

Caroline Cooper / Chobham Parish Council Planning Co-ordinator

Neighbourhood plan comments

20th June 2024

General

Suggest captioning all photos with location and date (if possible), noting if the photo is an example from outside Chobham.

Cannot see any mention of Brick Hill in the plan, it could be worth noting its particular character somewhere?

Pages/paragraphs

2.3 “The Green Belt is due to be amended in the emerging Local Plan, to exclude the village.” – is this being treated as a “done deal” or still a proposal?

2.4 Not sure if it is intentional not to include all designations, but Chobham Common is also an SSSI.

2.9 “A train station is situated adjacent to the Chobham local area, at Longcross in Runnymede. This station is located some 5km to the north of Chobham Village and has very limited train services to London.” – although trains have been very limited in the past, they are now half-hourly. The main issues with Longcross are its significant access, parking and facility limitations. The station has no direct road access. Public access is on foot only via an unmade and unlit woodland footpath off Burma Road, or from a path off the public highway at Churchill Drive, Longcross. The station is unstaffed, has no public car parking nearby, no cycle storage, no step-free access and no toilets. There is no bus service from Chobham to Longcross.

2.13 Mentions two rural exceptions developments that were turned down on appeal. Mincing Lane Nursery was one, what was the second one? If this refers to Castle Grove Nursery, this wasn't a proposed rural exception site.

4.1 Also Ottershaw in the east?

5.6 Is it worth mentioning that the new (draft) Local List includes quite a number of additional heritage assets for Chobham?

Page 31 Primary residential – it is not “Brookleys Drive”, but just “Brookleys”

5.32 Philpott Lane (typo – should be Philpot) / “Red Lion Road/Windsor Junction” (should be Windsor Road junction not just Windsor junction)

5.46 “Keeping the drains clear would stop accidents on the corner of Red Lion Road and Windsor Road” – not sure about this statement?

5.53 “The Grange was redeveloped to 33 bungalows on part of the site circa 1985” – not sure if this was a redevelopment, I don’t remember there being much if any development there before? (Could be wrong)

5.58 “bridge over Mill Brook” this may not go forward to be included in Local List. Cllr Victoria Wheeler stated in an SHBC meeting that the entire structure was a relatively modern rebuild. The Parish Council has asked for it to be checked that no historic fabric remains. Bridge is known as Emmetts Mill bridge, not bridge over Mill Bourne.

Page 49 Policy CH6 Heritage assets – if demolition can’t be avoided, the Parish Council has previously requested a) photographic and written records relating to the building to be made and deposited for archive with appropriate local organisations prior to dismantling and demolition, and b) assessment be made as to whether any significant parts of the building’s fabric or “finds” can be retained or conserved either on or off site, and that Historic England’s “Understanding Historic Buildings - A Guide to Good Recording Practice” is reviewed in the context of the loss of the building. Could something along these lines be considered for the policy?

6.15 Out of date photo of the neighbourhood parade (Inside Chobham closed down 2-3 years ago).

6.18 “ii Former British Oxygen Company Site, Chobham (known locally as Highams)” – this site is now officially known as Highams Park.

6.20 Re: Employment sites - I think figure 17 needs to be changed to figure 16 (also two mentions of figure 17 in the body of policy CH8).

6.21 “In the absence of up-to-date adopted Local Plan policy, the CNP seeks to designate these four sites.” – there seems to be only three?

Page 56 CH8 4) onwards – seems to be just one site so should the language be singular rather than plural?

7.4 “The Environment Act includes provision for a mandatory requirement for new developments to provide a 10% biodiversity net gain.” – is it worth adding that SHBC’s draft new Local Plan seeks 20% gain (policy E3)?

7.7 Figure 17 graphic - Isn’t it Muntjac deer, not Moncjac?

7.8 Table 5 - first picture looks more cropped than the others

7.28 “... importance that verges and wildflower planting within the area.” Should it be “of verges...”? Suggest also include Chertsey Road which is at least as verdant an approach as the others mentioned.

7.36 – Should field near Station Road be plural?

Page 72 – Is view 5 in the right place on the map and described correctly in the key? The footpath runs alongside the Village Hall but not behind it.

Page 78 (more of a personal note – there is no public cycle parking provision in the centre of the village, which is likely to discourage cycle trips to the local shops, eateries, commuting for village workers etc. Any chance of promoting some cycle parking places in the car park?)

8.12 “there is a level of public support for a 20’s Plenty scheme” - could note the recent introduction of the 20 speed limit now this is a reality.

Page 85 CH15 Stray colon in 1) a) “bedroom: dwellings”. States it is to mirror the policy for Windlesham but Table 7 (Windlesham) states 4 spaces for 4+ bed houses and this isn’t reflected in CH15 which only goes up to 3+.

9.4 Re: Youth club “(the previous one was changed into a community centre),” – there was a youth club building on land where the MacMahon Close “Heathlands” housing is now. To the best of my recollection the Community Centre was built on adjacent open/parking land. More recently, there was a youth club run from the Scout Hut on the Recreation Ground.

9.5 Should SLP be SHLP?

10.3 – 10.7 The outlined follow up work will be considerable – is this to be taken on by the Parish Council directly?

11.1 Parish Council as a corporate body is an “it”, so “its powers” not “their powers”.

11.2 Is it worth noting that the CIL and Section 106 are intended to be replaced with the new “Infrastructure Levy”?

Page 95 Worth mentioning that SPDs are intended to be phased out?

Page 98 National Planning Policy Framework (amended July 2021) – links to December 2023 update so just the linked text needs updating.

Page 101 “The Chobham forms Design Guidance and Codes forms an integral part of the Chobham Neighbourhood Plan.” – one too many “forms.”

Page 107 (and elsewhere in the document) “Chobham Water Meadows” rather than “Chobham Meadows”

Page 108 – I’ve never seen anyone picnicking at the Water Meadows (long grass, lots of dogs), but happy to be corrected on that!

Page 110 Photo shows children with their backs to camera, maybe include a caption about the planting event for context?

Page 111 “Previously washed over green belt.” – see earlier comment for 2.3, it is still washed over green belt currently. Should Conservation Area be included as a designation for this and the others within it?

Page 117 “Canon” typo.

Page 117 Should Benham’s Corner and Cannon corner be two separate listings?

Page 118 “The old bus stop” – should this be “bus shelter”? I believe its name is Stearns bus shelter (double check needed).

Page 120 “None (will lose washed over green belt status in the emerging Local Plan)” – only a proposal at the moment. Conservation Area designation?

Page 122 Re: Pet Cemetery “have even been trying to find the present owners.” – the Parish Council has an update on this. There has been communication with family of the owner.

Page 122 There isn't an official designated Public Right of Way in the pet cemetery as far as I am aware (none shown on Surrey Interactive map).

Page 122: As well as the accesses listed, there is also access from Mincing Lane. I would suggest deleting Red Lion Road as an access point as it isn't direct.

Page 126 Is CPC a co-owner of the Victorian Cemetery?

Page 128 "They are used for informal recreation." – This field is private land and not used for "informal recreation" as far as I am aware.

Page 129 Designations – Conservation Area; Green belt

Page 131 Delete "A large grass playing field with play park, tennis courts, pavilion and parish offices, scout building and sports pavilion"

Page 132 "footpath running adjacent" – as per comment for Page 122, not a right of way. I think there is/was previously a permissive path, but unclear on whether that has been stopped up.

Page 133 Talks about fields, open nature and walkway – the site is private and densely wooded, so the description could perhaps be tweaked.

Page 138 View over Fairoaks is more than just from Chertsey Road – there are significant sweeping views from Footpath 1 and Bridleway 3 either side. The airfield is not "criss-crossed with footpaths". Re: walking between Chobham and Woking, unfortunately the key footpath links 4 and 113 from Chobham are currently impassable from Philpot Lane.