

Respondent name	Specific Issue	Ref. No.	Summary of responses	Officer comment	Action
General Comments					
GOSE	General	2	SPD consistent with national/regional planning policy	Noted	None
Boyer Planning	General	1	Surprised that no text included to reflect timeline of the two sectors	As the construction of the site is at the discretion of the developers, it is not possible to provide a detailed timetable for delivery. A general indication can be made in terms of the allocation of the site and its role in delivering housing to meet regional and national targets.	Indicative timeline to be added in SPD
Section 1 - Provision of Infrastructure					
Court Lodge Residents Association	Pg. 12 Para. 1.28	4	Statement welcomed	Noted	None
Horley Town Council	Pg. 12 Para. 1.28	5	Additional statement is welcomed	Noted	None
Highways Agency	Pg. 6 Para. 1.7	7	Objectives welcomed	Noted	None
Highways Agency	Pg. 7 Para. 1.12	7	Pleased with reference to Community Infrastructure Levy	Noted	None
Highways Agency	Pg. 9 Para. 1.15	7	Pleased with reference to Strategic Road Network (SRN). Request to amend text: 'In spatial and development control terms, the Highways Agency, on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport, is responsible for managing and operating a safe and efficient strategic road network'.	Noted. Proposed information can be added to the text.	Add additional text to Paragraph 1.15
Highways Agency	Pg. 11 Implementation	7	Highways Agency (HA) welcomes approach to funding future infrastructure requirements in Horley through SPD. Require clarity on issue of how monies collected through tariff arrangements will be used to fund the SRN. Also, seek clarification regarding 'forward funding' of infrastructure and the mechanisms for it - and if the HA is considered to be a 'relevant organisation'. As 'off-site' infrastructure improvements on pg. 13, the implication is that improvements to the SRN are not included in the tariff - is this the case?	The HA were closely involved in Transport Assessments undertaken prior to approval of Horley Master Plan allocations. Surrey County Council are coordinating off site improvements to key junctions; these do not, however, include the SRN. Surrey County Council have forward funded some infrastructure works, including those to enable the operation of the Fastway service in partnership, and will look to recoup this funding from developers at various construction trigger points.	Surrey County Council Highway Officers to continue to liaise regularly with Highway Authority

Respondent name	Specific Issue	Ref. No.	Summary of responses	Officer comment	Action
Section 2 - County Council Services					
Boyer Planning	Pg. 17 Para. 2.22	1	Concern that it is misleading to imply that a 29% contribution would be paid towards regeneration initiatives and not merely for those which Section 106 agreement provides.	Noted. Wording to be amended.	29% removed from Paragraph 2.22
Boyer Planning	Pg. 18 Education section	1	Detail of analysis is considerably out of line with coverage given to other topics. Some of the detail could be redirected to the appendix.	Agreed for simplicity. An education appendix will be included.	Primary education section to be simplified. Detail to be moved to appendix.
Court Lodge Residents Association	Pg.13 Para. 2.3	4	20% modal shift will be difficult to achieve and what will be the impact on transport infrastructure should this not happen. Also, provision of cycle ways in Horley is haphazard.	Refer to Borough Local Plan Policy Hr 23. Substantial funding has been secured to improve pedestrian and cycle links and Surrey County Council have already started implementing this.	Add reference in text to Borough Local Plan 2005 Policy Hr 23
Court Lodge Residents Association	Pg. 15 Para. 2.10	4	Rather than create another bus service, support for existing should be maintained and increased.	Community transport proposals complement existing services and support future viability. Developer contributions can only be used to support demand generated by new development.	None
Court Lodge Residents Association	Pg. 24 Para. 2.53	4	Support comments made	Noted	None
Horley Town Council	Pg. 13 Para. 2.3	5	20% modal shift will be difficult to achieve and what will be the impact on transport infrastructure should this not happen. Also, provision of cycle ways in Horley is haphazard.	Refer to Borough Local Plan Policy Hr 23. Substantial funding has been secured to improve pedestrian and cycle links and Surrey County Council have already started implementing this.	Add reference in text to Borough Local Plan 2005 Policy Hr 23
Horley Town Council	Pg. 15 Para. 2.10	5	Rather than create another bus service, support for existing should be maintained and increased.	Community transport proposals complement existing services and support future viability. Developer contributions can only be used to support demand generated by new development.	None
Horley Town Council	Pg. 24 Para. 2.53	5	Support comments made	Noted	None
Highways Agency	Pg. 13 Para. 2.2	7	Highways Agency welcomes commitment to ensure new developments are accessible by sustainable transport modes	Noted	None
Highways Agency	Pg. 13-14 Para. 2.3-2.6	7	Highways Agency supports Horley Community Travel Plan	Noted	None

Respondent name	Specific Issue	Ref. No.	Summary of responses	Officer comment	Action
Section 3 - Borough Council Services					
Horley Town Council	Pg. 31 Para. 3.17	5	After 'Horley has only...' please add, 'which comprises a total of 60 plots for the entire town. There is already a serious shortage of plots in town, judged by the town council's extremely long waiting list. It is recommended that every effort is made to bring forward the allotments provision that is set out in the NE and NW sectors.'	Noted	Add additional text to Paragraph 3.17
Horley Town Council	Pg. 33 Para. 3.27	5	2nd Paragraph is not clear. Developers contributions should cover the total capital cost of providing new cameras, columns etc. and the cost of providing links to control centres, as advised by Surrey Police.	This text has not changed from the original SPD. CCTV costs are being sought via Section 106 agreements.	None
Section 4 - Other Services					
Boyer Planning	Pg. 35 Para. 4.5	1	Concern to see the proposal to delete the sentence in paragraph 4.5 of the adopted SPD. "The developers of the additional dwellings to the west of the A23 should contribute appropriate proportion of the capital cost of the facilities". Request that RBBC clarifies Surrey Primary Care Trust requirements and amends paragraph 4.5 so that it reflects more accurately the role of the NW Sector in its funding.	Noted. Primary Care Trust position not yet clarified. Text to be amended to clarify current position.	Text to be amended

Respondent name	Specific Issue	Ref. No.	Summary of responses	Officer comment	Action
Thames Water	Pg. 35 Para. 4.6 - 4.7	3	Thames Water considers paragraph 4.7 should be amended as follows: "Thames Water Utilities Limited have indicated that foul drainage from the proposed NW sector will flow to the Horley Lee Street Sewage Treatment Works, while flows from the NE sector will drain to the Burstow Sewage Treatment Works (STW). However, there may prove to be a need to relocate/rationalise these and other works in the area to provide the necessary additional wastewater treatment capacity and/or for environmental requirements. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. They will also be required to show that if development is located adjacent to the STW that there will be no loss of amenity due to odour. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to an overloading of existing infrastructure/loss of amenity. Contact with..."	Comment proposed adds further clarity. Thames Water have provided additional wording.	Text to be amended

Respondent name	Specific Issue	Ref. No.	Summary of responses	Officer comment	Action
Section 1 - Summary and Outcomes					
Court Lodge Residents Association	Summary	4	The new statement reflects our comments above	Noted	None
Horley Town Council	Summary	5	Summary is supported by Town Council	Noted	None
Section 7 - Results and Implementation					
Court Lodge Residents Association	Item 7.1/Part 12	4	Ambition that the SPD may assist in reducing emissions may be unrealistic due to aircraft prevalence. Also, ambition to reduce car emissions is not a certainty, as traffic volumes will be affected by business and tourist factors.	Noted	None
Horley Town Council	Item 7.1/Part 12	5	Ambition that the SPD may assist in reducing emissions may be unrealistic due to aircraft prevalence. Also, ambition to reduce car emissions is not a certainty, as traffic volumes will be affected by business and tourist factors.	Noted	None
Highways Agency	Item 7.1/Obj. 11 & 16	7	Suggest following additional points are considered as a way of monitoring achievements against the objectives: (i) The proportion of trips by non-car mode; (ii) The proportion of new development which is meeting its travel plan objectives; and (iii) The level of growth of traffic on key routes within Reigate and Banstead.	Surrey County Council are introducing a Horley wide Community Travel Plan and these objectives can be included as part of this.	Surrey County Council to incorporate in Horley wide Community Travel Plan
Appendix C					
Court Lodge Residents Association	App. C/Obj 3/Part 3	4	Continued need for 6th form provision in Horley. With student numbers rising, commute to Redhill/Reigate is unsustainable.	Noted. Paragraph 2.53 of SPD confirms position unsustainable. Surrey County Council looking at longer term options.	Surrey County Council to look at longer term option
Court Lodge Residents Association	App. C/Obj 3/Part 11	4	The proximity of schools will only apply to those of primary age; those of secondary age will continue to use Oakwood, which will increase bus/car journeys - therefore, Fastway needs to be routed near the school.	Existing Fastway route to NE sector runs past Oakwood School. NW sector route will come to Horley station which is 5-10 minute walk. Substantial funding has been secured to improve pedestrian and cycle links and Surrey County Council have already started implementing this.	None

Horley Town Council	App. C/Obj 3/Part 3	5	Continued need for 6th form provision in Horley. With student numbers rising, commute to Redhill/Reigate is unsustainable.	Noted. Paragraph 2.53 of SPD confirms position unsustainable. Surrey County Council looking at longer term options.	Surrey County Council to look at longer term option
Horley Town Council	App. C/Obj 3/Part 11	5	The proximity of schools will only apply to those of primary age; those of secondary age will continue to use Oakwood, which will increase bus/car journeys - therefore, Fastway needs to be routed near the school	Existing Fastway route to NE sector runs past Oakwood School. NW sector route will come to Horley station which is 5-10 minute walk. Substantial funding has been secured to improve pedestrian and cycle links and Surrey County Council have already started implementing this.	None
SA Report	App. C/Obj. 1/Summary	N/a	Comment added: 'There is still no detail on phasing/triggers particularly for the school'.	Noted	None
SA Report	App. C/Obj. 2/Part 9	N/a	Re: conserve and enhance biodiversity within the plan area. Comment added: 'Concern is severance of habitats by new access roads. Needs to be mitigated.	Noted	None
SA Report	App. C/Obj. 3/Part 3	N/a	Re: poverty and social exclusion. Comment added: 'Further education is still not resolved, however, very positive in relation to contributions allowing for primary/secondary school places'.	Noted	None
General Comment					
Boyer Planning	N/a	1	Concern that the issue of up-lift payments, between 25% and 50%, is a considerable increase. The Sustainability Appraisal process must take into account the impact of the increased payments sought in the Draft Amendments on the ability of developers/land owners to bring forward the required houses in terms of the financial burden imposed.	Payments are considered fair as it is important to meet the needs of development. The Borough Council has taken account of the guidance in Circular 05/05. It is satisfied that the requirement of the provision of or contributions towards infrastructure and facilities as specified in the policy is necessary, relevant to planning, and directly related to the proposed development.	Monitor through the Annual Monitoring Report