

**CLAYGATE PARISH COUNCIL**  
Comments for  
**DRAFT SETTLEMENT (ID) PLANS CONSULTATION**

**1. Open Space**

**Option A** – Designate all existing space as “Open Space in Urban Area”

The sites to be protected – Claygate Primary School, Torrington Road Tennis Club and The Roundway are mentioned in ‘sites to be protected’ in the document. We ask them to note that Meadow Road is already a designated “Village Green”. We have requested EBC for the same status for the “The Green” by the Hare and Hounds.

We also want Derwent Close Green Island and Glebelands Roundabout to also be designated.

**2. Local Space**

If there is an open space you would like us to consider for designation as a Local Green Space designation, please outline these in the comment box below. Please indicate why the green space is demonstrably special to the local community and holds a particular local significance.

The Recreation Ground, - there are strong cricket and football clubs based here along with a Community Clubhouse, complete with Café catering to all needs and age groups and the children’s play area. This area is also used by many sections of the community daily, including the primary school. There is also the annual Flower Show, which has run for many years.

Hare Lane Green – this is situated opposite the Swan Pub, although it comes under Esher ID plan, it is at the “Gateway” to Claygate, to change this would alter the intrinsic character on entering the Village. This green is used by families for fun cricket and football, picnics, dog walking and at the annual ‘Beer Festival’ when there are some fairground amusements available.

**3. Potential Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace**

**Option C** – Do not designate suitable areas as Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace or as a full Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace as we have sufficient for the plan period and beyond.

Claygate Common is already has protected status and the road leading to it is narrow with insufficient parking for more than 3-4 cars.

**4. Strategic Employment Land**

**Option A** – Designate Strategic Employment Land based on the Criteria set out in the Site Assessment Methodology documents.

This is on the basis that the grounds to Claygate House remain as Green Belt.

**5. Opportunity sites – BT Telephone Exchange, Hare Lane**

**Option B** – Allocate for mixed-use development, including housing and mixed use development to facilitate **provision of community asset**.

The proposals by EBC for upto 50 dwelling on this site, working out at 70 dph, this goes above the recommendations for housing density as laid out in the Core Strategy CS17. Claygate is not a rural village due to the nature to its boundaries with Esher and Hinchley Wood, but as an urban village the densities considered should be a maximum of 40 units per ha.

We would consider a maximum build of upto 25 units including 10 units of affordable housing, working out at 35 dph, with this there would have to be suitable, safe off street parking, with a good entry and exit strategy to Hare Lane due the high traffic flow and poor visibility to Hare Lane at this Junction. We would like option B as this gives Claygate the flexibility for an additional community asset.

As a Parish Council we wish to express our concern as the overall level of housing to be achieved in Elmbridge was set to be a maximum of 3,375 units not a minimum as currently expressed by EBC. We note the goal posts have been moved on the quantity of housing delivery required from Claygate. Previously the 2009 and 2010 number of units built and in the system was included in the 50 – 100 required.

## **6. Opportunity sites – Torrington Lodge Park, Torrington Close**

**Option D** – Do not allocate.

Claygate Parish Council is in discussions with EBC to promote advertising for this area to increase its utilisation as a car park. CPC also want to have the access through to Hare Lane reopened, to enhance the car park's use for users of the Recreation Ground.

## **7. Opportunity Sites – Hare Lane Car Park**

**Option C** – Do not allocate.

Same comments as item 6.

This car park is crucial to Claygate to avoid abusive parking in local roads by school parents and visitors to the Recreation Ground.

## **8. Education**

**Option B** – Do not allocate existing school sites for potential expansion to accommodate an increase in pupil numbers.

We note that Claygate Primary has moved to three form entry; this makes the school already too large.

Pressure for school places is set to continue to rise, especially at secondary level where there is already an acute shortage of places to schools within reasonable travelling distance, that have transport links with Claygate.

(This to be considered in relation to the Esher settlement ID Plan and the comment put in this one as well).

## **9. Transport and Highways**

Please let us know if there are any other transport and highways improvements you would like us to consider in the comment box below.

There need to be traffic calming measures between the Telephone Exchange and the zebra crossing by The Parade.

## **10. Other infrastructure**

Please let us know in the box below if there are any other infrastructure priorities you would like us to consider.

We agree with item 4.6 – Bridleway – Common Lane to A3 Bridge and Lower Wood Road to A3 underpass.

There is also the underpass at the top of Woodstock Lane that has ongoing drainage problems that need resolving.

We want to see the footpath at the end of Old Claygate Lane designated as a footpath.

\*The Gypsy site at the edge of Claygate comes under an inter boundary ID with Thames Ditton and Long Ditton. We accept the designated site at the Oaks. This is full and we oppose any intensification created by the reduction of pitch sizes at this site. We oppose any additional pitches on the adjacent private sites.

\*(This comment needs to be placed in the Thames and Long Ditton ID Plan)

## **11. Approach Taken**

What are your views on the Development of ID Plans by the Council and the approach they take?

The previous Planning Policy Manager had led us to believe the housing quantity required was a maximum, we are now told this is a minimum.

The Road Show organised by EBC to liaise with the local community did not engage properly or to the level we would have expected. It mainly consisted on the handing out of leaflets with people being told about the website for the questionnaires. It must be remembered that not all people are fully conversant with, or have computers. There should have been hard copy on view for people to browse and ask questions about the information and policies.

At our Village meeting 17May, residents felt they had not been properly informed about the ID Settlement Plan and were consulted too late in the in the given timeframe.

9May 2013