

Respondent	Section of report	Response	Officer comment
Leon Hibbs (Environmental Health)	Air quality	P21 Within the Merstham AQMA nitrogen dioxide from road traffic is a key source of pollution in the area. However a significant proportion of the pollution is from 'background' sources. These background sources include emissions from domestic and commercial heating systems, and so if any new housing or refurbishment is planned for the Merstham regeneration area the choice of an appropriate heating system can help reduce pollution within the AQMA (and vice versa).	Agreed. Paragraphs added to page 21 of report.
Leon Hibbs (EH)	Air quality	Under the issues for appraisal section an assessment should be made of any factor likely to increase traffic along the A23 between Hooley and Redhill, and not just on the High Street in Merstham, as Redhill will be declared an AQMA shortly and preliminary monitoring suggests that Hooley also has very high concentrations of nitrogen dioxide.	Agreed. Issue added to page 24 of the report.
Leon Hibbs (EH)	Air quality	(p35 - under table 1) unfortunately we do not measure CO2 emissions in Merstham, only nitrogen dioxide (NO2).	Correction made to page 35.
Chris Hobbs (Mole Valley DC)	Sustainability framework	The diagram on page 4 reflects the latest 5 principles of sustainable development in Securing the Future: UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy (March 2005). However we as the East Surrey Group have set out our 23 Sustainability Objectives within the government's earlier 4 principles/themes from A Better Quality of Life - a strategy for sustainable development(1999) as these are the principles set out in PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Development and which is still the overarching PPS for policy formulation. You may therefore wish to include, for clarification, a comment why	Agreed. Diagram on page 4 removed to avoid confusion.

		the document switches from a more recent diagram on page 4 to an apparently older framework for the SA process.	
Chris Hobbs (Mole Valley DC)	PPPs – Appendix C	With regard to Appendix C -Plans Policies and Programmes you may want to check for further updates - eg PPS3 now June 2010. You may also want to consider whether various recent government statements should be included in the list. I'm thinking in particular of the Budget statement - Plan for Growth for example.	Agreed. Update Appendix C and review 'The Plan for growth' for implications to SA.
Julia Coneybeer (Natural England)	No Comment	I am afraid that Natural England is unable to comment in detail on this document.	Noted.
Carly Pannell (Environment Agency)	Key Issues	The evidence relating to flood risk and environment shows the key issues and opportunities in Preston and Merstham are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improving water quality and efficient use of water resources ● Improving biodiversity and green infrastructure ● Reducing flood risk and surface water management 	Noted.
	Objectives	We welcome the sustainability appraisal objectives that cover flooding, land contamination, biodiversity, climate change and sustainable use of resources.	Noted
	Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	We are pleased to see the links between biodiversity and green infrastructure with climate change and flood risk. Development should seek to improve the interface with the greenfield habitats around the edge of the Framework areas. For Merstham these are for example Furzefield wood to the north east	Noted. Agreed. Paragraphs added to new section ' potential to improve biodiversity '.

and Holmethorpe sandpits to the south. For Preston this is Burgh Heath to the east. Creating robust links from these natural open spaces through the site in the form of green corridors and green infrastructure will create more resilient wildlife habitats and improved ecological corridors through the developed areas.

Opportunities to deculvert and open up culverted and constrained watercourses should also be sought, such as those running to the south west and north east of Merstham to create further wildlife habitat and access to nature. The existing should be improved where necessary and new aquatic habitats dug to create a mosaic of pond and wetlands habitats which are being regularly lost due to development.

Natural habitats adjacent to development should also be retained as intrinsically dark habitats through ensuring minimal light spillage with directional lighting and cowlings.

Building beneficial features for wildlife into the built environment such as incorporating bird boxes and bat bricks into new buildings, and plants locally native fruiting and flowering species will also improve the overall value of the development for wildlife.

Climate change

The importance of SUDs is evident in this section of the report, but there is no link between SUDs and the improvement of water quality. We suggest this is included within the document, as this is linked to the fact that the local authority must have regard for the objectives given in the Thames River Basement Management Plan for the Water Framework Directive.

Agreed. Climate change section – water quality added to introduction, and paragraph inserted in ‘what is the situation now?’ section. Groundwater quality added to section on issues.

	<p>We note that part of the Preston Estate is located within is within a public water supply source protection zone. Therefore, the appraisal should also consider surface water drainage management to protect groundwater quality as the part of the estate. This should also be considered within Appendix B as a likely significant issue.</p>	<p>Groundwater quality added to SA objective 12 in Appendix B</p>
Appendix C	<p>We note that although the Thames Catchment Flood Management Plan has been acknowledged on page 34 of the report, it should also be referred to in this section.</p>	<p>Referenced in Appendix C</p>
Water resources	<p>We think the sustainability appraisal should consider water resources and reducing water demand within the framework areas.</p> <p>We are aware of a joint project looking into these areas, and suggest that this can be referenced within the report:</p> <p>http://www.waterwise.org.uk/reducing_water_wastage_in_the_uk/research/sutton__east_surrey_water__preston_water_efficiency_initiative.html</p>	<p>Water efficiency and resources added as main issue in bulleted list p.36. Is already in introduction as 'water quantity' - reference to efficiency more clearly made.</p> <p>Reference added on p36</p>
Kath Harrison (SCC)	<p>I understand that there are ground water supply issues and that Growth Points funding was allocated to seeking to resolve this issue which, as far as I can see is not addressed in the report.</p>	<p>Agreed. Groundwater quality added to section on issues. Groundwater quality added to SA objective 12 in Appendix B</p>
Merstham - Summary (page 31)	<p>Replace "Much of this area has been used by Surrey County Council for mineral extraction, and there are good intentions for restoration" with 'Much of this area has been used in the past for mineral extraction and Mercers Farm to the south west is identified as a</p>	<p>Agreed. Requested text replacement made.</p>

	preferred area for future mineral working in the emerging Surrey Minerals Plan where there are good intentions for restoration.'	
Appendix B (page 69)	Amend Decision Aiding Question 21 (2) as follows: "Will the option lessen the use of resources, either by reduction, recycling or reuse?"	Agreed. Requested text replacement made.
Appendix C (page 73)	Replace "Waste Strategy for England and Wales (revised 2007)" with 'Waste Strategy for England 2007'.	Agreed. Requested text replacement made.
Appendix C (page 75)	Delete "Regional Waste Strategy (2004)".	Agreed. Deletion made.
Appendix C (page 75)	Replace "Surrey Minerals Plan - Preferred Option 2008" with 'Surrey Minerals Plan - Proposed Submission Document 2009'. NB: it is anticipated that these documents (Core Strategy DPD and Primary Aggregates DPD) will be adopted in July 2011 subject to the receipt of a satisfactory Inspector's Report.	Noted. Requested text replacement made.
	The two Planning Frameworks need to reflect the principles of sustainable waste management identified within the strategic objectives contained within the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 (SWP), SWP Policy CW1 and RSS Policy W2. The two Planning Frameworks need to reflect the objectives of emerging. Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Objective 1 and paragraph 1 of Policy MC4. This document is now at an advanced stage in terms of its preparation with the Inspector's Report due to be published before the end of May 2011.	Noted.
Page 17 re public transport accessibility	The statement that only northern part of Preston is accessible by bus to a town centre within 30 minutes, as my transport colleagues have pointed out, is not strictly accurate. Routes 420, 460 and 480 all run north-south though various parts of Preston. The timetable indicates	Noted. Wording inserted as update to our evidence base.

		that it takes about 20 minutes to get to Epsom (routes 460 and 480) while the 420 takes 29 minutes to get to Sutton.	
	Page 17 re public transport accessibility	My colleagues further consider it inaccurate to state that there are poor links to Tattenham Corner station and Epsom Downs as both the 460 and 480 are routed from Preston via Tattenham Corner station and over Epsom Downs at a combined frequency of 3 per hour.	Noted. Wording inserted as update to our evidence base.
NHS Surrey (Joanne Bradford)	Accessibility and Transport Page 15 - falling outside 5 to 10 minute walk buffer	Can it include whether there are cycling opportunities such as cycle paths and safe places to secure bikes. It also wasn't clear what the bus routes are to the train station	Agreed. This information has been included. Paragraph is concerning a 'walk' buffer.
	Page 17. Pedestrian and cycle access is mentioned in the Preston summary, but not Merstham	Can the Merstham pedestrian and cycle access be included in the summary	Agreed. This information has been included.
	Page 17. What issues be the focus of the appraisal? Section	Please could we add an extra bullet point; Ensure active travel routes are well lit	Agreed. Bullet point added.

Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Page 28/29	Could extra columns be added 'Distance from Merstham' and Distance from Preston'	Awaiting information
Page 32 What issues be the focus of the appraisal?	Please could an extra bullet point 'Health impacts of access to green space' be included	Agreed. Bullet point added.
Community, Health and Wellbeing Page 41. SMR = 187.	Is this the most upto date data? Could it be explained what that means. i.e. 87% of people in Preston die before they are expected to. Could the Mental Health data be included and draw the links between Mental Health and access to green space. Was the Mertsam HNA used to inform this section?	Noted. NHS Surrey undertook the Merstham Health Needs Assessment last autumn, and are committed to keep it up to date, in response to Merstham's Priority Place status and the identification of health issues. The HNA's findings were used to inform the update to the Merstham Estate Regeneration Plan which was completed in Feb 2011 Mental health and links to green space added to introduction to health and well being chapter, also bullet showing Merstham mental health data added to p40
Page 48 - table	Health deprivation isn't included. Any reason?	Health covered in health and well being section. This table

is aiming to show other types
of deprivation.