



CHOBHAM PARISH COUNCIL

The Clerk, Chobham Parish Pavilion, Recreation Ground, Station Road
Chobham, Woking, Surrey GU24 8AJ

Tel: 01276 856633

Email: planning@chobhamparishcouncil.org Website: www.chobhamparishcouncil.org

31st December 2019

Development Control
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Knoll Road
Camberley
Surrey
GU15 3HD

By email: development.control@surreyheath.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

LETTER OF OBJECTION

**18/0642 FAIROAKS AIRPORT, CHERTSEY ROAD, CHOBHAM, WOKING, GU24 8HU
CONSULTATION ON AMENDMENTS**

Further to Chobham Parish Council's letters of 21st November 2018 and 29th April 2019 detailing objections to the above application, the Council has reviewed the re-consultation material and has set out additional comments below. The Council wishes to make it clear that its earlier objections still stand, and all comments in this letter are to be read in conjunction with the aforementioned previous correspondence.

The Council reiterates its overriding objection that the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt and no very special circumstances are demonstrated that would justify the inappropriateness and resulting harm to the Green Belt.

Application amendments

The amendments to the application fail to address the vast majority of objections raised in the previous consultation round, and only serve to make the application weaker in terms of considering the planning balance, including the following:

- more built volume;
- less public open space;

- fewer net additional jobs proposed, despite greater non-residential space;
- reduced heritage value (already negligible);
- less affordable housing;
- older population balance;
- less sustainable;
- reduced self-sufficiency;
- greater impact on Chobham;
- increased ambiguity regarding SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space); management; and
- increased ambiguity regarding provision of transport services.

The Parish Council has considered each of the amendments highlighted in the consultation letter summary and its comments are set out below:

1. An increase in D2 Floorspace to accommodate gymnastics/acrobatics club Prime Acrobatics (subject to legal agreement) in the Village Core

The proposed 2,329 sqm increase in D2 floorspace is outside of the Major Developed Site area of the airport. The Very Special Circumstances Addendum fails to present any very special circumstances that would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. There appears to be no alternative site assessment for Prime Acrobatics or justification as to why the requirement could not be met within the previously applied for 62,675 sqm of non-residential floorspace.

Statements made indicate that the facility would intend to draw visitors from a catchment area reaching far outside of the Fairoaks site, and even internationally. This appears to be in contradiction to the self-sufficiency and sustainability claims throughout the application material. It is contended that, as with other leisure facilities in the area, the majority of visitors to such a facility would rely on use of the private motor vehicle for their journeys. The proposal to bring forward a longer section of link road from the A319 to allow access to Prime Acrobatics from the start of the development appears to encourage travel by car (no public transport seems to be proposed at this stage), with the pedestrian routes and cycleway portion of the link road unlikely to offer any benefit for potential customers travelling to the facility.

2. Increase indicative mix of C3/C2 elderly accommodation from 60 to 100 units

It appears that the increase in proposed elderly accommodation from the original application was informed by greater interest expressed over an increased number of units by potential occupants of the care home. Chobham Parish Council has previously raised the issue of there being no standard General Practitioner (GP) surgery or cemetery proposed for the site. The lack of these facilities would be even more significant if the average age of residents were to increase. There is also considerable uncertainty as to where the residents would access GP services (further comments on this subject in point 13 below).

It is noted that the up to 100 units designed for older people are proposed to be provided in the centre of the village, opposite the proposed primary school. There are safety concerns about a large group of potentially vulnerable residents' homes being concentrated in a single area.

While the application material gives focus to affordable homes for young people and the working population, it is not immediately clear what percentage of the up to 100 units designed for older people are to be affordable homes. Nor is it clear what minimum age threshold is proposed for the elderly accommodation.

3. Decrease indicative mix of C3 residential units from 940 dwellings to 900 dwellings

It is unclear what evidence has informed the decrease in this segment of the housing mix other than to balance interest from potential care home occupiers as noted above. It also appears that overall, the number of affordable homes will be reduced from 50% to 45% in the amended plans.

4. Reduce SANG/Public Open Space by 0.7ha

It is noted that while the D2 floorspace is proposed to be increased by 2,329 sqm, the SANG/Public Open Space has been reduced by 7,000 sqm in the amended plans. This is a significant net reduction of open space since the original application.

There remains considerable ambiguity around whether the SANG is intended as a bespoke SANG to serve the Fairoaks site, or is proposed to serve in part as a strategic SANG for a wider area. Claims that "the excess SANG would meet the SANG requirements for approximately 1,456 dwellings elsewhere" appear to again conflict with the principle of self-sufficiency for the site, as SANG visitors from elsewhere would in all likelihood travel to the site by private motor vehicle.

Responsibility for maintenance in perpetuity of the SANG, previously proposed to be a key function of the Fairoaks Community Trust, now appears to be uncertain with no management organisation identified. Chobham has seen the SANG land associated with the recent Little Heath Nursery development left abandoned despite a legal agreement being in place and despite the Parish Council bringing this to the local authority's attention for over a year. The lack of identified responsibility around such an essential part of the application does nothing to inspire confidence that the same situation would not recur.

The application material mentions in at least two places that the minimum requirement is for 1.8ha of bespoke SANG per 1,000 of new population. This is incorrect; Surrey Heath's minimum requirement, in line with Natural England's guidelines, is for at least 8ha per 1,000 head of population.

Chobham Parish Council has previously set out a number of objections in relation to the unsuitability of the site as a SANG, including the risk that it may drive additional visitors towards the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) rather than divert them away. In addition to the objections set out in paragraph B8 of its letter of 29th April 2019, the Parish Council would also like to add that the noise from helicopter movements is likely to deter visitors from

enjoying the SANG and potentially lead them to seek alternative sites, including the SPA, for recreation.

5. Change of Description of Development to allow for the use of the Pillbox and Blister Hangar to become SANG Maintenance stores

Notwithstanding the Parish Council's wider objection on the subject of the airport's legacy and heritage, these two buildings were proposed to be retained as significant features for their heritage value from the site's airport use. The proposed use as maintenance stores offers little to no value as a heritage asset, and fails to provide either public access or interest. No restoration, enhancement or conservation scheme appears to be proposed, and no long term commitment to prevent neglect and possible future loss of these buildings.

With the blister hangar no longer proposed for equestrian use and no equivalent alternative set out, the overall equestrian strategy for the site (which was already vague) appears to be further diminished.

6. Minor amendments to the Phasing Plan

The September 2019 exhibition material stated "amendments to the phasing to improve speed of delivery" but the overall speed of delivery (ten years) appears unchanged. The speed of delivery of each phase remains unclear.

The application should not be considered without a much more detailed timetable of phasing. The three phases are simplistic and offer little assurance that the right infrastructure would be in place before it is needed. The proposed order of construction should be made absolutely clear with detailed sub-phases together with appropriate legal agreements and conditions.

The non-delivery or delayed delivery of key parts of the application remains a concern. Poor and vague construction phasing could have wide-ranging negative implications on existing residents in the area, who already deal with overstretched infrastructure on a daily basis.

There is particular concern that substantial homes, services and employment space are proposed for phase 1 but no guarantee that the link road, in full or part, will be in place to support this development before first occupation.

It is noted that the remainder of the link road to join the A320 is not proposed until phase 2 (if it is built at all), which creates an obvious risk that the A319 could end up bearing the full volume of traffic of two or more phases of the development.

7. Amendments to deliver the pedestrian routes and cycleways as part of the link road encouraging its use as a sustainable transport corridor to be delivered early on in phase 1

The material displayed at the exhibition to accompany this application stated "intention to provide sustainable corridor/link road for cycling and walking as part of phase 1". This wording is notably indefinite and indicates that it is an aspiration rather than a fixed component of the application.

Chobham Parish Council has previously stated that the link road in its entirety (not only the pedestrian and cycle element) should be brought forward in the phasing. Access from both the A319 and A320 from the start of construction would avoid the risk of non-delivery of the full link road and allow construction traffic to utilise both main roads to service the site.

No specific provision for horse riding appears to have been included as part of the sustainable transport corridor proposed for phase 1. Considering the popularity of horse riding in the area, the Parish Council recommends that the requirements of horse riders are accommodated in the same way as they have been for pedestrians and cyclists.

8. Minor amendments to site accesses

None of the Parish Council's previous concerns (numbered A1-A10 in its letter of 29th April 2019) around means of site accesses appear to have been resolved in the amended application.

The supplementary objection submitted by Fair Oaks 2020 identifies numerous problems with the site accesses which have not been resolved in the amended application. These include issues around inadequacy of swept paths, signalling, sightlines, sizes of footpath, user conflicts, unsuitability for HGVs, highway safety, non-compliance with standards, and no evidence that the proposals have been deemed acceptable by highway authorities. The Parish Council again recommends that all of the concerns relating to site accesses raised in this report are sufficiently considered and any missing/incomplete information must be supplied before a decision is taken on this application. If this or any other required information is not supplied, inadequate or non-compliant, the application should be refused.

9. Update to the address on the application form

The address on the application form appears the same on both the superseded and revised versions, so it is unclear what update has been made. It is assumed that this does not represent a material change to the application.

Correspondence published on Surrey Heath Borough Council's interim publisher appears under the heading "Fair Oaks Airport, Chertsey Lane". This should read "Chertsey Road".

10. Updated suite of documents, which includes an Environmental Statement Addendum

The updated suite of documents has been reviewed and comments included under the various separate headings in this letter.

Other matters

Along with the objections to the amendments highlighted by the applicant set out above, Chobham Parish Council wishes to make additional objections, updates and comments, based on evidence or additional information received since its 29th April 2019 letter of

objection. The following points also include comments on various other changes found in the application which were not highlighted in the consultation letter:

11. Very special circumstances

The Parish Council has previously disputed the six “very special circumstances” claimed in the original application. It notes that a seventh claim has been added, namely “sustainable transport corridor / link road”. It is unclear why this was not highlighted in the summary of application amendments.

It is claimed that the link road should count as a very special circumstance which “could not otherwise be made without the development of FGV”. No evidence appears to have been included to support the claim that a link road could not be delivered via other means. The Parish Council is not aware of any feasibility study which has considered a link road between the A319 and A320 or whether the Fairoaks site would be the preferred location for such a road if it were to be built.

In any case, the creation of a link road is not a very special circumstance as it is a measure to attempt to contribute towards mitigation of the traffic impact of the proposed development and to serve the development itself. This is a requirement of any planning application for a large development, not a very special circumstance.

The Parish Council therefore maintains that none of the claimed very special circumstances, individually or cumulatively, would outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt.

12. Community engagement

Feedback received from attendees of the public exhibition at Fairoaks Airport on 19th and 20th September was poor. It was noted that despite the exhibition being billed as the sharing of further information in support of the application, the vast majority of the information displayed was the same as that which had previously been published. The “key changes” were vague and shown as five small bullet points which could easily be missed. Comments were received that the parking arrangements, presentation room and location were unsatisfactory. It was felt that the exhibition should have been held in Chobham village, to allow public access by means other than private cars. It also appeared that exhibition notification cards had not reached some households (including within the closest part of Chobham’s settlement area to Fairoaks Airport).

The Council reiterates that the local community has not been “involved in developing the vision”. The exhibition did not effectively highlight or communicate the changes to the application and it did not demonstrate how or if previous public comments had been taken into account in the amended proposal.

13. GP Practices

The application material continues to fail to properly identify where Fairoaks residents would be able to access local GP services. Ottershaw, Chobham and

the next nearest GP Practices are all understood to currently be at or near capacity.

Material displayed at the September 2019 exhibition stated that “GPs will be accessed via the new health centre planned in Ottershaw” and the Planning Statement also asserts that Ottershaw surgery would be expected to serve Fair Oaks. The Practice manager has, however, denied that Ottershaw surgery would take extra patients from Fair Oaks (which is not in its catchment area) and has advised that there has been no consultation from the developer.

Unless the developers’ apparently speculative claims regarding accessing GP services can be substantiated, they should not be used to support the proposal or carry any weight in the decision.

14. Highways and traffic

There appears to still be no assurance that Highway authorities would approve the scheme and the off-site infrastructure works. County Highways has requested further work on a number of areas. Highways England has also stated that further work is required and asks that no determination is made (other than a refusal) without it having received and responded to the required information. The complete satisfaction of the Highways authorities is a critical consideration and, notwithstanding the other grounds for refusal, the scheme should not be granted without this assurance.

The Parish Council wishes to strengthen its previous objections to the poorly-designed traffic mitigation proposals within Chobham, particularly the proposed banning of right turns at the A319 Chertsey Road and B393 Windsor Road junction. The safety risk of a large number of vehicles, including HGVs, attempting U-turns at the High Street/Bagshot Road mini roundabout must not be overlooked. The alternative through routes (Bowling Green Road, Burr Hill Lane, Windsor Court Road, Delta Road, Red Lion Road, Mincing Lane) are residential neighbourhoods completely unsuitable for heavier traffic volumes and HGVs. Among other issues, it is unacceptable to expect the residents of these minor and relatively narrow roads to bear the impact, safety risks and conflict of the additional volume of traffic passing through day and night, or for those living and working in Chobham to endure further traffic queues and likely incidents entering and exiting the main roads from these minor residential roads. In accordance with basic highway planning principles, through traffic and HGVs must be encouraged away from these unsuitable, vulnerable roads and kept to main trunk routes.

In recent weeks, there have been extended closures of both Philpot Lane and the A320, and there have been M3/M25 motorway incidents which have seen Chobham again experiencing gridlock on its roads. These issues are a common occurrence. The situation is already severe, and the applicant continues to have not demonstrated that the highway network implications of the proposal would be satisfactorily reduced and mitigated.

The Parish Council is in broad agreement with the issues raised by Fair Oaks 2020 in its supplementary objection. Based on the Council’s first-hand local knowledge and experience of traffic issues, a severe cumulative impact would be

likely to be created by the proposed development. There is also concern that the proposed off-site infrastructure works may hinder response times for emergency vehicles serving the Chobham population.

To add to the implications for increased motor traffic, there appears to be a lack of prioritising in the plans for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian users. The proposed development focuses upon improvements to existing networks and connectivity into Woking town centre, whilst simultaneously negating links and access directly into Chobham and other neighbouring areas. It is contended that development of this scale is better suited to locations closer to town centres which can ensure, at a minimum, adequate inter-connectivity of infrastructure for transport modes other than motor vehicles. At a time when the County Council is seeking to decrease air pollution in highly-congested areas, of which Chobham can be factored into at rush hour times, without mitigating and encouraging alternate modes of travel which are healthier and more sustainable for the local population, the plans do little to alleviate the traffic burdens and tackle current air pollution levels.

15. Retail and economy

The Parish Council has reviewed Lichfields' July 2019 "Economic and Retail Evidence Critique" together with the November 2019 Stage 2 follow up report commissioned by Surrey Heath and Runnymede Borough Councils and notes the many issues raised, including but not limited to:

- a lack of sufficient detail in terms of certain assumptions;
- impossible to verify the accuracy of impacts;
- little to demonstrate why the benefits cannot be delivered elsewhere (non-Green Belt locations);
- concerns around meeting the local needs for housing;
- non-compliance with national policy regarding the proposed retail and leisure use;
- no robust justification for the proposed level of office and hotel floorspace;
- sufficient employment land has already been identified through Surrey Heath's Employment Land review without this development;
- no consideration given to employment space already approved at Longcross Garden Village;
- likely to be a not insignificant trade diversion to the Fair Oaks centre from businesses in smaller local centres including Chobham (i.e. the commercial offering exceeds that which would be reasonably required by those living and working within the site);
- no reason why the existing employment site cannot be redeveloped and upgraded within the existing site boundary;
- other inappropriate and/or simplistic assumptions;
- omission of various other analyses, evidence, market testing and justifications (some identified in stage 1 of the report and not addressed in the application amendments); and

- a lack of explanation as to why this location is required and why other sites (e.g. closer to a town centre) would not be suitable for the proposed hotel.

If any of the issues raised in the report and its follow up are omitted, remain non-compliant with policy or have not been sufficiently addressed, the application should be refused.

Additionally, it is surprising that the reports repeatedly refer to the mixed-use development as a “Garden Village” when it is specifically recognised within the report that the development does not meet the Garden Village criteria set out in the Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities prospectus.

16. Aviation/Helipad

It is noted that the helipad is now proposed to be delivered in phase 1 (brought forward from phase 3), and that the inappropriateness of siting the helipad adjacent to an area proposed for equestrian use has been addressed.

That applicant’s claim that “the aerodrome is not set to close” (updated planning statement) appears to be deliberately misleading as it is clear that a helipad is not an aerodrome and that the Fair Oaks aerodrome would absolutely be set to close if the plans were to be implemented. There also appears to be no alternative site assessment for the proposed helipad.

The Parish Council has reviewed Alan Stratford and Associates Limited (ASA)’s August 2019 Aviation Report commissioned by Surrey Heath and Runnymede Borough Councils. The following key conclusions from the report include many of the themes previously raised by Chobham Parish Council and other parties:

- there is strong national support for the development of general aviation;
- Fair Oaks is located in a strategically important catchment area;
- Fair Oaks Airport is sustainable over the long term, and there is no reason why it could not continue as an airfield;
- growth and profit have been achieved despite a lack of investment and uncertainty over the airport’s future;
- the relocation of runway-dependent businesses to other airports is not necessarily feasible;
- the proposed heliport is unlikely to be commercially viable;
- it is unlikely to be a suitable location as a future “vertiport” for eVTOL (electric vertical take-off and landing) aircraft and unmanned or manned drones; and
- it is highly likely that Fair Oaks would rank in the top one-third of the government’s protected general aviation airports in the UK.

On the question of viability of the proposed heliport, it is noted that the anticipated number of movements would be “likely 800” per annum (compared to the current average of 4,700 per annum). This equates to little more than an average of one take-off and one landing per day. Natural England in its letter of objection dated 23rd October 2019 has proposed that, if the helipad were to go ahead, a condition of no more than four movements per day should be applied in order to not have a

detrimental noise impact on SANG users. Using a previous example of a peak of 17 movements on a Royal Ascot day in 2018, it appears probable that the constraints in the proposed location would not be congruent with a flourishing helicopter operation. Limits set on the number of movements per day would also, presumably, need to include some helicopter movements for emergency services.

The possibility of the heliport being developed into a Vertiport for eVTOL aircraft and drones in the longer term is of some concern as it is unclear what this might mean for Chobham and the surrounding areas. The use of the heliport, if approved, should be restricted by condition to exclude airborne activity other than appropriately limited helicopter flights. Any future diversification should be the subject of a separate planning application.

Fairoaks 2020 has responded in detail on the aviation issues, and the Parish Council asks that all the matters raised by this organisation in its objection letters and other correspondence are given appropriate consideration.

17. Impact on Chobham and its residents

It is noted that Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing foul water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the proposed development. The works required would presumably be extensive and require a significant lead time but it appears that the applicant has not responded to Thames Water's contact regarding this situation. No decision other than a refusal should be taken while the position on necessary upgrades and the associated funding remains unclear. The proposed development must also not be allowed to negatively affect water and wastewater services in the local area.

Issues raised in consultation responses by residents and those with a connection to Chobham continue to cite likely adverse effects in almost every planning area, including environment, heritage and Conservation Area, ecology, flood risk, visual impact, noise, pollution, traffic and transport, infrastructure, social and recreation, etc. The true cumulative impact is almost certainly impossible to quantify but must not be downplayed as negligible or minor.

18. Natural environment and flooding

The Parish Council has, in its previous correspondence, set out a number of objections in respect of the natural environment. It further objects on the grounds of reduction in SANG/public open space and the lack of SANG maintenance arrangements (as per point 4 above).

In its letter of 23rd October, Natural England has objected to the application and, amongst other points and advice, given its view that the planning authority will not be able to ascertain that the proposed development would meet relevant regulations in respect of the integrity of the SPA. This appears to be a critical consideration which should carry significant weight. Natural England also reminds the planning authority of its notification obligations to Natural England under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

The Environment Agency maintains its objection as the requested additional information on flood risk and nature conservation has failed to address its concerns. It notes that the Agency must be contacted in advance in line with planning policy guidance if the planning authority is minded to approve the application against its advice.

On the subject of flooding, the Parish Council is in receipt of several aerial photographs taken of the site and its surroundings in recent days. Two examples are attached to this letter (Appendix A). These photographs show the fields immediately adjacent to the runway area almost completely under water, and significant pooling on the grass areas between the airport buildings and the runway. Heavy rainfall has recently been experienced, but this is not an unusual occurrence. The construction of additional roads, hard-surfaced areas and buildings would likely exacerbate the situation increasing flood levels from the additional run-off, and making vulnerable the newly-constructed housing.

19. “Garden Village” and development principles

The Parish Council continues to object to the use of the term “Garden Village” throughout the application material. Garden Village is a specific planning term used to describe certain new communities which meet the criteria set out in the Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities prospectus. It is disappointing that despite this having been pointed out, nothing has been done to amend the false premise used in the updated suite of documents.

It has also previously been pointed out that the planning authority is on record as stating that, in the view of its officers, housing development would “only be acceptable if it came forward as a garden village, where the vision and principles have been developed in conjunction with the local community”, neither of which are the case with this application. The source document, “future of Fair Oaks Airport briefing note for Councillors” is attached to this letter (Appendix B).

20. Community Trust aims

It appears that the aims of the Community Trust have been significantly reduced in the amended application. It is understood that, amongst other changes, the Trust would:

- no longer manage the SANG, Visitor Centre/Pavilion and playing fields;
- no longer manage the provision of transport and mobility services; and
- no longer provide affordable housing alongside stakeholders.

This significant reduction in aims, without any clear indication of which organisation(s) would take on these responsibilities, is felt to be a material change to the proposal, but this has not been highlighted as an amendment to the original application.

Chobham Parish Council notes that the references to “Ottershaw Parish Council” (which, as previously pointed out, does not exist) have been replaced by “Ottershaw Group”. It is not clear which Ottershaw organisation is being referred to in this regard.

The outline business plan proposes that one Trustee Director be appointed from “Chobham Parish Council (or Ottershaw Group)”. The Parish Council has still received no approach to provide any representation or nominee for the Community Trust despite the indication in the vision and principles that the Trust would be established “at hybrid application planning stage”.

It is also proposed that the Trust be awarded an “annual grant from the Parish Council in lieu of precept collected from Fairoaks”. Chobham Parish Council wishes to state for the record that there has been no approach made by the developers to discuss whether this assumption is appropriate or beneficial to Chobham residents. There is no such segregation of precept funds for other communities within the Parish and this is another speculative statement from the developers, made without any basis.

21. Planning conditions

Notwithstanding the fact that the Parish Council recommends outright refusal of this application, it recognises that some form of development may come forward for the site. A non-exhaustive list of planning conditions has previously been recommended (section B17 of letter dated 29th April 2019), to which the Council would like to add the following:

- a. Comprehensive upfront financial bonds to be secured to guarantee the full cost of completing the infrastructure (roads, junctions, sewers, drainage and any other essential infrastructure).
- b. Restrict or remove permitted development rights to not only ensure the openness and character of the area is not further damaged under the current legislation, but to retain planning control in the event of more blanket permitted development rights being introduced. This should apply to both residential and non-residential development.
- c. Restrictions on number of helicopter movements per day in line with or lower than Natural England’s guidance to avoid a detrimental noise impact on SANG.
- d. No airborne activity other than helicopters to be allowed (including no eVTOL aircraft, unmanned and manned drones etc.) without separate permission being granted for diversification of use.
- e. A separate application for advertisement consent must be submitted and subject to consultation for any proposed advertisement(s) to be displayed on hoardings, flags or by other means surrounding the site, unless the advertisement meets the criteria to benefit from “deemed consent”.
- f. The design of any hoardings to be erected on the site should reflect the character of the area, fit comfortably within the street scene and not negatively impact upon the area’s visual amenity. Hoardings should not contain internal illumination or unreasonably bright external illumination.
- g. Any scaffolding or hoardings to be erected should not encroach onto highway or public land without appropriate licence/permission and all necessary measures should be taken to ensure public safety at all times.

22. Runnymede Local Plan examination

Chobham Parish Council has written to the Programme Officer for the Runnymede Local Plan examination (letter dated 29th April 2019) to seek clarity about the removal of the Fairoaks Airport site from the forecast of the Strategic Highway Assessment Report. The update note published by Runnymede Borough Council on 22nd March 2019 includes the following paragraph:

“remove the forecast large development sites of Fairoaks airfield and Martyr’s Lane as there is now increased certainty that these sites, which are just outside Runnymede Borough Council’s administrative area, will not be progressed at all, or until after the Local Plan period;”

The Parish Council has not received a response to its letter, nor seen any further updates to explain this apparent discrepancy. In the interests of transparency, the Council respectfully requests that the evidence which has informed this increased certainty regarding the future of the site is made public and duly considered as part of the decision process.

Chobham Parish Council has made its best endeavours to review the documentation supplied in respect of the amended application, together with the various reports and responses from the Councils, consultees and members of the public. This has been a challenging task due to documentation being published across several locations on the Surrey Heath website (the main Fairoaks application page, the sub-site containing the application documentation, and the three separate old/interim/new publishers). At times the system has appeared slow or given error messages (e.g. “this document is unavailable for viewing at this time”) and documents have been published late. There is also concern that some documentation or letters of representation may be missing or incorrectly published, due to a number of items recently being found published under the wrong case number, including at least one relating to Fairoaks. It is felt that these system issues may have somewhat hindered the consultation process, with most consultees already not in a position to review hundreds or thousands of pages of application material, especially with a short deadline.

In some cases the revised application material appears to still include out of date information, notably the main Design and Access Statement. There has also been difficulty identifying the amendments from the original application, as the bullet point summary provided is not thorough and does not include many pertinent changes. Chobham Parish Council may make additional representation if further information or new material comes to light prior to the decision date of the application.

While the Parish Council objects to the development proposal on the table, it believes that there is an opportunity for many benefits (employment, general aviation growth, economic, enhanced public open space, ecology, sustainable travel links and potentially more) to be delivered at Fairoaks Airport in full accordance with development allowed under its designation as a Major Developed Site. These benefits can be achieved without airport closure, without large scale Green Belt destruction and without the myriad of negative consequences raised by this Parish Council and numerous other parties. The Planning Authorities are urged to both refuse this application and take a proactive

approach to ensuring potential developers of the site understand that plans will only be acceptable if they are fully in line with local plans and national policy.

As previously requested, please could the Parish Council be notified of the date of the Planning Applications Committee meeting at which this application will be considered and of the deadline for registering with the Council its desire to speak.

If there are any questions or if further clarification can be provided on any of the above points please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully



Ms C L Cooper
Planning Administrator

cc:

County Cllr Mike Goodman, Surrey County Council
The Rt Hon Michael Gove, MP Surrey Heath
The Rt Hon Philip Hammond, MP Runnymede & Weybridge
The Rt Hon Jonathan Lord, MP Woking
County Cllr David Mansfield, Surrey County Council
Borough Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath, Surrey Heath Borough Council
Mr Tim Oliver, Leader of Surrey County Council
Mr Douglas Spinks, Deputy Chief Executive, Woking Borough Council
Borough Cllr Mrs Pat Tedder, Surrey Heath Borough Council
Borough Cllr Mrs Victoria Wheeler, Surrey Heath Borough Council

**Appendix A: Water levels at Fair Oaks Airport and surroundings in December 2019
(Please refer to point 18 above)**



Appendix B: Surrey Heath Borough Council briefing note for Councillors (Please refer to point 19 above)

Future of Fairoaks Airport Briefing Note for Councillors

Dear Councillors

As this matter is now out in the public domain, as Councillors you may receive questions. For your assistance, set out below is a brief explanation of the current situation.

Following the recent sale of part of the site by West Register, Fairoaks Airport is in two ownerships who have formed a consortium with a view to seeking development of the site. We therefore have to recognise that the site is coming forward for something. There is as yet no developer that we are aware of, nor have we seen any detailed scheme for the site.

It is the view of officer's that, if the site is to be developed for housing then it would only be acceptable if it came forward as a garden village where the vision and principles have been developed in conjunction with the local community. We would expect it to provide or contribute to all necessary infrastructure and deliver a self contained community (so schools, local shop, highways etc) including business provision with retention of existing firms who want to stay. We think it would need a scheme of about 1500 houses to achieve this based on what we have learnt from Deepcut. We haven't to date seen any scheme so we don't know what it might look like.

In respect of any discussions with the owners, to date we have only discussed the principles that we think they need to address and that is also what the Garden Village bid sets out.

Foremost of those principles is that the local community must be involved in developing the vision, that does not mean merely consulting them, it means working with the local community from the outset to establish principles and what the community wants from the site.

The garden village bid was made by the Council but was supported by the owners. The bid is not a scheme, it outlines a series of principles of approach the Council would expect in any scheme for it to be acceptable. The bid does not give planning permission, does not imply approval of any scheme and nor is it planning guidance.

What we hope to get through the bid is the funding/support the Council needs to resource the work with the local community, local stakeholders and the owners and alongside that a steer from government that principles we have identified are the right ones.

Officers have spoken to Chelgate (they are the Fairoaks owners PR company). They have advised that they are sending a letter to local ward councillors about the future of the site. They also advised that the Fairoaks Garden Village website would be going live today, that a letter would be going out to all the business tenants and a press release would be issued.

If any Councillor would like a chat about any of this please contact Jenny Rickard or Jane Ireland.