, through guiding new development and other changes to the environment.</p> <p>3. Principle L2 of the SPD states: Heathland areas adjacent to the Village boundaries should not be developed and should be protected and enhanced for their landscape and wildlife value. The RSPB in general welcomes Principle L2, however its robustness could be significantly improved by the following amendment: Heathland areas should be protected from development and increased recreational pressure and should be protected and enhanced for their landscape and wildlife value. New residential development, within 400 metres of the SPA is likely to cause significant harm to the SPA and is therefore likely to be refused. New residential development between 400 metres and 5km of the SPA will create disturbance to the SPA, which will require mitigation. Mitigation will require the provision of alternative open space and access management on the SPA.</p> <p>4. Principle H8 seeks "Improved footpath and bridleway access to the countryside and surrounding villages is to be encouraged". Given that Lightwater village is surrounded by Colony Bog & Bagshot Heath SSSI, which forms part of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, it is unclear how Principle H8 could be delivered without increasing access to the SPA. The RSPB is therefore very concerned that Principle H8 will result in increased recreational pressure on the SPA</p>	<p>Not agreed that the objective of the SPD should refer to protecting and enhancing the local distinctiveness of Lightwater in respect of its natural environment. The objective of the SPD is to protect and enhance local distinctiveness, and in terms of the natural environment this will be through protecting and enhancing the landscape. Any references in the SPD to wildlife and the natural environment reflect the protection afforded by other policy documents to these areas.</p> <p>Not agreed that Principle L2 should refer to the constraints on housing development from the SPA. The SPD does not address the principle of development but its design.</p> <p>Not agreed. There are areas of countryside and some footpaths and bridleways surrounding the village which do not encroach upon the SPA. Any development or management proposals which involve access to the SPA will be subject to other policies which address the need to protect the SPA.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>and is therefore a blatant contradiction of Principle L2, which prescribes that heathland areas should be protected and enhanced for their landscape and wildlife value. This is a very significant concern that needs to be properly addressed by the Borough Council.</p> <p>5. The RSPB would also wish to remind the Borough Council that following the October 2005 European Court of Justice ruling against the UK Government, an appropriate assessment must be undertaken to evaluate the effects of the proposal on designated sites. It is acknowledged that a Screening Opinion was prepared by the Borough Council in September 2006. The Screening Option concluded that no Appropriate Assessment would be required because "it will not set a new framework, rather it will supplement existing planning policy in the Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000". The RSPB does not support this conclusion because the Local Plan predates the October 2005 ruling of the European Court of Justice. The RSPB therefore considers that the Council has a legal requirement to prepare an Appropriate Assessment for the Lightwater Village Design Statement Draft Supplementary Planning Document and therefore we reserve the right to provide a further response to the Borough Council in respect of the SPD once an Appropriate Assessment has been published. In subsequent correspondence clarifying their representation, the RSPB consider that an Appropriate Assessment is required because and the SPD: includes information which may guide the location of development within the village; and includes Principle H8 which specifically seeks to improve access to the countryside which may have a significant effect on a European site.</p>	<p>Not agreed. Advice has been taken from Natural England who state that it is the impact of the SPD in itself on the SPA which should be addressed in any Screening Opinion, rather than any policy from which the SPD is derived. The Principles in the SPD only address the design, and not the principle, of development of development. It is therefore considered that the original screening opinion is correct which concluded that the SPD was not likely to have a significant effect on the SPA or SAC. It is not considered that the SPD guides development within the village as it only addresses the design of development in different parts of the village. It is not considered that H8, which encourages access to the countryside, has an impact on the SPA as it is a "Further Initiative" and not a "Principle" which development would be subject to.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
David Cummings	<p>I am surprised that there is not more emphasis on the inadequacy of the junction of the M3 and the A322 Lightwater bypass. Traffic from Lightwater and the bypass has the lowest priority at this junction as can be seen by this being the only road with long tail backs in the morning and evening rush hour. Traffic leaving the M3 southbound and heading for Bracknell frequently blocks the exit from the A322 over complete changes in the traffic light cycle. This created the long tailbacks and forces people into rat running through the village and</p>	<p>Noted. Comments regarding traffic and highway safety have been passed onto the Surrey County Council Transportation Department.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>also village residents to drive through Windlesham to approach the junction from the north adding several miles to journeys with increase environment and local impact. Unlike the south bound access from the A322 to the M3 there is no dedicated lane for traffic bound for the southbound M3 forcing this traffic to wait in the queue of traffic bound for Bracknell and the M3 northbound. This is a major issue that should be emphasised more in the statement. I also believe that the inadequate and unsafe accesses to Red Road, which are well emphasised in the document is the other vital traffic issue for the village. One has to ask why so much money has been spent on traffic lights and roundabouts on the A322 through West End and Bisley while nothing is done about the Red Road exits. Otherwise the statement is an excellent document and the authors are to be congratulated.</p>		
Mr Donald Fraser	<p>Lightwater boundary:- Is there a definite boundary. Scope of intended design/planning:- Is it intended to limit to the village or to include some surroundings? Land availability:- Is there any remaining land for new houses? Population and housing need:- Is there any need for increasing? Car parking:- There does not seem to be any land available for new car parks. Village centre:- There does not seem to be any land available for new development such as more shops, pubs, restaurants, etc. Planning etc.:- I consider most new buildings to be pleasing in appearance and probably well designed. This is presumably due to the efforts of the architects, developers, private effort and the influence of Surrey Heath Planning Department. I suggest that existing planning powers are adequate. Plans/drawings:- The plans accompanying the documents are too small and not clear. Public transport:- There is obviously only bus transport. I believe that the buses not being particularly filled with passengers. Steps must be taken to continuance and financing of the service. Sports ground in the country park:- The ground is extremely hard and dangerous for rugby or football players. A good layer of topsoil, adequate drainage and fencing to prevent soiling by dogs and other animals are needed. In my younger days I played rugby on many pitches in Scotland and England and never encountered the above mentioned problems and if I was asked to play on such a</p>	<p>Agreed that references should be clearer as to where the Built Environment Design Principles for "All Areas" and for the "South and West of the Village Centre" apply to. Insert text at the beginning of section 5 "The Built Environment" to clarify where the Design Principles for "All Areas" and for the "South and West of the Village Centre" apply to. Rearrange the position of the Design Principles within section 5 so that they follow on directly from their explanatory text.</p> <p>The SPD does not address issues of allocations for housing and car parking. These will be addressed in due course in the preparation of other Local Development Documents in the Local Development Framework. It is currently difficult to achieve additional public parking through a lack of public land available on which to locate parking. The potential to improve public parking will be examined in the event that any significant redevelopment proposal comes forward. Further Initiative H9 refers to encouraging a further study to examine car parking in the village. The plans are considered to be clear enough for the purpose of a design guide. Comments regarding public transport have been passed onto the Surrey County Council Transportation Department. Comments regarding the sports ground in the Country Park have been passed onto Lightwater Leisure Centre. Comments regarding flood defences have been passed to the Council's Drainage</p>	<p>Amend.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>playing field I was have refused. Flood control:- There seems to be no purpose in flood risk assessment. We know the flood risks from actual events described in the Environmental Agency's Flood Event Report regarding the flooding during 13 & 14 August 2006. What is wanted is investigation and action to improve the existing situation. I understand that Surrey Heath Borough Council does not take part in administering flooding prevention and drainage. As there several responsibilities covered by the water company, the county highways and the Environment Agency some positive co-ordination is necessary. I have taken some interest in possible remedial work at low cost and would be pleased to discuss with those responsible.</p>	<p>Engineer, Thames Water Utilities and the Environment Agency. The Council is actively considering what measures can be put in place to alleviate the future risk of flooding. Mitigation measures to control the risk of flooding are required for new development when determining planning applications where appropriate.</p>	
<p>Dr A Davis, Lightwater Surgery</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of Dr Newport and partners. We are the only GP surgery in Lightwater. We provide general practice doctors, midwifery, practice nursing, community nursing and health visiting services to Lightwater, Windlesham, West End and Bagshot. As a practice we were disappointed to read the proposed development plan and find no mention or provision was made for health care. We work from a pair of 1970s houses on All Saints Road and will shortly need to move to new premises. We would like priority to be given to any new planning application we make for a new health centre. We believe it is a priority for the village and a major benefit. It may have to be built on land currently used for other uses such as residential, business or agriculture. We hope that the planners will accept these changes of use to be useful to the village as a whole and support them. We would also like to be consulted if new nursing homes or residential care facilities are planned. These prove very costly to support in terms of medical and nursing visits. We get no extra funding for these and so in real terms they are a drain on the service we can provide to existing residents and patients of ours. One resident in a nursing home generates as much work as three families with small children. If a proposed facility were required locally then we would be able to support it, if not we would be in a position to know. In short prior to these developments being approved we would ask that the effects on the local health economy be taken into account. Finally, if there are to be any significant housing or commercial developments we would like the council to insist that</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD does not address issues of allocations or the provision of land for health facilities. These will be addressed in due course in the preparation of other Local Development Documents in the Local Development Framework.</p> <p>Any new planning applications for a new health centre or new nursing homes or residential care facilities will be considered in the light of planning policies at the time of determination.</p> <p>The Council's Planning Service is not able to make special arrangements to consult organisations over planning applications. However, all new applications are published on the Council's website.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>developers offer us some land in those developments to provide further medical facilities. Ideally this cost should then be paid by the developers. Such schemes exist in Bracknell Forest and have proved a great benefit to local residents.</p>		
<p>Cllr Timothy Dodds</p>	<p>I'm delighted that the final public meeting of the consultation phase of the Lightwater Village Design Statement – Supplementary Planning Document [SPD] was such a success. Both yourself and Cllr Stewart Stevenson deserve praise for conducting the meeting so successfully. I'm in full agreement with the idea and objectives of the LVDS, but feel the document does not put enough stress on two key issues, maintenance of local employment diversity and the need to mitigate the effects of flooding. Suggested additions to the SPD I offer the following suggestions and comments to add to this document.</p> <p>1. Greater consideration should be give to maintaining, and the potential expansion of business premises in Lightwater, and halting the loss of business premises to housing. Recent examples are: a. the loss of a garage / vehicle repair business next to the Post Office in Guildford Road - replaced by retirement flats b. the loss of light engineering business in Ridgeway Close - replaced by a gated development of town houses c. planning application for a 70 bed care home at Silicon Valley in Lightwater Road. 2. Section 5 of the SPD describes the design issues but in section B5 does not mention the need to retain commercial premises to retain mixed employment opportunities within the Village. I should like to see an additional requirement in section B to provide for the retention of land use for commercial purposes. a. Local employment adds enormously to the social cohesion of a community. Protecting the look and feel of the village is all well and good, but, if we're continually losing business premises to conversion to flats and care homes the Village will become nothing more than a dormitory and retirement village. b. I'm keen to halt any further conversion of business premises to housing. I'm also keen to promote diversity in business in Lightwater village centre, believing it to contribute to making Lightwater more independent from surrounding towns and villages.</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD does not address the issue of local employment provision as it focuses on design. Employment provision is addressed by current Local Plan policy which is being reviewed through the preparation of other Local Development Documents in the Local Development Framework. These comments will be taken into account in this review.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>3. As the profile of Lightwater continues to change – with an increase in an older population – greater emphasis should be placed on necessary additions to the Village centre, such as the provision of public toilets, directional signs to such as the overflow car park behind the church, and a greater connectedness between the facilities - such as access to the Library.</p> <p>4. In section 6 I'd like to see greater emphasis on mitigation of flooding. Please refer to note 7 below. Point 6.2 rightly describes residents concerns. I would like to add to the principles and initiatives section: a. Provision of temporary storage areas to which floodwater could be pumped b. Inclusion of balancing ponds in all future developments c. Clearer identification of existing gullies and watercourses and inclusion of requirements to fulfil maintenance of such during the planning approval process d. Minimisation of driveway water run-off through effective design. Suggested additions to the Sustainability Appraisal Report I offer the following suggestions and comments to add to this document.</p> <p>5. Section 1.2 [of the SA] mentions the need to assess the economic effects on the implementation of the SPD. Because of the lack of specific mention of retention and/or expansion of commercial activity in the Village item 28 in Appendix 6 states there will be no effect if an SPD is or isn't prepared. This makes my point perfectly. 6. Therefore, in tables 4.48 and 4.58 I would like to see the addition of an additional item, as follows: a. Number 29 – To recognise and potentially reduce the impact of loss of local employment occurring in any change of use of land from commercial activity to housing. 7. With regard to flooding, point 8 is well specified. But it could go further, and include the points I made in 4a – 4d above. Also, I would like to see H4 in the SPD 'beefed-up', by including some of the words in point 8, such as 'Where development occurs ... it should contain sustainable urban drainage design. Conclusion To restate my reason for this submission, it is simply to ensure that Lightwater continues to offer mixed employment opportunities to residents of all ages, thereby adding to social cohesion and local vitality, along with a</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD does not address the issue of the provision of public toilets as it focuses on design. These comments have been passed onto the Council's Environmental Services. The provision of directional signs and opening up access routes within the village is a matter for private landowners or the highway authority. Comments regarding directional signs have been passed onto the Surrey County Council Transportation Department.</p> <p>Comments regarding flood defences have been passed to the Council's Drainage Engineer, Thames Water Utilities and the Environment Agency. The Council is actively considering what measures can be put in place to alleviate the future risk of flooding. Mitigation measures to control the risk of flooding are required for new development when determining planning applications where appropriate. The focus of the SPD is design: flood risk is addressed through other policy documents. However, para 6.2 could be amended to raise awareness of other measures which can be put in place to mitigate against the risk of flooding.</p> <p>Noted. The SA Objectives were agreed by the Council in 2004 for use in the Sustainability Appraisal of all Local Development Documents. At this stage it is not possible to amend these objectives as it may lead to inconsistencies in assessments. However, this will be noted and taken into account when such a time comes to review the objectives.</p> <p>Agreed that the detailed indicators for SA Objective 8 be amended to include a general reference to other measures.</p> <p>The potential to require Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) in new development is being considered as part of the preparation of other Local Development Documents in the Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Amend.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Amend.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>greater recognition of the effects of flooding and how this should be an important item in any planning application acceptance. At the recent public consultation evening, two wheelchair-bound Lightwater residents, a Mr & Mrs Braine, approached me about an apparent inconsistency in the SPD. The inconsistency is in Appendix 2.2(d), and is the mentioning of disabled access in the 'Where are we now' section, while no mention is made of disabled access in the 'How do we achieve this goal?' section. At a recent committee meeting the Lightwater Business Association discussed the issue and resolved that it should be amended. Please therefore, amend the third bullet point in the 'How do we achieve this goal?' to read as follows: "Review parking, traffic flow, pedestrian movement, and disabled access" I make this submission on behalf of the Lightwater Business Association of which I am a committee member.</p>	<p>Appendix 2.2(d) gives a record of the views of the Lightwater Business Association (LBA) to the consultation exercise originally undertaken by the Village Design Statement Local Steering Group. The reference to the need to improve disabled access will be recorded in Appendix 2.2(d) which will be included in the separately published consultation statement to accompany the adopted version of the SPD. .</p>	<p>Amend.</p>
<p>Mr Blake</p>	<p>Broadly speaking I am in agreement with the principles outlined in the Village Design Statement. However, the expression 'mechanisms to achieve a parking solution' gives me some cause for concern, page 22 H9. If the intention would be the introduction of parking charges, that is one thing to which I should be strongly opposed. On the other hand a time limit would be a different matter. An ongoing problem does exist with long-term parking of cars and other vehicles in Ambleside Road, Grasmere Road and Macdonald Road, with their junctions with Guildford Road which create a safety hazard. This would be overcome by imposing a 1 hour waiting limit over the first 100 yards. Also in Cophorne Drive with its junction with Grasmere Road for the first 50 yards.</p> <p>The recent development of flats in the Guildford Road, adjacent to the Post Office is a monstrosity which is in the wrong place and should never have been allowed. This land, which was once the site of Lintots petrol filling station and bus garage, should have been reserved for the much needed additional retail outlets. The list of small businesses in para 3.4 on page 7, and endorsed on page 26, is commendable. (My grandfather, Cephus Holmes, was the village greengrocer and florist from 1928 until he retired circa 1990, and his shop was where Deepcut Garage now stands). May I suggest one</p>	<p>Noted. It is currently difficult to achieve additional public parking through a lack of public land available on which to locate parking. The potential to improve public parking will be examined in the event that any significant redevelopment proposal comes forward. Further Initiative H9 refers to encouraging a further study to examine car parking in the village. The detailed management of any parking would be addressed when any parking comes forward. Comments regarding highway safety, car parking, and public transport have been passed onto the Surrey County Council Transportation Department.</p> <p>The SPD does not address the issue of local retail provision as it focuses on design. Retail provision is addressed by current Local Plan policy which is being reviewed through the preparation of other Local Development Documents in the Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	other absentee business which would be useful to the village, that of a retail television and audio shop. On page 27, under the heading "Highways and Byways", a call is made for more frequent public transport. A more frequent service to Frimley Park Hospital and Camberley Town would be welcome. However, in the opposite direction the service to Guildford is appalling and a direct route along the A322 would be a benefit rather than the tiresome jog around so many back streets and byways via Woking.		
Mr J Cheston, GOSE	There are no comments that we would wish to make in response.	Noted.	No change.
Ms Georgie Cook, Thames Water Property Services	Thames Water are the statutory sewerage undertaker for the Authority area. Thames Water are pleased to see that the issue of flooding has been briefly addressed within the document, however, flood risk needs to be taken into consideration also having regards to sewer flooding, as per Annex C of PPS25. It is important not only to consider the flood risk on sites within the flood plain but the flood risk off site as a result of development. It is essential to ensure sufficient off-site network capacity exists to serve any proposed development and that it will not cause flooding to any existing customers. Where capacity does not exist it is essential that it is provided ahead of the development to prevent flood risk from sewer flooding both on and off site.	The SPD focuses on design and only reflects the approach taken in other policy documents to minimise flood risk. For this reason, it is considered that Principle H4 adequately addresses issues of flood risk. Agreed that reference to sewerage flooding be included within the decision making criteria for SA Objective 8 and in Table 2: Sustainability issues and problems.	No change. Amend.
Mr & Mrs Bond	RED ROAD - A known dangerous road and therefore needs proper road markings. There are no markings on LEFT hand side after MacDonald Road area. Markings are old and are in need of painting. LIGHTWATER ROAD - Speed signs of 40mph are largely ignored. The road is in need of some sort of speed limiting before serious accidents occur. Congratulations on the excellent Lightwater Draft Supplement for the depth of research and information. Many thanks.	Noted. Comments regarding highway safety, and road markings have been passed to the Surrey County Council Transportation Department.	No change.
Mr J O'Brien	I was extremely impressed with the service I received (telephone follow up due to email address problem) from the planning department and particularly pleased to receive a colour hard copy as it provides interesting and excellent building history of the village. Most of my questions were addressed e.g. worry that the form of words "in keeping" would limit modern, leading edge design (as often	Noted. The SPD focuses on design. Policies to encourage the use of environmental initiatives such as wind turbines etc are being considered in the preparation of other Local Development Documents in the Local Development Framework. Comments regarding car parking and introducing one way traffic down All Saints Road and possibly the other centre roads have been passed onto the Surrey County Council	No change.

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	seen on Grand Designs, C4 TV) – but later modernity is embraced. Thus I can congratulate the planning team for a comprehensive and highly impressive set of documents. Two items remain in my mind; - can we not include content to encourage more environmental initiatives e.g. wind turbines, solar panels and alike plus use of local and sustainable materials. Car parking – can we look at making the All Saints Road one way and establish diagonal parking bays – thus increasing Ambleside available parking? We could be very radical and make all three sides one way and liberate on our community roads significant memorial additional parking?	Transportation Department.	
Mrs I Tutton- Torode	Noise – reducing tarmac on bypass. Cut down on the noise of cars, bikes, vans etc, speeding or noise reducing engines.	Noted. Comments regarding the highway have been passed onto the Surrey County Council Transportation Department.	No change.
Ms C Riddell, SEERA (South East England Regional Assembly)	The Assembly has no comments to make relating to this document. However, we would take this opportunity to remind you that your development plan documents should be in general conformity with the current Regional Spatial Strategy (RPG9) and also take into account the merging Draft South East Plan, Part 1 (Core Regional Policies).	Noted.	No change.
Mr P Chadwick	I've just read the draft Design Statement and echo a number of the requests (eg no more offices / flats in the centre and preservation on the green areas / parks. I have one additional suggestion - there are a number of requests for better car parking in the village centre - I would also request some provision for secure, covered parking for bicycles in the centre - ie a roof with bike racks so that you could securely chain your bike all day out of the rain. I would definitely use such a shelter - so avoiding driving into the centre of Lightwater at all on a number of occasions.	Noted. The request for secure bicycle storage area in village centre has been passed onto the Surrey County Council Transportation Department.	No change.
Mr M Harnden	I have now had an opportunity to review on your website the Lightwater Village Design Statement Plan 2 “Area of Lightwater Village Design Statement & Landscape Setting”. Your attention is drawn to the boundary line of Lightwater Country Park. An area to the south west of Curley Hill has been included within the Park Boundary that does not form a part of the Park. This area is registered under Title Number SY 443109 and is held jointly by Michael & Dorothy	Agreed. Plan 2 of the SPD and Plan 1 of the SA have been amended to exclude this area from the Country Park.	Amend.

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	Harnden of the above address		
Mr B Harrison	Thank you for drawing this important document to the attention of residents. For me, it read very well. To my mind the important issues are: •Positive action to restore more of a traditional feel to the village centre and particularly the shopping area •Addressing the awful parking in the village (where it seems to me that restrictions are widely flouted) •Protection of existing heath land and other green spaces from development •Strict controls over redevelopment to avoid increased density of housing •Improved facilities for teenagers. These issues were well covered by the document. The one thing that is less clear to me is whether the document will have teeth in preventing future actions that might appear to risk infringing some of the principles and how this will work in practice.	Noted. It is currently difficult to achieve additional public parking through a lack of public land available on which to locate parking. The potential to improve public parking will be examined in the event that any significant redevelopment proposal comes forward. Further Initiative H9 refers to encouraging a further study to examine car parking in the village. Comments regarding the improvement of facilities for teenagers have been passed onto the Council's Leisure Services Team and the Parish Council. The SPD will be taken into account when planning applications are determined.	No change.
Mrs S Bezodis	I have received the letter you sent regarding the future plans etc for Lightwater. On the whole the village is pretty good. Though the recycling behind Budgens could do with emptying more often. The bins seem to be overflowing all the time. Could you consider putting rubbish bins on the little green by the M3 junction. I know some people will never use them but hopefully some would. The green is 'cleared' once a week but its no sooner done than someone will throw something away on there. One thing that does need seeing to is the corner I am registered blind (though I can still see to some extent.) I walk my dog on that M3 green. Quite often when I go down to there (3 times a day) I have to pass cars that are parked on the pavement outside the Take – Away and the Dry Cleaners. I know that cars have to park somewhere but sometimes it is a maze. The cars are parked any old how. Would it be possible to either put posts around the area so as to block it all off completely or perhaps put a couple of parking bays there. I know the telephone box are in the way but I am sure your planners could work something out. One of the women who works in the cleaners parks her silver car out there, yet she only lives 2-3 minutes walk away in The Close. She walks occasionally but mostly uses her car. To the best of my knowledge she is not disabled.	Noted. Comments regarding recycling have been passed onto the Council's Environmental Services. Comments regarding placing posts or parking bays near the junction of The Avenue and Guildford Road have been passed onto Surrey County Council Transportation Department.	No change.
Mr D Russell	We refer to Plan 3 page 13 Heronscourt Lake, The name is incorrect. We are the owners of 2/3 of the lake and on our deeds it is	Noted. Colville Gardens is not mentioned as the SPD is not intended to comprehensively list all of the developments in the village. However,	Amend.

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>Lightwater Lake and has been since 1901. 2.7 page 5 Heronscourt Estate was not built on the grounds of Lightwater Manor, it was built on the grounds of Heronscourt. The history is as follows:- The lake was created in 1901 by Sir Henry Colville, the owner of Lightwater Manor and 27 acres. The property was sold in 1923 to Mrs Irene Roberts who created a new house in 1956, taking the title of Lightwater Manor with her. In 1958 she sold the old building plus 1/3 of the lake and called it Heronscourt, to Mr and Mrs Jennings. This was converted into six flats until demolished for development in the late 70s. In 1970 Mrs Roberts sold Lightwater Manor and its lake to Mr and Mrs D F Russell who lived there until 1987. In 1980 Colville Gardens, and phase 1 was built, consisting of twenty lakeside dwellings and nine adjacent houses who owners enjoy the pleasures of the lake. You do not mention this development in 2.7 page 5 or 4.5 page 11. Please correct the lake name and the omission of Colville Gardens.</p>	<p>the term "Lightwater Lake" will be used instead of "Heronscourt Lake" in Plan 3 and para 4.5.</p>	
Mrs A J Booty	<p>I live in Marshwood Road and my property backs on to the A322. This road is extremely noisy and destroys any enjoyment I can get from my garden. I have erected a sound proofing wall but as my neighbours don't have one it has made no difference. This road is getting noisier every year and making my life less and less pleasant as I have to stay inside even during summer months if I want to speak to anyone. I would like to stay where I am but have decided to try to move. I am unable to sell the house though as everyone hates the noise when they walk into the garden. Other towns have sound barriers erected to protect them from this type of hazard. Isn't it time that Lightwater had the same?</p>	<p>Noted. Comments regarding the possibility of erecting a sound barrier to protect properties that back onto the A322 have been passed onto the Surrey County Council Transportation Department.</p>	No change.
Mr J Bladon, CSJ Planning	<p>Land Use Designations, Lightwater Village Design Statement SPD. The following comments relate to the designation of land immediately North of High View Road, Lightwater. This land is currently designated as "Countryside Beyond the Green Belt" (Policy RE3) and "Potential Sites of Nature Conservation Importance" (Policy RE12) on the proposals map of the 2000 adopted Local Plan. The exclusion of this land from the settlement and therefore the Lightwater Village Design SPD is in our view a missed opportunity in terms of meeting the objectives of the Local Plan, the Lightwater SPD and indeed</p>	<p>Not agreed. The SPD does not address the designation of the settlement area of Lightwater. This issue will be addressed in due course in the preparation of Local Development Documents in the Local Development Framework.</p>	No change.

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>central government policy on the delivery of housing. We would recommend that land to the North of High View road be included for the following reasons: a) Despite ecological surveys beginning in 1995, the Surrey Wildlife Trust is still yet to conduct such a study of this area, over six years after the adoption of the Local Plan. It is considered that this is an unjustifiable amount of time to safeguard a site without sufficient evidence for doing so. b) There is already development on this site, albeit at a low density that does not conform to the usual character of this area of the village – as described in section 5b of the Lightwater Village Design Statement (hereafter LVDS). c) Section 5.10 of the LVDS (Design Issues of the South and West of the Village Centre) establishes that “there is potential for development and infilling on some of the older, lower density areas such as on Ambleside and MacDonald Roads”. High View Road has similar if not greater potential for such development. d) Emphasis is placed on resisting the over-development of sites in Policy B2 of the LVDS, instead suggesting that lower-density areas are the most appropriate for infill development. e) Policy B1 of the LVDS asserts that “new development should pay regard to the locally distinctive and valued patterns of development”, including “the size of building plots” and “the spaces between buildings”. This suggests that intensification along High View Road would be an excellent opportunity to integrate it fully into the aforementioned traditional patterns of development. I hope these comments will be considered in regard to the planning and enhancement of Lightwater.</p>		
Ms Whitelock	<p>Page 7, para 3.4 Local consultation questionnaire revealed many residents in Lightwater wanted another restaurant and pub in the village as well as other amenities. What questionnaire? We cannot recall having received a questionnaire on Lightwater village? We have 2 clubs, a pub which serves meals and Lightwater Leisure Centre as well as 6 different takeaway places plus another one in Budgens, so why on earth do we need another pub and restaurant, and if we did have these, where are they going to be located? Not, I hope, a restaurant where Alldays used to be especially as permission for a restaurant there has already been refused. Lightwater does not need another pub either. You state in your information packs you</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD focuses on design and does not address the issue of retail provision in the village. This issue will be addressed in due course in the preparation of Local Development Documents in the Local Development Framework.</p> <p>Comments regarding flood defences have been passed to the Council's Drainage Engineer, Thames Water Utilities and the Environment Agency. The Council is actively considering what measures can be put in place to alleviate the future risk of flooding. Mitigation measures to control the risk of flooding are required for new development when determining planning applications where appropriate.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>want to keep a 'village' environment - so let's keep it a 'village'. No more developments whether it be private, council, commercial or otherwise. Certain areas of Lightwater are susceptible to flooding, as stated on page 22, and if any more developments take place, where is all the surface water going to go? Most of the culverts are totally inadequate now to cope with rainfall and should be constructed on a larger scale. Why was the appropriate authority not more insistent with builders and developers in the past to ensure that this was so? If the culverts were larger, surface water would not be a problem. Any more developments and the whole of Lightwater will become a swamp. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH and Lightwater has already been developed to saturation point. In the 34 years we have lived in Lightwater, Ambleside Road has never been re-surfaced and the pavements also are disgusting. When can we expect improvements to 'Shambleside Road' as the residents have named it, so we do not have to walk or drive over something like a ploughed field? Why is Ambleside Road the poor relation when it comes to improvements? Every other road in Lightwater seems to have work done, why not Ambleside? Is there going to be something going on in the future that is a secret and we do not yet know about, and when we do know it will be too late to do anything about it, AS USUAL? It will be interesting to read the minutes of the meeting being held on the 9th August 2007 at All Saints Church Hall, Lightwater. Please inform us when and where we can view these.</p>	<p>Comments regarding the re-surfacing of Ambleside Road have been passed to Surrey County Council Transportation Department.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Mr & Mrs Braine</p>	<p>H3, page 22 - we think the final two words [as appropriate] should be deleted as it is always appropriate to encourage inclusive design. H7, page 22 - we think the two final words should be deleted as they are superfluous. Lightwater Business Association, page 28d - As there appeared to be a difference in the 'Where are we now' and the 'How do we achieve this goal?' sections we contacted the LBA who agreed to rectify this by adding 'Improve disabled access' to their list of goals. We hope that by now they have done this.</p>	<p>Not agreed. The term "inclusive design" refers to a broad range of features to improve access, for example for the disabled, some of which exceed standards currently required. An element of flexibility is therefore required in allowing to what degree developments are encouraged to be inclusive.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Mr Roy Hammond</p>	<p>In proposing the following alterations (shown in quotation "" marks), I have in mind...adding a two storey building into a neighbourhood of bungalows could spoil the privacy enjoyed by the new and existing residents in their properties: new higher-level buildings could</p>	<p>Not agreed. Principle B8 allows for the development of single storey buildings, already takes account of the spacious character of areas. Other policies and principles allow for wildlife to be protected.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>overlook bungalows and their grounds. Local wildlife should be protected by avoiding any unnecessary destruction of the existing greenery (shrubs, trees, hedges etc.) or the topography (hills, dells, banks etc.). Such additional constraints will maintain, if not enhance, the amenities enjoyed by both the existing and the new residents in their properties. For the South and West of the Village Centre B8 - New development should have regard to the following criteria: a) Consist principally of "single and" two-storey buildings, "consistent with other buildings in the vicinity: the aim being to enhance the visual amenities and comparative seclusion of each property in that vicinity". b) Respect the spacious character of the residential areas through reflecting "the local topography", the predominant depths of front gardens and, the size and frequency of gaps between houses. c) Development should incorporate front boundary treatments, particularly through the use of hedges, unless it comprises a redevelopment within an existing open-plan estate. d) Substantial landscaping through trees, shrubs and hedges should be provided, "consistent with maintaining the visual amenities of the existing landscape, and protecting the local wildlife".</p>		
Mr A S Wilsdon	<p>1) Congratulations on an excellent document. It only lacks to my mind that certain locations in the area receive little discussion. Perhaps they wish to be hidden [e.g. the cemetery off the Avenue or privately owned land]. However, that means there is no indication as to whether they are vulnerable to development. 2) Could anything be said against security gated houses/communities springing up, we do not need them in a low crime area?</p>	<p>Not agreed. Principles B1-B4 address all areas within the village. The SPD provides design guidance and does not address site specific allocations. The question of gated communities is addressed in other planning documents.</p>	No change.
Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth	<p>Sustainable objectives (Page 12) 4.17 housing prices too high 4.26 Biodiversity protect SPA's & SNCI sites no building within 5km so that heath land species will not be disturbed but will be a problem if people are diverted to new open spaces to find the new open spaces. 4.40 Flooding - seals for air bricks a good idea for danger of immediate flooding. As you said at the meeting driveways should have drainage to alleviate flooding. 4.45 Lack of car parking - could have gravel car parks if possible to</p>	<p>Not agreed. Paragraph 4.18 adequately reflects this point. Not agreed. The SPD provides design guidance. Any proposal which may have an effect on the SPA is addressed through other policy documents. This section demonstrates the baseline situation and helps to identify issues and problems for the village. Detailed flood prevention measures are a solution to the flooding problems identified. In any case, it is not appropriate to address such detailed measures in this SPD or SA report.</p>	<p>No change. No change. No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>avoid flooding.</p> <p>Sustainable Issues (Table 2) 4.49 too many flats or offices - wildlife corridors by landscaping will help biodiversity because insects as well as animals and birds are interdependent - use of local plants as well.</p> <p>Table 3 - Sustainable Objectives 8 - SUD's - due to climate change more attention must be given to this. Also I think it is important in times of high rainfall to save water because people won't bother because they think there is plenty of water about. The reason why they should save water is because of the extra load it places on the drainage system.</p> <p>SA Scoping Report appendix Green roofing will increase biodiversity but I don't know what the technicalities connected with this i.e. any problems associated with it. (Page 62) - Footpaths- cycling is important, walking and cycling are good for your health and public transport means less traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Noted. The SA report made recommendations to amend the SPD to include reference to wildlife corridors and the use of native local species to improve the SPDs performance against biodiversity SA objectives. However, these points were not included within the SPD as it was felt that they were beyond the scope of the SPD and would be addressed in detail in other DPDs/SPDs.</p> <p>Noted. The use of SUDs and other water saving measures will be addressed in more detail in the DC Policies DPD.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The DC Policies DPD will address these issues in greater detail.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Mr Arliss	<p>A commendable endeavour to improve the otherwise rather uninspiring village in which we live. However, I feel that without encouraging a sense of social responsibility, any cosmetic improvements will achieve little. There is a need to inspire/motivate residents to respect their environment, fellow villagers & the law. This applies from car parking to countryside code. If the following comments are felt not to be relevant to the Lightwater Village Design Statement perhaps they could be passed to the relevant Local or Central Authority.</p> <p>Village Centre & Traffic a. Car Parking: A difficult problem but one which is discouraging the commercial use of the village; it is becoming easier to go elsewhere. (Bistros & Tea Rooms have not survived in times when the village</p>	<p>Noted. It is currently difficult to achieve additional public parking through a lack of public land available on which to locate parking. The potential to improve public parking will be examined in the event that any</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Name/ Company	Response	Officer Comment	Action
	<p>could accommodate the traffic. Ref 3.3/3.4).</p> <p>B. Car parking in front gardens, for houses close to the village centre, is infinitely preferable to parking on-road to the further detriment of local businesses.</p> <p>C. Drive entrances. Planners should insist that 'gated' entrances are set back from the highway to enable vehicles to leave the road when stopping to open and shut gates (already a legal requirement?), rather than blocking the congested traffic flow.</p> <p>Development Area: The exclusion of areas such as High View Road from sensitive low density development is denying the chance to meet, at least in a small part, the Borough's Housing Needs. This could be easily & sympathetically achieved without replicating the disproportionate high density & volume of recent building on sites adjacent to this area. It should be noted that in correspondence in Oct 2004 with, English Nature it was stated that as a result of the CROW Act 2000 it is not possible to ban walkers with dogs, on or off lead, from Lightwater Country Park. The effect on ground nesting birds within the spurious SPA should be recognised by the appropriate authorities.</p> <p>Littering and Fly-tipping: There is much talk of the value of the less developed areas of Lightwater and yet a noticeable number of those who actually use these areas appear to care very little. Some walkers, dog walkers, and other drivers on High View Road regularly clear rubbish from their vehicles at the road-head. Even when cleared-up by residents the same sad state returns within the month. The poor state of Notices and By-laws (recently cleaned by residents), like "ignored graffiti", only encourages the litter-louts whose debris includes alcohol and cordial cans & bottles, paper & wrappings, condoms, & bagged dog faeces. The most recent dumping of builders material was Sat 25 August 07.</p>	<p>significant redevelopment proposal comes forward. Noted. Current transportation policies encourage off-street parking.</p> <p>The siting of gated entrances is addressed when redevelopment proposals come forward.</p> <p>The SPD provides design guidance. Other Local Development Documents in the Local Development Framework will address issues the designation of the village boundary and housing allocations.</p> <p>The current management of the Country Park is in accordance with its SPA status. Any future review of its management will continue to take account of its SPA status.</p> <p>These concerns have been passed to the Council's Environmental Services.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Additional Comments made by Council officers and Responses

Response	Officer Comment/ Recommendation	Action
Is it clear how the SPD addresses those housing areas outside the settlement area boundary? Should the South and West of the Village Centre description be changed as these principles also refer to all areas outside the Village Centre within the built up area and not just to the south and west?	Agreed. Insert text at the beginning of section 5 "The Built Environment" to clarify where the Design Principles for "All Areas" and for the "South and West of the Village Centre" apply to. Rearrange the position of the Design Principles within section 5 so that they follow on directly from their explanatory text.	Amend.
Lightwater Stream to the east of Guildford Road should be shown within the flood zone.	Agreed. Plan 6 to be amended to show the alignment of Lightwater Stream within the flood zone.	Amend.

APPENDIX 4 – Consultation prior to the publication of the Draft SPD Supplementary Planning Document

4.1 Introduction

The following section sets out how the local Steering Group engaged with stakeholders and the community prior to the formal consultation stage on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document. In doing this, the Local Steering Group were advised by Council officers.

4.2 Lightwater Village Design Statement Consultation Exercise by the Local Steering Group

(a) Consultation Process in 2005

February	<p>Letter sent to Lightwater Borough Councillors, Windlesham Parish Councillors, Lightwater Associations including: Lightwater Business Association; Darby and Joan Club; Lightwater WI; Lightwater Gardening Club; Lightwater Care; Lightwater Village School; Hammond School; All Saints' Parochial Church Council and Members of Lightwater Traffic Action Committee inviting them to the first Committee Meeting in March.</p> <p>Five of six Windlesham Parish Councillors joined the Committee and the Parish Clerk received copies of each monthly Committee Meeting Minutes.</p>
April	<p>Meeting with Headmistresses of Lightwater Village School and Hammond School and Governor of Hammond School to ask for the children's involvement in the LVDS document.</p>
May	<p>Article in Camberley News describing how Committee started and its aims.</p> <p>Questionnaire sent to households in Lightwater advising the contents of a Village design statement and asking for comments to be included in the LVDS document. Collection boxes for Questionnaires sited at Budgens, the Post Office, Bron's Newsagent and the Church Fete.</p> <p>Stall at Lightwater Church Fete with display of historical photographs of Lightwater and pictures and stories written by Lightwater school children. Villagers returned Questionnaires to a collection box</p> <p>Stall erected outside Budgens with posters advertising the LVDS and additional questionnaires handed out to Villagers who had not yet completed one. The Treasurer informed Villagers of the activities of the LVDS Committee and asked for Villagers' involvement.</p> <p>Advertisement placed on Surrey Heath Borough Council's website to invite Lightwater Villagers to attend the June Exhibition. Camberley News invited to attend June Exhibition.</p> <p>Large display area advertising June Exhibition in Budgens.</p>
June	<p>Posters placed around Lightwater inviting Villagers to attend Exhibition on 28 June. Borough Councillors and Parish Councillors invited to attend</p> <p>June Exhibition. Article in "Roundabout" Magazine publicising June Exhibition.</p>

Exhibition held at All Saints' Church Community Hall. Opened by The Mayor of Surrey Heath Borough Council. Guest Speakers were: John Dawson, Principal Planning Officer of Surrey Heath Borough Council and Graham Hodgson, Director of Transport for Surrey County Council.

Synopsis of LVDS document published on Lightwater Village website with questionnaire and request for comments for inclusion in the final document.

- July All future publicity material contains Lightwater Village website address to allow Lightwater Villagers to access progress of LVDS document and find out dates of Committee Meetings. Future Committee Meeting dates and October Exhibition publicised on Lightwater Village website to obtain Villagers' involvement in LVDS.
- August Posters placed in Lightwater shops to advertise the Exhibition on 4 October.
- Article in "Roundabout" Magazine publicising details of the Exhibition held in June, the future work of the Committee and an invitation to the October Exhibition.
- September Letter sent to Alan Peirce, Surrey County Councillor, Lightwater Borough Councillors and one Windlesham Parish Councillor inviting them to join the Committee and attend future meetings and Exhibition in October. Letter sent to remaining Windlesham Parish Councillors asking for their continued support on the Committee and inviting them to October Exhibition.
- Advertisement placed on Surrey Heath Borough Council's website to invite Lightwater Villagers to attend the October Exhibition.
- Article in "Camberley News" regarding Community Funding applied for and details of October Exhibition. Article in the Lightwater Church Magazine – 'Roundabout'.
- Two banners erected to invite Villagers to the October Exhibition.
- October Exhibition held at All Saints' Church Community Hall. Draft document available for inspection and comments.
- An article appeared in Camberley News. An article appeared in "Heathscene". Article in the Lightwater Church Magazine – Roundabout'.
- November Consultation process ended. Article in the Lightwater Church Magazine – 'Roundabout'.
- December Committee agreement on wording of document. Article in the Lightwater Church Magazine – 'Roundabout'.

(b) Results of the Questionnaire in the Local Consultation Exercise

In 2005 households in Lightwater (and non-residents working in the village) were given the opportunity to contribute to the Village Design Statement by completing a questionnaire. The main results of the survey are summarised under the three headings below.

Popular Features of Lightwater

- The main attractions of Lightwater are its convenient location for transport, its Village atmosphere, its broad range of amenities, the Lightwater Country Park, Lightwater's position for access to the countryside, as well as its own trees and flowers, and its perception as a clean, tidy and safe environment.
- Of the buildings of Lightwater, the favourite is the Church, followed by the Village's traditional houses and cottages, traditional shops and schools), and new houses, flats and shops. Other, individual buildings were also mentioned.
- Features of the Village which residents want to keep are its wide range of shops, open spaces, the Country Park, the Church and War Memorial, the general look of the Village, and the library.
- Residents were asked about their favourite walks in and around Lightwater. These are the Country Park, Windlesham Arboretum, Turf Hill Park, Macdonald and Ambleside Roads and Curley Hill.

Aspects of Lightwater which are Disliked.

- The most unpopular feature is the over-development of the Village, particularly with respect to the excessive numbers of office buildings and flats. Many shops and other buildings are also considered to be unattractive.
- Inadequate parking facilities are often mentioned.
- The type and style of some of Lightwater's shops comes in for criticism, with frequent mention of the high number of estate agents and other inappropriate shops for a Village.
- The high volume of traffic.
- Reasons which would make residents leave Lightwater are the traffic, increased housing density, changes in family circumstances, retirement, and the cost of living.

Improvements and Desired Developments in Lightwater

- Respondents would like to see more traditionally designed houses and cottages in the Village, and more trees, shrubs and flowering areas.
- In terms of replicating what exists elsewhere, residents want better amenities, particularly specialist shops (e.g. baker, greengrocer, florist) and cafes or restaurants improved roads and pavements, and more places to socialise.
- The following list of improvements which residents want in Lightwater received a high proportion of responses. Improved car-parking in the centre of the Village, better facilities for pedestrians, particularly a crossing for Guildford Road, control of traffic in the Village, better quality shops and amenities, and houses as opposed to flats.
- When asked about "acceptable" new development, most respondents want no more development, and especially not offices or flats. If there is to be development, then what is wanted are: restaurants, pubs or other eating places, houses or cottages affordable to young people, recreational facilities (including a swimming pool, facilities for young people, and public conveniences) and car parks.

(c) Combined June & October 2005 Graffiti Wall Analysis in the Local Consultation Exercise

Summary of Villagers' Comments from the Exhibition held on 28 June and 4 October 2005.

Lightwater Village

Need another pub/restaurant/bistro/family pub
Use wheelie bins for recycling
More facilities for young people
Improve attractiveness of The Village Square
Hanging baskets much appreciated – pity about the appearance of the remainder of the village
Enlarge the Christmas Fayre in the Square
Provide free transport for pupils of Collingwood School
More frequent police patrols

Buildings and Street-scene

Ensure that new development does not out-strip the infra-structure (doctors, dentists, schools and car-parking)
Restrict development of new flats to two storeys
Restrict further development of flats in the Village centre
Too many offices and flats – not enough shops
Increase car parking before further development is considered
I like the style of the tall ornate lights in the Village
Design of new developments to complement existing buildings

Highways and Byways

Improve car-parking/installation of car park
Put in more traffic-calming measures
Improve the safety of access points to Red Road – possibly a roundabout
Install pedestrian crossings. Suggested locations are: outside Village School; All Saints' Church and Guildford Road between Broadway Road and Lightwater Road
Improve facilities for the disabled (provide parking in Village centre and identify dropped kerbs to prevent parking over these)
Enforcement of yellow lines in Village Centre
Herringbone parking & landscaping in front of shops
More speed controls on Ambleside Road & Guildford Road
Improve street-lighting
Provide more frequent public transport
Noise-reducing tarmac on bypass
Improve road surfaces in village
Divert large vehicles from Red Road to A30

(d) Lightwater Business Association Feedback

Where are we now?

- Losing trade
- In-adequate parking for both vehicles and cycles
- Access for delivery vehicles is difficult
- Poor pedestrian access, both footpaths and walkways
- Difficult disabled access
- Generally poor appearance of the Village shopping centre
- Low awareness of Lightwater commercially
- Limited public transport
- Staff recruitment and retention issues, related to poor local facilities and public transport
- Lack of facilities; toilets, cafes and/or restaurants
- Some businesses are reviewing their presence in Lightwater
- Incidents of crime and vandalism detrimental to both residents and commerce
- Limited range of retail outlets does not encourage shoppers, nor indeed retail developers

Where would we like to be?

- To see Lightwater established as a lively, active, attractive viable commercial centre for business and residents alike.

How do we achieve this goal?

- An active Business Association
- Working with Parish, Borough and County Councils and the Local Community.
- Review parking, traffic flow, pedestrian movement and Improve disabled access.
- Improve visual amenities
- Further improvement to village policing. Significant improvements have been made over the recent past
- CCTV