

Reference	Comments Received
1	A. The Thorpe Farm brownfield development proposal as outlined should not exceed 15 dwellings on the proposed site.
	B. Access in to the proposed Thorpe Farm development, should be via the site's current main entrance off Coldharbour Lane. The other smaller wooden gated entrance off the mini roundabout, is not deemed viable for an entrance supporting 15 dwellings from a safety or accessibility perspective and is not considered wide enough to accommodate two way traffic.
	C. All proposed dwellings must be constructed with the latest conservation technology included e.g. solar panels, ground heat pumps, triple glazing, electricity producing roof tiles, high level insulation etc.
	D. Any dwellings must be constructed with adequate off-road parking for residents and their guests, in order to avoid road parking on Thorpe's main thoroughfares.
	E. A revised speed limit within the Village, must be agreed before any development takes place. The speed limit on Coldharbour Lane out of the Village is currently 60 mph! There must also be Stop signs installed on the mini roundabout at the junction of Ten Acre Lane and Coldharbour Lane, if serious T-Bone accidents are to be avoided going forward.
	F. Before any development takes place, an urgent review and upgrade of the waste water/sewage network and surface water drainage system in Coldharbour Lane must take place, as it is currently inadequate and frequently blocks.
	G. Before any development takes place, the domestic water supply in Coldharbour Lane must be upgraded as it is currently inadequate and subject to variable loss of pressure.
	H. Before any development takes place, the potential for greater traffic flow in the Village must be adequately considered, along with the provision of a desperately needed Car Park for Thorpe.
	I. Before any development takes place, despite being in the Thorpe Conservation Area, a Tree Survey should take place to ensure key specimens, such as the very old Cedar Tree in the grounds of Manor Farm House are not arbitrarily removed.

J. The listed buildings and their respective curtilages must be protected in perpetuity, namely Manor Farmhouse, Manor Farm Barn (locally known as The Calf Barn) and its adjoining virgin Green Field (which should be put back in to the Green Belt for it's long term protection) and The Shire Barn, which have respectively stood there for centuries. It is also recommended that The Granary building whilst not listed, is also protected in perpetuity. A Heritage Statement for each entity protecting same, should also be procured.

K. A Wildlife Survey must be undertaken before any development takes place, with special emphasis on hedgehogs, stag beetles, lizards, newts, grass snakes and slow-worms.

L. A Bat Survey must be undertaken before any development takes place, with special emphasis on the bat colonies in the listed barns, which are protected and should not be disturbed.

M. A Bird Survey must be undertaken before any development takes place, with special emphasis on Barn Owls which roost in the listed barns, which again are protected and should not be disturbed. As an important SSSI, the adjoining lakes are also significant breeding grounds for local and migrating birds.

N. Since three of the four proposed sites lie in acknowledged Flood Zones, the recent decision to go ahead with the Thames Relief Scheme is of considerable concern, as the potential risk for flooding will increase in these areas, if Thorpe Lakes become the overflow reservoir for excess water from the River Thames. This coupled with housing development in existing identified Flood Zones, will only add to the already very high water tables.

O. It is of some concern that a number of the plans/charts (e.g. Thorpe Constraints Plan on page 18), accompanying the Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan 2015 - 2030 (Pre-Submission Plan), appear to have been re- dated November 2019. The changed plans/charts should revert to their original dates, as they do not reflect the current key requirements noted for Policy TH2(iii).

P. The visual over development of Thorpe must be avoided at all costs, if as a community we are to retain the much valued rural and open feel of our 10th Century Village.

2	<p>Regarding the field owned by Thorpe Park previously Thorpe Park Farm in Coldharbour Lane, *which houses some very Old barns. These barns are home to owls and bats which are becoming rarer. Also we have grass snakes, hedgehogs (also becoming rare) plus slow worms and wildlife! This is/was a conservation area and needs to be taken in to account before building work is approved Preferably this area is not used for building as these are all protected species</p>
3	<p>I appreciate and must accept that a certain amount of development within Thorpe is inevitable. However, I have outlined below some of my concerns which I believe are relevant to the future of Thorpe Village.</p> <p>As a resident of Blackhouse Farm, Coldharbour Lane, you will appreciate that my main concerns lie within Policy TH2 (iii)</p> <p>The Thorpe Farm brownfield development proposal as outlined should not exceed 15 dwellings on the proposed site.</p> <p>The listed buildings and their respective boundaries must be protected in perpetuity, namely Manor Farmhouse, Manor Farm Barn (locally known as The Calf Barn) and its adjoining virgin Green Field (which should be put back in to the Green Belt for its long term protection) and The Shire Barn, which have respectively stood there for centuries.</p> <p>It is also recommended that The Granary building whilst not listed, is also protected in perpetuity. A Heritage Statement for each entity protecting same, should also be procured.</p> <p>It is of major concern that a number of the plans/charts (e.g. Thorpe constraints Plan on page 18), accompanying the Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan 2015 - 2030 (pre-submission Plan), appear to have been re-dated November 2019. The changed plans/charts should revert to their original dates, as they do not reflect the current key requirements noted for Policy TH2(iii) in particular clause 5.26</p> <p>Access to the proposed Thorpe Farm development should be via the site's current main entrance off Coldharbour Lane. The other smaller wooden gated entrance off the mini roundabout is not deemed viable for an entrance supporting 15 dwellings from a safety or accessibility perspective and is not considered wide enough to accommodate two way traffic.</p>

<p>It is vital that given current lack of parking within the village any dwellings must be constructed with adequate off-road parking for residents and their guests, in order to avoid road parking on Thorpe's main thoroughfares which in my opinion are already insufficient to accommodate existing traffic.</p>
<p>A revised speed limit within the Village, must be agreed before any development takes place. The speed limit on Coldharbour Lane out of the Village is currently 60 mph!</p>
<p>There must also be Stop signs installed on the mini roundabout at the junction of Ten Acre Lane and Coldharbour Lane, if serious T-Bone accidents are to be avoided going forward.</p>
<p>An urgent review and upgrade of the waste water/ sewage network and surface water drainage system in Coldharbour Lane must take place, as it is currently inadequate and frequently blocks.</p>
<p>Similarly the domestic water supply in Coldharbour Lane must be upgraded as it is currently inadequate and subject to variable loss of pressure.</p>
<p>The village currently has extremely limited public transport links. The potential for greater traffic flow in the Village must be adequately considered, along with the provision of a desperately needed Car Park for Thorpe.</p>
<p>Despite being within the Thorpe Conservation Area, a Tree Survey should take place to ensure key specimens, such as the very old Cedar Tree in the grounds of Manor Farm House are not arbitrarily removed.</p>
<p>A Bat Survey should be undertaken before any development takes place, with special emphasis on the bat colonies in the listed barns, which are protected and should not be disturbed.</p>
<p>A Bird Survey must be undertaken before any development takes place, with special emphasis on Barn Owls which roost in the listed barns, which again are protected and should not be disturbed.</p>
<p>As an important SSSI, the adjoining lakes are also significant breeding grounds for local and migrating birds.</p>

	<p>Since three of the four proposed sites lie in acknowledged Flood Zones, the recent decision to go ahead with the Thames Relief Scheme is of considerable concern, as the potential risk for flooding will increase in these areas. I am especially concerned that if Thorpe Lakes become the overflow reservoir for excess water from the River Thames then there is a significant threat of flooding to my property. I am very anxious that we had a "too close for comfort" situation which I think occurred in 2013. Many properties bordering Thorpe were flooded. My own property only narrowly escaped. This coupled with housing development in existing identified Flood Zones, will only add to the already very high water tables.</p>
	<p>Finally, I believe that the visual over development of Thorpe must be avoided at all costs, if, as a community we are to retain the much valued rural and open feel of our 10th Century Village.</p>
4	<p>The Thorpe Farm brownfield development proposal as outlined should not exceed 15 dwellings on the proposed site.</p> <p>All proposed dwellings must be constructed with the latest conservation technology included e.g. solar panels, ground heat pumps, triple glazing, electricity producing roof tiles, high level insulation etc.</p> <p>Any dwellings must be constructed with adequate off-road parking for residents and their guests, in order to avoid road parking on Thorpe's main thoroughfares.</p> <p>A revised speed limit within the Village, must be agreed before any development takes place. The speed limit on Coldharbour Lane out of the Village is currently 60 mph! There must also be Stop signs installed on the mini roundabout at the junction of Ten Acre Lane and Coldharbour Lane, if serious T -Bone accidents are to be avoided going forward.</p> <p>Before any development takes place, an urgent review and upgrade of the waste water/sewage network and surface water drainage system in Coldharbour Lane must take</p>
5	<p>Hi I believe this is a positive plan for Thorpe and the result of a lot of effort by those responsible. My view is that providing the Thorpe Farm housing development is restricted to the 15 dwellings and the field is saved next to Blackhouse farm along with the Barns etc I am happy.</p>

	<p>The issue of traffic speed through the village is a real concern to me now my grandson attends the local school when we take and collect we walk that's when it brings it home to you how fast some vehicles travel even the speed humps in Coldharbour Lane do not deter some vehicles especially the 4x4.</p>
6	<p>A. A revised speed limit within the Village, must be agreed before any development takes place. The speed limit on Ten Acre Lane is 40 mph and on Coldharbour Lane going out of the Village it is currently 60 mph! There should also be Stop signs installed on the mini roundabout at the junction of Ten Acre Lane and Coldharbour Lane, if serious accidents are to be avoided going forward.</p> <p>B. Before any development takes place, the potential for greater traffic flow in the Village must be adequately considered, along with the provision of a desperately needed Car Park for Thorpe.</p> <p>C. The listed buildings and their respective grounds must all be protected, namely Manor Farmhouse, Manor Farm Barn (locally known as The Calf Barn) and its adjoining virgin Green Field (which should preferably be put back in to the Green Belt for it's long term protection) and The Shire Barn, which have all stood there for centuries.</p> <p>D. A Wildlife Survey should be undertaken before any development takes place.</p> <p>E. A Bat Survey should be undertaken before any development takes place, with special emphasis on the bat colonies in the listed barns.</p> <p>F. A Bird Survey should be undertaken before any development takes place, with special emphasis on Barn Owls which roost in the listed barns.</p> <p>G. Since three of the four proposed sites lie in acknowledged Flood Zones, the recent decision to go ahead with the Thames Relief Scheme is of considerable concern, as the potential risk for flooding will increase in these areas, if Thorpe Lakes become the overflow reservoir for excess water from the River Thames. This coupled with potential housing development in existing identified Flood Zones, will only add to the already very high water tables.</p>
7	<p>As a 15 year resident of Village and teacher at the TASIS England School for the same amount of years, I write to you with my full support of the Thorpe Neighborhood Plan as both a resident of Thorpe Village and a teacher at the school.</p>

	<p>I am very supportive of your community views in fostering community links to existing businesses. In addition, as a member of the TASIS England community and wonderful individuals who work for this school, I am very pleased to read of the supporting position the neighbourhood plan has taken on the positive developments outlined in the reasonable expansion plan of our campus.</p>
	<p>This overall Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan is very supportive of our entire community as well as our school and the children we teach and care for.</p>
8	<p>I write in support of the Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan as both a resident of Thorpe village and as Head of School for TASIS England. I support all aspects of the plan and I share in its main objective of maintaining and fostering community links.</p> <p>I also support improved Broadband access, improved cycle and pedestrian links and preserving the biodiversity of our village and its environment. All of these would support our community, our village and our school. They would provide better access to learning, improved safety for our children and support the school's desire to preserve the beauty of our environment.</p> <p>In addition, I further acknowledge the need for additional housing and access to improved Sports facilities for the village. Both of these aspects would assist in preparing the village for a vibrant and collaborative future with all community members actively playing their part to promote our village.</p>
9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Thorpe Farm Brownfield proposed development should not exceed 15 houses. 2. Access to the proposed development should be via the current site entrance off of Coldharbour Lane. The small entrance off the mini roundabout (Ten Acre Lane) is too small and traffic will become congested especially with TAS(S school traffic). 3. Proposed houses must be top quality to match the surrounding dwellings — ie no cheap pre fab construction. 4. There must be sufficient parking (for at least 2 cars) for each and every proposed dwelling.

	<p>5. A proper sewage survey must be carried out before any ground is broken for proposed dwellings. Also, what about Affinity water? Have they been contacted? What will added dwellings do to the existing water pressure?</p>
	<p>6. What about the current dwellings? Ie Manor Farmhouse, Manor Farm Barn and The Shire Barn? Are these not listed buildings?</p>
	<p>7. I suggest a wildlife survey be carried out before any proposed development.</p>
	<p>8. I don't want Thorpe to become over developed and grow into an eyesore. All of my friends who live in Richmond and Kingston Boroughs LOVE coming here to visit us "out in the country'. Thorpe is a special and unique place, Let's please not ruin it!</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>The Thorpe Neighborhood Plan responds sensitively to the village's historic and rural character while recognizing the need for additional sustainable development to secure and manage its future growth. The mixture of affordable housing for first time buyers and renters, its respect for the Green Belt, conservation land, and numerous listed buildings, the integration of the needs of existing and future businesses and consideration for recreational activities such as cycling, walks and sports are particular strengths of the Plan. In addition the Plan effectively addresses flood plain issues, mixed diversity of its habitat, and its infrastructure, (ie. roads, parking and lack of public transportation) as well the historic nature of its setting with regard to heritage lighting</p> <p>I also applaud the significant efforts undertaken to engage the entire community in the process through three Open Forums and various surveys to get the input of the residents and local businesses. I support the draft Thorpe Neighborhood Plan with enthusiasm and gratitude for the countless hours the members of the Thorpe Forum have spent in creating it, which I am convinced will serve Thorpe extremely well into the future.</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>We are concerned with the Neighbourhood Plan that states that the Runnymede Local Plan 2030 establishes a housing requirement of 74 homes for the designated neighbourhood area. However, if you add up the number of proposed dwellings for each of the 4 developments it actually adds up to at least 84 homes.</p> <p>The quantity of homes proposed seems excessive and we are struggling to see how a village the size of Thorpe could accommodate 74+ new homes. Not only would it make the village overdeveloped, but with only one school, one village shop and one pub, the area does not have the amenities.</p>

	<p>There is a lack of public transport in Thorpe, resulting in the reliance of private cars to travel anywhere outside of the village which would significantly increase traffic, noise levels and CO2 emissions in the immediate area.</p>
	<p>Our concern with the Coltscroft development in particular is that Rosemary Lane is classified as a single track road and there is no pavement. It appears that access for vehicles to reach the new development would be via Rosemary Lane, but this would result in a great deal of disruption to current residents and make the road unsafe for pedestrians particularly during development stages.</p>
12	<p>Regarding the land off Rosemary Lane, Coltscroft - if this is to go ahead, is the proposal for vehicular access via the north end of the plot only rather than the east? There is insufficient space to create safe vehicular access on the east side or to consider vehicular access via a through-road. Any access to the plot on the east side should be pedestrian only to maintain safety and the existing public footpath.</p>
	<p>Concern still remains that 24 houses on this site would likely increase daily traffic in the region of an additional 40 vehicles. Also, there would be extra deliveries, vans, lorries, etc. Rosemary Lane is a single track road, with no pavement, so safety for pedestrians has to be a primary concern. Traffic should be encouraged via Midway Avenue/Western Avenue.</p>
13	<p>Whilst I am opposed to further housing development in the village, I recognise it as a necessity. With that in mind, I believe the proposals set out in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan offers sensible <u>suggestions to achieve the necessary development.</u></p>
	<p>However i strongly urge the council to consider the parking requirements which will Recent developments have provided arise as a result of these developments. inadequate parking for residents and visitors, leading to inconsiderate/dangerous parking within the village.</p>
14	<p>Thank you for all your efforts with this plan. It has clearly taken significant time and energy to produce with much care and thought put into it. A few points of concern to raise:</p>
	<p>-Is it possible to review the idea of an entrance from the bypass to the new development This would alleviate both construction and additional car traffic in Rosemary Lane that is not designed for this increased level in traffic. In today's world there are constant deliveries to homes and looking to the future it would seem wise to plan for these eventualities.</p>

- Rosemary Lane has already had significant increase in traffic resulting in a more hazardous road for pedestrians with no current footpath. This is a concern particularly for school children and families. Could we consider a one way option and possibly a footpath?

Ten Acre Lane is in need of both lighting and a pedestrian footpath. Is this something that can be included in the plan as a matter of urgency? The road is dangerous for pedestrians, particularly in winter months to walk along.

what infrastructure will be put in place for doctors, dentists, schools and other needed amenities with the increase in population predicted?

15	<p>Whilst we are not completely adverse to having 24 dwellings being built on Coltscroft, we are categorically against more traffic using Rosemary Lane. Rosemary Lane is a single track road, which is already used by some as a race track! When this development was first muted by the Contractor, we were assured that a new road would be put in place from Thorpe Bye Pass. This now seems to have been withdrawn from the plans. It would be interesting to know how access to the site by heavy plant and machinery, together with delivery trucks would be achieved without causing severe disruption to the existing residents.</p>
	<p>Is rbc considering the infrastructure in Thorpe to meet further demands? (Schools, shops, buses, to name but a few).</p>
	<p>As Thorpe has had substantial building works carried out in the last few years and with this proposed development, are we not in danger of losing our village status?</p>
16	<p>All opportunities should be explored to improve walking and cycling to Thorpe C of E school. Are there any proposal to improve cycling along Thorpe Bypass? Can we please have a cycle lane from Thorpe to Egham.</p>
	<p>Anners 1D 30P mentions strategic land available. Are there any current proposals?</p>
	<p>What is the "new community land trust"?</p>
	<p>Table 6-14 "comparison of current stock and future need for housing Runnymede and Thorpe" is dated 2011 - 8 years out of date.</p>
	<p>Mentions in plan about "Thorpe Village Core" and retaining mature trees and hedgerows. There are lots of old trees outside the core. Can these be protected also?</p>

17	<p>Rosemary Lane is a single track road and two cars passing at any point is already an issue, with incidents of walls to front gardens being damaged. This issue is exacerbated at certain times of the day due to school drop off and pick up when there is also a higher number of pedestrians walking in the carriageway. Unfortunately, not all drivers use due care and attention when driving on Rosemary lane and there is a valid concern that with extra traffic on the road generated by the development there would be serious safety issues. The integrity of the highway will be impacted by the additional vehicles, proving further health and safety concerns.</p>
18	<p>I Have read the Thorpe Neighborhood Forum "Neighborhood Plan — Regulation 14 Consultation" with interest and great concern especially regarding what I see as the over development of what is effectively a village and the loss of so much green belt land. As a resident of Rosemary Lane I strongly object and hereby state that the Policy TH2 (i) — Land off Rosemary Lane, Coltscroft proposed development is wholly unacceptable to me and my family as is the proposed other developments at Woodcock Hall Farm & Land East of Ten Acre Lane/North of Coldharbour Lane.</p> <p>Policy TH2 (i) — Land off Rosemary Lane, Coltscroft As mentioned above I am a resident of Rosemary Lane and I see from the draft proposal it is suggested to build this new development right up to the boundary of my property.</p> <p>I also note that the proposed access is via Rosemary Lane, this must not be allowed to happen;</p> <p>Rosemary Lane is a single track road that would simply not cope with the increased volume in road traffic and would become unsafe for pedestrians, cyclists and other users. Given that the suggestion is to develop 24 x homes (their sizes and the type of occupants suggested) and give vehicular let alone pedestrian or cycle access via Rosemary Lane would result in an unacceptable increase of at least 200 plus cars using the lane per day. That would be 200 plus cars passing my home resulting in an unbearable increase in pollution, noise and danger and the total loss of my family's quality of life not to mention the loss of value to my property.</p>

I really am at a loss to understand how access from Rosemary Lane would work given the existing issues of when cars try to pass each other, the congestion from Thorpe school traffic and the parking issues in Western Avenue. What is the plan, to introduce a dreaded "One Way System", Traffic Lights" ... This is a crazy, ridiculous and as stated to me and my family totally unacceptable.

If the land is snatched from "OUR / current Thorpe Resident's" green belt then any developer must be made to accept that they will have design access via the By Pass and accept the extra costs involved, you can call me selfish but I am not willing to sacrifice my family's quality of life, value in my home and suffer what will be a traffic nightmare for the sake of 24 x new homes and to save a developer or the council for that matter money

If this proposed development does go ahead and access is given via Rosemary Lane then you might as well add my property in for redevelopment too as I would not want to continue living there and I doubt anyone else would want to either making the property worthless!

Woodcock Hall Farm I note that the Woodcock Hall Farm development proposed access is directly on to Green Road not far from the junction with Rosemary Lane. Although this development is smaller than that proposed for Rosemary Lane I cannot believe that the suggestion it to try to feed the access of both developments in to Green Road. This will result in what is now a relatively low traffic flow area in to one that would become over bareingly busy.

If all three developments were to go ahead then Thorpe may as well be dissolved and become Greater Egham, it would certainly lose what's left of its Village feel.

The increase in traffic from these developments added to those of Longcross, Cemex & Thorpe Lea Road will only result in local grid lock. The strains on already over stretched services such as schools & doctors will also result in local misery.

I am not against all development but it should be in smaller lots and in a way that does not impact and cause detrimental effects to existing residents.

I also sincerely hope that residents' concerns are listened to and that they are not simply ignored.

19	My Land is Rosemary Lane is proposed to be removed from the green belt. Wish to develop this site for 1/2 residential dwellings. Do not wish to retain caravans on site. Wish to build out as shown in plan with red brick etc.
20	The Forum is to be congratulated on the production of this excellent plan. I appreciate the need for extra houses in the area but would not support the 84 odd houses proposed as I understand it on the Coltscroft site, a much lower number of say 25-30 would be acceptable and leaving a area between the development and the by pass as green belt.
	Also I applaud the design codes to ensure compatibility with the good builds within the area
21	Foreword: why is Thorpe unique? Does it mean it is the only one in RBC? The Neighbour Area: 1) If you have definitive proof Monks walk was called this prior to Thorpe Park then I would be delighted to see it. It certainly has been a footpath to Chertsey for 200 years but I have no evidence it was ever referred to in connection with Chertsey Abbey. You could say 'tradition has it' . 2) The Village Hall is NOT a tythe (tithe to avoid shades of Merrie England) barn, that is the barn in the grounds of now TASIC. The Village Hall was a barn belonging to Blackhouse Farm. Vision Principles: my ignorance but what do the numbers mean? & is there a minimum limit. P31 what is SANG? P33: what is FTE? P35: should H5 be TH5? p38:Monks Walk see earlier comment P43: should it be the current sewerage& etc. These are only minor quibbles - the substance which I do see has been massively revised is OK & appreciate the amount of work entailed.
22	The Forum is to be congratulated on the production of this excellent plan.
	I appreciate the need for extra houses in the area but would not support the 84 odd houses proposed as I understand it on the Coltscroft site, a much lower number of say 25-30 would be acceptable and leaving a area between the development and the by pass as green belt.
	Also I applaud the design codes to ensure compatibility with the good builds within the area
23	I found the draft very readable and it seems to cover what is important issues in the village.
	I am pleased you find it important to support local amenities

	<p>but disappointed St Anns Hill was not included even though outside the plan's boundary. A pedestrian access along the Thorpe road between the end of Mill Lane and the motorway bridge would make it more accessible. It would also give pedestrian access to the water ski lakes. There is a grass verge but it would be very muddy at times and difficult for pushchairs and I thought a better path would be a big improvement.</p>
24	<p>Agree with the plan in principle, but feel environmental concerns must take precedence</p>
25	<p>Coltscroft Development. 24 homes. Good idea that consideration will be given to 1st time buyers and 1st time rentals providing the prices are realistic.</p> <p>Concerned by extra traffic in Rosemary Lane during busy school times.</p> <p>Woodcock Farm. Very good idea with little impact on roads.</p> <p>Thorpe Park Farm. Looks a very exciting project especially with the provision of parkland for local residents.</p> <p>I welcome any new tree planting in the village especially in the large green area in Fleetway which is currently very bland.</p> <p>Extra parking for Thorpe Village Hall and Church is needed.</p> <p>Extra buses in Thorpe village.</p> <p>I applaud and congratulate the hard work of the members of Thorpe forum. The plans are fair and well presented. Big thankyou to you all.</p>
26	<p>The local infrastructure improvements are very welcome but I would suggest additional street lighting in Village Road which would encourage more residents to talk from the village to the community hall especially after dark.</p> <p>The Thorpe Neighbourhood scheme appears to be well thought out covering a large number of issues. I am sure that if the developers, local and county councillors and planners ensure the objectives are met, the wellbeing of the village and residents should only be improved.</p>
27	<p>If I had my way not another inch of land would go for building within the designated area. Not another vehicle would drive through already congested roads. Not another bulb of light pollution put into our night sky. Unfortunately for powers above we have no choice but to let development unfold (SHAME) So to have some control through Thorpe Forum and to have the say to how the development happens can only be a positive. I have lived in Thorpe all my life and would like it to remain as is for the rest of my life. I could always move away.</p>

28	<p>Re 5.46 'as local incomes across Runnymede are relatively high there is a modest need for socially rented property in the area' - the statement about local incomes is a generalisation and presumably refers to some type of average. There are many people who work part-time, are low earners or not in work for various reasons and therefore do not benefit from the high incomes of others (eg around 1 in 10 Children in Runnymede live in poverty - see Surrey Live: Curley, R. (16 November 2e18) 'Frimley parents forced to choose between feeding children or heating home, poverty report reveals: A report by End Child Poverty reveals some worrying statistics for Surrey' . Available at: (web reference). (Accessed: 28 November 2019) . Runnymede is seen as an affluent area but it is also an area of great inequality. It is not clear from the quote how 'modest' should be interpreted ie there is not much need, or there is a need which Should be recognized.</p>
	<p>Table 6-14 shows a significant shortfall in provision Of 1-bed socially rented housing (40% requirement but Only 21% currently existing according to census data). I could not find any mention of this in the proposals for the various potential housing sites. There was very little need established in terms of market sale/intermediate 2-3 bed housing but this has been emphasised in the policies as being a priority for the proposed housing sites. It has also noted by a younger person who viewed the plan with me that the houses on most of the sites appear to have quite large gardens. buyers/renters are not looking for large gardens. It looks I lke an attempt to ensure more wealthy people move to (thereby keeping less 'desirable ' out) rather than to provide for needs (and developers are willing and able to supply at a reasonable price given that most exist to make a profit).</p>
29	<p>I realise there is a need for roofs over heads and as long as the infrastructure is there, ie schools , doctors surgeries, sewers, roads would not object. More traffic on Norlands Lane will probably need a roundabout or traffic lights at junction with Staines Road.</p>
	<p>There is a need for a car park near the church.</p>
	<p>Excellent report</p>
30	<p>I am unhappy. With the plan as the village is not big enough for large development and I am worried my property value will decrease. I purchased a house in the village for it's eqclusivity</p>

31	<p>Dear Sirs / Madam. I am not going to take any sides in this Neighbourhood Plan as I have an interest in it, but would like to say my yard does not flood at all and when it is developed I would put all the houses in line with the rest of the propoerties from Thorpe War Memorial and Thorpe Green roundabout and no back building as the rest of the places are all the same.</p>
	<p>I like Swallow and Wisteria Cottages, also Orchard Gardens down Rosemary Lane as the are more inkeeping with the Village scene and are a pleasure to look at at all times.</p>
32	<p>The construction of a village car park is essential for the future viability of the Church, Village and community halls. This is the first priority of Thorpe PCC . We agree with improving Ten Acre Lane and some new housing in that area.</p>
33	<p>I have been delighted to read this consultation and fully support the proposals. It has been and honour and a pleasure to be, in a small way, associated with its production.</p>
34	<p>I totally support the draft neighbourhood plan and wish it to be endorsed (and enforced)</p>
35	<p>My views broadly agree with those outlined in the Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2030 pre-submission plan.</p> <p>I would like to emphasise the urgent need for car parking provision in the village in order for the Church, Village Hall and Community Hall to continue to viably serve the needs of the village and wider community.</p> <p>It is also imperative that more cemetary space is allocated. Local residents need to be reassured that, when the time comes, they will not have to be buried elsewhere in the borough.</p> <p>Ten Acre Lane serves a route from Thorpe Lea, in ancient Thorpe, to the parish church of St Mary's. From it's junction with Village Road it is unlit and has no pavement to either carriageway, making it extremely unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists to negotiate, especially at night and in winter months.</p> <p>I concur with the view that the above needs could be addressed using the parcel of land East of Ten Acre Lane / North of Coldharbour Lane for the mixed usages described in the pre-submission plan.</p>
36	<p>I am sending this email to indicate my support for the draft neighbourhood plan.</p>

37	<p>Dear Mrs Gilliam and fellow persons involved with the creation of the attached Thorpe Village Development Plan, may I begin by having had the privilege to read/listen to its entire content? I am writing the following comment in my capacity as Chairman of Runnymede Access Liaison Group</p> <p>I note that some mention is briefly made of the expectation that any significant road and other pedestrian routes will conform to the existing regulations. I have concerns that when the increased residential development happens that insufficient provision will be made for the unfettered passage of pedestrians. With the "ageing" population, there will be an increase in the number of residents and of course visitors who will need safe access on foot, not only to the listed village facilities but also to the existing and proposed new buildings.</p> <p>These concerns will only be allayed by ensuring that precise detailed dimensions of paths, footpaths and road crossings enable the free movement of wheelchair and other mobility impaired people. Safe access to the schools and church and other community structures must be assured</p> <p>Your report already mentions a potential difficulty with Coldharbour lane. Runnymede Access liaison Group is not tasked with commenting on the aesthetic quality of a semi-rural village however the capacity to incorporate full accessibility is its paramount responsibility.</p> <p>When the environment as a whole is concerned, the provision of safe access to much improved public transport is an imperative.</p> <p>If the Thorpe Forum wishes to involve RALG they are very welcome to make a formal approach to initiate a detailed assessment with the chief objective being to ensure that access is at least maintained and wherever possible greatly improved.</p>
38	<p>Spellings and Typos</p> <p>P14 - Footer is missing</p> <p>P15 3.5 - Should this read "This designated neighbourhood area lies close to (strike the) Thorpe where its boundary meets the M25" The boundary of Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan is not the M25.</p> <p>P15 3.8 - should read "much needed"</p> <p>P16 - 3.10 – Plan's</p>

P20 4.5 – states “Full details of the consultation are available on the website” <u>Missing</u> from the web site.
P29 iii (h) – should read “measures”
P29 5.25 – Change Grade 11 to Grade II
P32 5.35 - coalescence of village with Thorpe Lea should read “to the North”
P35 - should read TH5
P36 5.49 - “regard to the specific principles it,...” grammatical point
P39 (h) .. along its banks
P40 TH9 – has St. Mary’s Church listed twice, once with Rutherwyck Room and once without – is there a reason for this?
Since the draft plan has been written the Environment Agency have issued details of its updated flood modeling for planning. Therefore we suggest all Plans and reference to flood risk areas should be amended in accordance with the online Floodmaps for Planning.
In the Foreword paragraph 1 it states “ .. had limited development in recent years” Can this be qualified as to how long and what development? There has been considerable development since the 1970s (which we would consider to be recent times in the context of the historical settlement status) and we feel the Plan should be about positively managing this change.
In paragraph 4 we suggest “This had repercussions on weddings, funerals, Christenings and other community events at St. Mary’s Church”
Pre-submission Plan Page 7 1.6, Where is the Evidence Base? It requires a list. This does not appear on the Supporting Document Listing and Policy Reference.
2.2 - Suggest changing Staines to Staines-Upon-Thames.
2.3 - Suggest “River Thames and its tributary the River Bourne”
2.7 - Suggest “.. the wider area of Thorpe Ward, along Green Road ...”
2.10 – “Thorpe Park Resort being a significant tourist attraction.” We suggest there should be a Policy in the Plan relating to Thorpe Park, which is also a large landowner, and substantial employer, particularly in the summer season.
2.14 – “ <i>however the proximity of the M25 and M3 motorways and mineral working has resulted in modern housing developments outside of the Conservation Area .</i> ” We suggest the Plan could benefit from a historical statement of development as several developments have been undertaken since 1970, and prior to the building of the M25/M3, to the West of the Conservation Area.
2.15 – Suggest adding Green Lane Stores, which is within the boundary, and the Thames Waste Management/Viridor site which generates electricity from their landfill gas engine.
Plan D, Flood Risk needs updating following the EA’s latest flood modeling.

<p>3.2 – Sufficient choice of school places. Suggest a statement should be included to cover the expansion of the Primary School as it is likely to be oversubscribed following housing development, both within the designated neighbourhood area and outside.</p>
<p>We suggest the Plan acknowledges adjacent developments in the Emerging Local Plan that have ramifications within the Neighbourhood Plan (for example the Muse Development).</p>
<p>Following Thorpe’s removal from the Green Belt we suggest a Policy to safeguard and retain BE15 of the Local Plan 2001 to include the area close to Thorpe Bypass, as this policy is to be replaced by EE7 of the Emerging Local Plan.</p>
<p>Why is NE7: Restoration of Penton Hook and Mixnams Lane included as they are outside of the TNP Boundary?</p>
<p>Plan F, Thorpe Constraints Plan November 2019 does not include the additional 2019 SLAA sites. Can these please be added.</p>
<p>4.5 - as mentioned above, at the time of this consultation the details were not available on the Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan website.</p>
<p>5.2 – Key objectives – The Plan states “and to encourage new Businesses”. May we suggest there is a Policy for new Businesses.</p>
<p>5.14 - We found this rather confusing. The original RBC Local Plan figure was 74 dwellings, the HNA indicates 185, the latest RBC trajectory is 98 dwellings. The Neighbourhood Plan indicates approximately 24 at TH2(i) between 5 and 10 at TH2(ii), approximately 15 at TH2(iii) and “about” or “at least” 40 homes at TH2(iv). This gives an approximate figure of 89. We suggest a tabled breakdown setting out respective figures and how they are derived would be helpful.</p>
<p>TH2 (i) i. states a predominance of 2 and 3 bedroom homes, yet the concept drawing shows a number of large detached houses. Whilst we understand that at this stage it is only a concept, we suggest a better vision is shown for the site.</p>
<p>TH2 (i) v. quotes vehicular access via Rosemary Lane to the satisfaction of the Highways Authority. Has this been tested with the Highway Authority and local residents?</p>
<p>TH2 (ii) Will the Plan be vulnerable if there is no evidence to support the viability of all available housing sites?</p>
<p>References to flood risk will need to be changed in the light of the new flood risk modeling.</p>
<p>TH2 (iv) There is inconsistency between (b) “at least 40 dwellings” and 5.31 “about 40 homes”.</p>

5.35 Re 'parkland in perpetuity' how will the Plan guarantee this and please explain how it will be sustained in the future. Also as mentioned above, this should read "Thorpe Lea to the North"

For the purpose of examination we suggest there is evidence base supporting the statements regarding "Major employer" i.e. how many staff are local employees and how many live within the Neighbourhood boundary? Given that the school teaches American syllabus, how many teachers are from overseas?

5.39 states "For security reasons the campus is private" This appears to be in conflict with statements that TESIS is a local amenity for all local residents for example:

Overall in TH3 it is stated four times that TESIS is a major employer, and once that it is a major landowner. Thorpe Park is also a major landowner, and major employer. Evidence base from RBC's Local Plan submissions (dated 2019) shows that at Thorpe Park there are 173 permanent jobs, 1250 seasonal employment plus construction and visitor related employment. Is it an oversight that Thorpe Park has not been included in the Policies?

TH6 Was the Village Pound considered as a local Heritage Asset? It is not Nationally listed.

5.54. The Green and Blue Infrastructure map shows Sports Facilities. The majority of these are marked E, which are listed as TESIS Playing fields and not open to the community for security reasons.

5.57 d. suggests "linking the cycle path which passes under the M25 and onto Thorpe Green with the A320." It is not clear what this means and where the route would go to link with the A320.

TH9 vi and xi repeat St. Mary's Church. Suggest Rutherwyke Room behind St. Mary's Church.

viii Should TESIS be included as a community facility when it is at odds with previous statements regarding private business and security.

TH11iii. This sentence appears to be confusing, We suggest it should also include clause 156 from the NPPG "to consider cumulative impacts and ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere" and refers to SV2 General Flooding Policy (page 15 of the draft plan)

6 How is the visual amenity of those in The Gower to be dramatically enhanced? Please explain

Thorpe Neighbourhood Forum's Response
Policy TH2 iii has been deleted
Policy TH2 iii has been deleted
No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage
No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage
Noted this is dealt with in the NP para Implementation section 6.4, No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage
No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage
No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage
Noted this is dealt with in the NP para Implementation section 6.4, No change
Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

The Forum does not see any reason to ammend

No Change

Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

The Forum does not see any reason to ammend

Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

Noted this is dealt with in the NP para Implementation section 6.4

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

Noted this is dealt with in the NP para Implementation section 6.4 and policy T2 iv, no change

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage
No Change
Policy TH2 iii has been deleted
No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage
No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage
Noted this is dealt with in the NP para Implementation section 6.4
No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage
No Change

Noted this is dealt with in the NP para Implementation section 6.4

Noted this is dealt with in the NP para Implementation section 6.4

Noted this is dealt with in the NP para Implementation section 6.4

Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change

Noted and no change needed

Noted and no change needed
Noted and no change needed
Noted and no change needed
Noted and no change needed
Noted and no change needed
Policy TH2 iii has been deleted
Policy TH2 iii has been deleted
No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage
No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

Policy TH2 iii has been deleted

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

With the deletion of the dwellings at Thorpe Park Farm the allocations add up to 74. However, with the windfalls of 11 and the calculation of units at CEMEX house the total is 129, this enables the Green Belt boundary to endure after the Neighbourhood Plan period.

The reasoning for the higher number is set out in the vision principles in section 4, no change

Noted and no change needed

There is already an established use as a builders yard on the Coltscroft site with unlimited vehicle movements entering and exiting the site via Rosemary Lane, therefore the allocation on Coltscroft is considered by the Forum as an acceptable afteruse.

There is already an established use as a builders yard on the Coltscroft site with unlimited vehicle movements entering and exiting the site via Rosemary Lane, therefore the allocation on Coltscroft is considered by the Forum as an acceptable afteruse.

There is already an established use as a builders yard on the Coltscroft site with unlimited vehicle movements entering and exiting the site via Rosemary Lane, therefore the allocation on Coltscroft is considered by the Forum as an acceptable afteruse.

Noted and no change needed

Noted this is dealt with in the NP para Implementation section 6.4

Noted and no change needed

There is already an established use as a builders yard on the Colecroft site with unlimited vehicle movements entering and exiting the site via Rosemary Lane, therefore the allocation on Coltscroft is considered by the Forum as an acceptable afteruse. The entrance on the bypass will not integrate the new development into the village

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

Noted this is dealt with in the NP para Implementation section 6.4

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

There is already an established use as a builders yard on the Colecroft site with unlimited vehicle movements entering and exiting the site via Rosemary Lane, therefore the allocation on Coltscroft is considered by the Forum as an acceptable afteruse. The entrance on the bypass will not integrate the new development into the village

Yes as part of the Cil implementation.

No as there are significantly larger villages in Surrey

The NP already has proposals to improve cycle and pedestrian ways through Thorpe under 6.4

The Forum doesn't have any knowledge of the landowners intentions for this site

A Community Land Trust would develop houses for the community and the allocation TH2 iv encourages the developer to consider this

This relates to the last available census

Important trees within the designated area already have TPOs the NP encourages further tree planting in the designated area

There is already an established use as a builders yard on the Colecroft site with unlimited vehicle movements entering and exiting the site via Rosemary Lane, therefore the allocation on Coltscroft is considered by the Forum as an acceptable afteruse.

The NP needs to be in general conformity with the emerging Local Plan and therefore requires land to be allocated for development

No comment

There is already an established use as a builders yard on the Colecroft site with unlimited vehicle movements entering and exiting the site via Rosemary Lane, therefore the allocation on Coltscroft is considered by the Forum as an acceptable afteruse.

There is already an established use as a builders yard on the Colecroft site with unlimited vehicle movements entering and exiting the site via Rosemary Lane, therefore the allocation on Coltscroft is considered by the Forum as an acceptable afteruse.

There is already an established use as a builders yard on the Colecroft site with unlimited vehicle movements entering and exiting the site via Rosemary Lane, therefore the allocation on Coltscroft is considered by the Forum as an acceptable afteruse.

There is already an established use as a builders yard on the Colecroft site with unlimited vehicle movements entering and exiting the site via Rosemary Lane, therefore the allocation on Coltscroft is considered by the Forum as an acceptable afteruse. The entrance on the bypass will not integrate the new development into the village

No comment

No change as this will be dealt with at the planning application stage

The amending of the Green Belt boundary so it would endure after the Plan period ensures the the unique character of the village is retained

Any forthcoming application will require approval Highway Authority

The allocation at Coltscroft and Woodcock farm are considered to be smaller lots, the allocation at Coldharbour Lane is justified by the community benefits it provides

Extensive consultation has been taken in preparing the Neighbourhood Plan - no change needed

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Delete the word unique and replace with one of it's kind; inclde the words tradition has it in relation to Monks Walk, remove the word Tythe; the numbers refer to each Principle; SB to put defn of SANG, FTE is FullTime Equivalent and refers to the aggregation of Part time jobs, ammend H5 to TH5, 5.57a should refer to the footpath traditionally known as; current is considered not required

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Outside the designated area
Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed
This coment refers to policy TH2 iv no change needed
Noted no change needed
Included in policy TH2 iv no change needed
Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed
included in 6.4
Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

This is a matter for the Highway Authority

Noted and policy TH2 iv includes a car park

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed
Noted and policy TH2 iv includes a car park
Noted and policy TH2 iv includes a provision for the extension on the cemetery
Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed
Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Each planning application will address disabled access

Each planning application will address disabled access

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Noted no change needed

Amend

Amend

Amend 2nd to last line

Amend 2nd to last line

Now on the website
Amend
Amend
Amend
Amend
Delete the word it
Amend
Delete vi so only one entry
Consultation document amended
The Forum does not consider development in the 1970s to be recent, no change
Amend
A list of the evidence will be set out at the end of the Submission of the Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan
Amend
Amend
Noted but no amendment
Noted but no amendment as employment policies would duplicate the policies in the draft Local Plan
This is included in the evidence base refer to Aecom and Forums Heritage reports
Amend
Consultation document amended

The upgrading of education facilities to accommodate new development will be dealt with in the planning application stage - no change

These developments are not in the Designated Area - no change

The Neighbourhood Plan doesn't include this area

Noted this should be deleted

Amend

This has now been published and is on the website

Noted but no amendment as employment policies would duplicate the policies in the draft Local Plan

This is included in the appendices in the Reg 15 document

This has been amended

In any future planning application for this site the access onto Rosemary Lane will need the approval of the Highway Authority, the local residents should be consulted at that time.

Each landowner has provided a viability statement - no change

Consultation document amended

Amended to say 40 dwellings

Thorpe Lea to the north amended, the applicant will need to demonstrate that the parkland will be maintained in perpetuity and that there are funds in place to do so - no change

This is not a relevant consideration for inclusion into Neighbour Plan

TASIS is a visual amenity to the village and a number of the allotments are available and used by Thorpe residents.

The forum considers that the employment policies in the Draft Local Plan deal adequately with Thorpe Park and the NP would not add to these

Not known

These sports facilities still have an important role in maintaining and protecting biodiversity and wildlife and have amenity value to Thorpe- no change

This is outside the Designated Area

To be deleted as it is referred in TH9 xi

This has been deleted

Amend

The Forum has identified this area would benefit from more tree planting , moneys from Cil payment could provide this.