

**Banks Solutions
64 Lavinia Way
East Preston
West Sussex BN16 1EF**

For the attention of Mr Chris Banks

3rd October 2018

**REIGATE AND BANSTEAD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
EXAMINATION
OCTOBER 30TH – NOVEMBER 8TH inc**

SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF BANSTEAD VILLAGE RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

1. BAN1

While we are in full agreement with the Reigate and Banstead DMP submission that BAN1 should be treated as an Opportunity Site there are future possible aspects of this plan that could have a bearing on the Village as a whole.

- A part of this area, Banstead Police Station is, earmarked by the Surrey Police as an asset to sell. At this point it will become a matter of interest to the council who see part of it as a site for 40 homes – type unspecified and which we would like to see as including provision for older active residents of the village which would then free up sorely needed family homes for the next generation.
- At the same time the council see the possibility of more retail and community and leisure uses of the site. From our *Annexes 1 and 2* you will see we already have a wide variety of convenience retail outlets, including 2 supermarkets, as well as offices, banks and restaurants/cafes. That we have less comparison retail is due to the current shopping trends in which shoppers tend to use on-line means for purchase. This has been made evident by the closure of our only furniture shop. We also have reasonable access to Croydon and Kingston which still have department stores and other comparison outlets.
- It is very unclear as to what is proposed by community and leisure use. Looking at BAN2 one can see that community use is already provided by the library, Banstead Centre, a clinic, 2 schools and a youth/children's centre. It would be interesting to see what additions to this could be made in BAN1.

2. BAN2

- This is the area part owned by Surrey County Council, South East Coast Ambulance Service and Reigate and Banstead Council. It is accessible to the High Street shopping area on foot via a pedestrian crossing or by car. We have asked in both consultations of the Development Management Policies that the carpark facing the library be retained as an essential part of the town centre. It has spaces for 80 cars, during shopping hours has a high occupancy and out of hours is a popular parking place for people using the many A3 outlets in the village. For people shopping in the village It is important that the car park is retained as there is nowhere around the High Street where there is space to build

[Type text]

[Type text]

[Type text]

- another car park and the town centre car park and the spaces along the High Street are in constant use and often full. See *Annexe 3*
- In highlighting the car park, old Civic centre, Clinic and Youth/Children's centre for possible redevelopment for community and public services there should be awareness of the valuable work done in the Civic Centre by Age Concern. There is an active community of older members of the village who benefit from the company of their peers and have many facilities provided for them by the managers of Age Concern Banstead. In the same way the Clinic offers services complementary to our local doctors' surgery and the Children's /Youth centre provides a safe vibrant centre for youngsters from all over the northern part of the borough. There is always a danger when buildings come down in a regeneration project that all or some of the existing facilities and associated services will be lost.
 - Apart from the two residential homes and Bentleys very little is happening in Section C of the Horseshoe site which is owned by Surrey County and Raven Trust. The Longcroft Clinic which looks after the health of most Banstead, Chipstead and Woodmansterne residents has long out grown its premises in Woodmansterne Lane and needs a new home very badly. We would be in favour of Squirrels, which is boarded up and is part of Section C, being re-configured as a health clinic if the existing clinic in the Horseshoe was not considered suitable. Bentleys is used as a unit for adults in the area who need day care due to various health problems and is very valuable to the community. There is a small piece of overgrown land with trees between Bentley and Bolters Lane which, with careful landscaping and retention, where possible, of trees, might be suitable for housing (as an alternative to taking land/parking spaces from the thriving Community Centre – see next section below).
 - Annex 6 CF4 talks about redeveloping of Banstead Library as part of the Horseshoe development. A lot of money has been spent in the last few years on the library and unless there is still an intention to use part of it for social services, in which case a fresh reconfiguration might be appropriate, there is little need for replacement.
 - Also, Annexe 6 ES1 talks about the 'Blue Light Hub' on that part of the Horseshoe owned by SECAMB. We are in favour of this and the improved services that would result from this venture and would suggest the police also be represented there, which would then enable the Police Station in the High Street to be sold for development.

3. **BAN3**

This is the most contentious of the three BAN plans. The Community Hall was completed in 1975, paid for mainly by contributions from local residents. The size of the car park was dictated by Banstead Urban District Council as part of the planning permission. As, overall, the hall has 87% occupancy this car park is much utilised. The hall also stands on Park Road, not far from the Banstead Well at a point where on-street parking for those attending a class or event at the Community Centre would certainly not be appropriate. It is appreciated that Banstead Village has little or no land for development and, because of that, it will be difficult to fulfil our obligation for 180 homes within the period of the Local Plan. Like the library the replacement and enhancement of the Community Centre is opportunistic. Perhaps as suggested under BAN2 the 15 flats considered for the Community Centre site could, instead, go onto the piece of land in the Horseshoe between Bentley and Bolters Lane (see BAN2 above). Regrettably, as noted earlier under BAN2. it is a fact that the deliberate destruction of a building does not always lead to a replacement being built in the same place to the same sq meterage as its predecessor. The loss of the Community Centre, for even a short length of time, would quite possibly lead to the loss of various organisations that use the facility as the only other remaining centre in the village, the Church Institute, would simply not be able to cope. Both are very well used and are an essential contribution to the strong community spirit to be found in Banstead. We would therefore ask that this site be looked at again and another location for 15 flats be found, perhaps as said earlier on the land between Bentley and Bolters Lane.

4. **WELLESFORD CLOSE**

[Type text]

[Type text]

[Type text]

Between Wellesford Close and the A217 are the remains of an allotment garden which was in use until the late 1980s. The land forms part of the Banstead Estate, an area of 540 acres of Green Belt, which was originally owned by Legal and General and later sold to Whitecote and, while the major part of the estate remains as Green Belt, re-designated UOL. More recently the latest UOS review has removed this land from protection of any kind. A previous attempt to develop this site was refused by HM Inspectorate in 2009 and more recently a developer expressed interest in building a nursing home. This interest led to a Deed of Release of the S52 being signed by RBBC, Whitecote and Frontier Estates (which was interested in erecting the nursing home) in August 2016 for the period ending 1st November 2017. The allotment site is only accessible via a single lane carriageway with no passing points. In some places the width is only 4.8m and the corner leading to the second part of the Close is blind. Should a planning application be successful the access road would need widening and there is insufficient land to do this.

Policy NHE5 3) page 69 of the RBBC Submission Document which deals with the rectification of Green Belt anomalies relates to a different part of Wellesford Close. We contend that the Wellesford Close allotment garden should be included in this Green Belt anomaly list and designated Green Belt as it is a part of the Banstead Estate.

5. OTHER MATTERS

- **Annex 6 Infrastructure delivery schedule page 203 NR3.** We would applaud the scheme to link Banstead Railway Station to the surrounding area to encourage greater use of trains by the addition of cycle stand and CCTV but would also stress the urgent need for the renovation and upgrading of the actual station.
- **and page 211 CP22:** At the same time we would point out that there is pavement between Banstead and Burgh Heath and a newly installed Toucan crossing between Banstead and Nork via the A217 to the north side of Burgh Wood.
- **and page 213 CP26:** The A217 is a very busy dual carriageway in both directions. The land between the eastern carriage way and the boundary of properties situated on that side between Banstead traffic lights and the pedestrian entrance to the Horseshoe is narrow. Banstead High Street, though part of the official cycle route, is not conducive to cyclists given that there are cars constantly parked along both sides of the High Street and a lot of vehicular traffic using the road.
- **and page 235 G130:** We applaud the proposal for new and upgraded public open space and enhancements to green infrastructure to complement and strengthen the existing 'green corridor' along Bolters Lane as a part of the development of the Horseshoe site. Where possible we would wish to see our trees maintained in all the approaches to Banstead enhancing the feeling that Banstead is a village in the Surrey hills rather than just another anonymous outer London suburb.
- **Parking:** Annexe 4 parking requirements are based on town centres such as Reigate and Redhill both of which have better public transport than Banstead Village. Banstead relies on its viability and vitality on convenient car parking. To reduce the parking requirement on new development by 50, or even 25% would significantly impact on the current fragile balance. Indeed, if it were applied to a rebuilt/relocated Community Hall, it would so reduce the parking numbers that it would become unviable. There is no surplus parking to make up for such a loss. This also applies to any new developments in the defined Village Centre. New developments in the Horseshoe would not provide sufficient on-site parking at existing standards which would impact on viability of the High Street.

[Type text]

[Type text]

[Type text]

As well as the changing nature of demand for retail and similar uses in the High Street there is a move towards a busier lifestyle with less time for hunting for distant parking spaces, the consequence of which would be to reduce trade as finding parking becomes less convenient/more difficult. There is insufficient public car parking provision in the two off-street car parks to soak up the increased demand due to reduced new-build standards. The limited amount of public transport serving Banstead makes the car an important means of transport for those coming to Banstead to shop and who, if they are unable to park, will take their business elsewhere which would ultimately destroy the village. *see Annexe 4*

Secretary BVRA and
Chair of Planning Sub Group