

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

(Prepared under regulation 18(4)(b))
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004;

Farnborough Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document

Rushmoor Borough Council

1. Who was consulted?

Before adopting the Farnborough Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), as part of the Rushmoor Plan (LDF), the Council consulted with those bodies listed in appendix 1.1 to gather their views.

2. How were they consulted?

A six-week public consultation period took place from **18 January 2007** to **28 February 2007**. A draft SPD was supported by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and an Article 6 Assessment (under the Habitats Regulations).

Letters dated 18 January 2007 were sent as in appendices 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3.

The SPD and its accompanying sustainability appraisal were attached to the letter sent to the statutory consultees (see appendix 2.1). The non-statutory consultees listed in appendix 1.1 were referred to the website etc (see appendix 2.2). The relevant nature conservation consultees were sent the draft SPD, its accompanying sustainability appraisal and Article 6 Screening report (see appendix 2.3).

All three documents were available for viewing and downloading via the Rushmoor website at: www.rushmoor.gov.uk/farnboroughtowncentrespd .

There was also a website that the project consultant, Urban Practitioners, set up: www.farnboroughtowncentrestudy.co.uk, which provided further information.

Paper copies of all three documents were available via the Planning Policy section at Rushmoor, and available to view at:

- ❑ the Council Offices (first floor reception 8.30am-5pm Monday-Thursday and 8.30am-4.30pm),
- ❑ Farnborough and Aldershot libraries during their opening hours (Farnborough: 9.30-7pm Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday, Wednesday 9.30am-5pm, and Saturday 9.30am-4pm; Aldershot

10am-7pm Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday; 10am –5pm Friday, and 9.30am-4pm Saturday).

Exhibition boards setting the main proposals of the draft SPD were placed in the first floor reception of the Council offices for the duration of the consultation, with questionnaires. The boards were also set up in the town centre at Princes Mead and Kingsmead for periods during the consultation period.

A two-page article on the proposals set out in the draft SPD were included in the January 2007 edition of the Borough Council's bi-monthly magazine *Arena*, which is delivered to all households in the Borough. An article was included in the January edition of the Borough Council's internal 'Bulletin'. There was an advertisement included in the local free 'Star' newspaper on 19 January 2007. The Borough Council also released a press release in association with the consultation to all local media.

To reach the draft SPD stage of the process there was the following consultation:

- An Action Planning Day at the Rushmoor Offices on 13 July 2006 attended by over 60 attendees (and all Rushmoor LDF stakeholders were invited) (see appendix 3.1)
- A Rushmoor Members' workshop on 31 July 2006
- Interviews with key stakeholders during August 2006 by Urban Practitioners
- A presentation to the Farnborough Business and Community Panel on 6 September, and
- A 'Test and Review' workshop on the emerging proposals with over 30 participants on 11 September 2006.

3. What issues were raised?

We received 36 responses duly made (see appendix 3.2). The main issues raised are shown in appendix 4.1.

4. How were the issues addressed?

Appendix 5.1 lists the comments made and the action taken (i.e. amendments to draft SPD prior to adoption). No projects were added or omitted however.

LIST OF APPENDICES:

- 1.1 Names of persons consulted in connection with the preparation of the draft SPD
 - 2.1. Letter to statutory consultees
 - 2.2. Letter to non-statutory consultees
 - 2.3 Letter to listed nature conservation consultees

- 3.1 Farnborough Town Centre Walkabout Attendees
- 3.2 Farnborough Town Centre draft SPD respondents

- 4.1. Summary of themes raised from draft SPD consultation
- 4.2. Responses for the draft SPD questionnaire

- 5.1 Comments and Responses to the draft SPD

Appendix 1.1 Names of persons consulted in connection with the preparation of the draft SPD

Statutory Consultees

GOSE
SEEDA
SEERA
Hampshire County Council
Planning Services, Guildford BC
Spatial Policy Team, Surrey CCI
Directorate of Planning, Hart DC
Local Plan Manager, Surrey Heath
BC
Planning Policy Team, Directorate of
Planning, Waverley BC
Planning and Development,
Bracknell Forest DC
Head of Land Use Planning,
Strategic Rail Authority
Highways Agency
Environment Agency
Countryside Agency
English Nature
Equal Opportunities Commission
English Heritage
The Historic Buildings and
Monuments Commission for England
BT
Mobile Operators Association
The National Grid Co. Plc
The Director of Public Health
Blackwater Valley and Hart NHS
Primary Care Trust
North Hants PCT
Frimley Park Hospital
Electricity Companies
Southern Gas
BG Transco, Land Inquiry Asset
Planning Department
South East Water
Thames Water Property Services
Area Sewage Manager (Rushmoor)
Hampshire Waste Services
TAG Farnborough Airport Limited

Housing Consultees

Various House Builders
Registered Social Landlords
Council for the Preservation of Rural
England
Defence Estates
House Builders Federation
CABE

Employment Consultees

Aldershot Retail Action Group
Enterprise First
North Hants Chamber of Commerce
North Hampshire Chamber of
Commerce and Industry Ltd
Aldershot Town Centre Manager
BAE Systems plc
QinetiQ Ltd
Wilky Property Holdings
Slough Estates plc
Computer Sciences Corporation
Asda Foodstore
Princes Mead Shopping Centre
Farnborough Business Park
DC Leisure Management Ltd
Town and Country Markets
Sainbury's Supermarkets Limited
Marks and Spencer
LAH Marketing, Farnborough
Business Park
Farnborough Air Sciences Trust
St Modwen Properties Plc
Farnborough College of Technology
and the local schools and Sixth Form
College
Business Link Wessex
Learning and Skills Council -
Hampshire and I of W
Systems Union Ltd
Commercial Estate Agents
Farnham & N.E. Hants Branch
Federation of Small Businesses

Employment Consultees cont

Hilson Moran Partnership
Hampshire Economic Partnership
VP Product Development, Nokia
Telecommunications Ltd
Novartis UK Ltd
B&Q
New Economics Foundation
London & Lisbon Properties Ltd
Christopher Martin Associates,
Professionals in Recruitment
GKN Aerospace Services
QinetiQ
QM Systems Ltd
Sony Ericsson
Sun Microsystems Limited

Rushmoor Strategic Partnership

Aldershot Garrison
Basingstoke Canal Authority
Hampshire Constabulary
Guildford Diocesan Board of Finance
North Hampshire Chamber of
Commerce and Industry Ltd
Rushmoor Citizens' Advice Bureaux
Rushmoor Voluntary Services

Environment Groups

Surrey Hampshire Borders NHS
Trust
Blackwater Valley Countryside
Partnership
Surrey & Hampshire Canal Society
Cove Brook Greenway Group
Blackwater Wildlife Rescue
Friends of the Earth, Blackwater
Valley
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife
Trust
RSPB
Hampshire Ornithological Society

Other Interested Groups

Hampshire CC Social Services and
Age Concern
Community Action, Hampshire
County Youth Service
Hart and Rushmoor Youth Offices
Chief Community Liaison Officer,
Connaught Community Centre
Army Welfare Service
Surrey Ambulance Service
Aldershot Civic Society
DeafPlus
Searchlight (blind)
Hampshire Association for the Care
of the Blind
Rushmoor Access Group
Local Churches in both Aldershot
and Farnborough
Aldershot and District Allotment
Society
Rushmoor and District Football
League and the two football clubs
Aldershot Military Historical Trust
Aldershot Historical Society
Blackwater Valley District Scouts
Various Residents' Association
North Camp Matters
Potters International Hotel
Southern Tourist Board
Womens Institute
U3A
Gypsy Council
Hampshire Children and Families
Forum
Various Planning Consultants

**41 individuals who asked to have
their names added to the list**

Appendix 2.1 Letter to statutory consultees on Farnborough Town Centre draft SPD

2.C2

Tim Richings

01252 398734

tim.richings@rushmoor.gov.uk

18 January 2007

«CONTACT»
«ORGANISATION»
«ADDRESS1»
«ADDRESS2»
«ADDRESS3»
«ADDRESS4»
«ADDRESS5»
«ADDRESS6»
«POSTCODE»

Dear «CONTACT»

Farnborough Town Centre Draft Supplementary Planning Document Consultation

I am writing to inform you that Rushmoor Borough Council is consulting on the Farnborough Town Centre draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and its Sustainability Appraisal (SA), and seek confirmation that it is conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy. Copies of the SPD and SA are attached.

The draft SPD is also accompanied by a screening assessment (under Article 6 of the European Habitats Directive). Prior to finalising the Farnborough Town Centre SPD, we are consulting Natural England and other relevant agencies, seeking comments and advice on the adequacy of the accompanying Article 6 assessment.

All these documents can also be found on our web site via: www.rushmoor.gov.uk/farnboroughtowncentrespd. In addition the Annual Monitoring Report for 2005/06, which was submitted to the Government Office in December, is also now available. This report is full of information that paints an up-to-date picture of Rushmoor. It is on our web site at: www.rushmoor.gov.uk/amr.

We will need to receive any comments you wish to make on the SPD or its SA no later than **28 February 2007**. We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully
Tim Richings
Planning Policy and Conservation Manager
Planning Services

Appendix 2.2 Letter to non-statutory consultees on Farnborough Town Centre draft SPD

2.C2B

Non-statutory consultees

Tim Richings

01252 398734

tim.richings@rushmoor.gov.uk

18 January 2007

Dear Sir/Madam

Farnborough Town Centre Draft Supplementary Planning Document Consultation

I am writing to let you know that we are seeking your views on the Farnborough Town Centre draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and its Sustainability Appraisal (SA).

Copies of both documents can be found on our web site via:

www.rushmoor.gov.uk/farnboroughtowncentrespd, but if you wish to view paper copies of the documents please contact me at the above.

In addition the Annual Monitoring Report for 2005/06, which was submitted to the Government Office in December, is also now available. This report is full of information that paints an up-to-date picture of Rushmoor. It is on our web site at:

www.rushmoor.gov.uk/amr.

We will need to receive any comments you wish to make on the draft SPD or its SA no later than 28 February 2007.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

Tim Richings
Planning Policy and Conservation Manager
Planning Services

Appendix 2.3 Letter to nature conservation statutory consultees on Farnborough Town Centre draft SPD

2.C2B

Tim Richings

01252 398734

tim.richings@rushmoor.gov.uk

18 January 2007

Dear

Farnborough Town Centre Draft Supplementary Planning Document Consultation (including assessment under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive)

I am writing to let you know that we are seeking your views on the Farnborough Town Centre draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and its Sustainability Appraisal (SA).

The draft SPD is also accompanied by a screening assessment (under Article 6 of the European Habitats Directive). Prior to finalising the Farnborough Town Centre SPD, we are consulting Natural England and other relevant agencies, seeking comments and advice on the adequacy of the accompanying Article 6 assessment.

Copies of the SPD, SA and Article 6 Assessment are attached. These documents can also be found on our web site via: www.rushmoor.gov.uk/farnboroughtowncentrespd .

In addition the Annual Monitoring Report for 2005/06, which was submitted to the Government Office in December, is also now available. This report is full of information that paints an up-to-date picture of Rushmoor. It is on our web site at: www.rushmoor.gov.uk/amr.

We will need to receive any comments you wish to make on the SPD, its SA or the Article 6 assessment, no later than **28 February 2007**. Should you be unable to meet this timescale please let me know, otherwise it will be assumed that you have no comments to make.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

Tim Richings
Planning Policy and Conservation Manager
Planning Services

List of relevant nature conservation consultees:

Planning
Environment Agency
Swift House
Frimley Business Park
Camberley
Surrey
GU16 7SQ

Conservation Officer
RSPB
SE England Office
The Lodge
Sandy
Bedfordshire
SG 19 2DL

Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
Beechcroft House
Vicarage Lane
Curdridge
Hampshire
SO32 2DP

Natural England
Thames & Chilterns Team
Foxhold House
Crookham
Thatcham
Berkshire
RG19 8EL

Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership
Ash Lock Cottage
Government Road
Aldershot
Hampshire
GU11 2PS

Appendix 3.1 Farnborough Town Centre Walkabout Attendees

<i>CONTACT</i>	<i>SALUTATION</i>	<i>ORGANISATION</i>
Cliff Ansell	Mr Ansell	Asda Stores Ltd
Phillip Austin	Mr Austin	Austin Pheonix
Christopher Butler	Mr Butler	Wilky Property Holdings
Mark Chivers	Mr Chivers	Systems Union Ltd
Ben Clifton	Mr Clifton	Hampshire County Council
Valerie Cloke	Ms Cloke	North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
Les Coleman	Mr Coleman	
Cathy Darcey	Ms Darcy	Slouth Estates
Tony Docker	Mr Docker	Rushmoor Healthy Living
Rod Dowden	Mr Dowden	
John Easton	Mr Easton	Mansell Construction Services Limited
Pete Errington	Mr Errington	HBF
Neil Flanigan MBE	Mr Flanigan MBE	West Indian Association
Roger Finch	Mr Finch	Lyons, Sleeman, Hoare
Simon Greener	Mr Greener	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
John Grenham	Mr Grenham	Sheldons (Farnborough) Ltd
John Harrocks	Mr Harrocks	North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
Alex Hughes	Mr Hughes	Rushmoor Citizens' Advice Bureau
PC Lee Jeffers	PC Jeffers	Farnborough Police Station
Colin Kiely	Mr Kiely	Robert Shaw / Vail Williams
Rob Lane	Prof Lane	
Jonathan Laurence	Mr Laurence	London Clancy
David Lee	Mr Lee	Baker Consulting Services
Gary Little	Mr Little	Princes Mead Shopping Centre
Karen McDonald	Ms McDonald	Parkside Housing Group
Danny Mather	Mr Mather	Asda Stores Ltd
Michael O'Brien	Mr O'Brien	Linden Homes Southern Ltd
Robin Oliver	Mr Oliver	Thames Valley Housing
Stella Olivier	Ms Olivier	Age Concern Farnborough
Gerald Phillips	Mr Phillips	Phillips Associates
Simon Rutter	Mr Rutter	St Modwen Properties / KPI
Jan Sheehan	Ms Sheehan	Hampshire County Council - Youth Service
June Smith	Ms Smith	Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth
Ian Taylor	Mr Taylor	Raglan Housing Association
David Taylor	Mr Taylor	J Sainsburys
PS Jon Turton	PS Turton	Farnborough Police Station
Don & Audrey Walker	Mr & Mrs Walker	30 St Michaels Road
M Walton	Mr Walton	Montagu Evans
Rev David Willey	Rev Willey	St.Peter's Church
Kathy Wood	Ms Wood	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Malcolm Young	Mr Young	Wilky Property Holdings
Vashti Campbell	Ms Campbell	West Indian Association
Mike Hughes	Mr Hughes	Blackwater Valley District Scouts

Appendix 3.2 Farnborough Town Centre draft SPD respondents

Title	Name	Company
Mr	Peter Edwards	
	KG Taylor	
	Maurice Aylett	
	Daniel Barney	
	Corine Y	
	Les Coleman	
	Rodney Dowden	
	Colin and Lynda Miller	
Mrs	David Jones	
	B. Allday	
	G Steer	Slough Estates plc
Mrs	Chris Milsted	
	M Jones	
	Michael Forrest	
	Montagu Evans	
	Robert Lane	
	Richard Shaw	Savills
	Anna Gillings	Rapleys
	Neil Maud	Cliff Walsingham & Company
	C. Tingey	
	Linda Seabrook	
	Carrie Temple	RSPB
	Katy Atkinson	Planning Perspectives LLP
	Jackie and Roy Slater	
	Caroline Ford	
	Patrick Blake	Highways Agency
Cllr	David Clifford	
	Barbara Touati-Evans	
	Clive Long	Primary Asset Ltd
	Stephen Blyth	Hampshire County Council
Dr	Gilles Charbit	
	Martin Wilson	
	Peter Gardner	

Appendix 4.1 Summary of themes raised from draft SPD consultation

Themes raised from the responses from the Farnborough Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document – March 2007

There is a general support for the Supplementary Planning Document but some issues have been raised.

1. Farnborough Town Centre:

- There needs to be a focal point to the town centre.
- The centre needs to reflect the identity, heritage and culture of Farnborough.
- The leisure centre, Civic Offices and a new community centre should be brought into the centre.
- The centre needs to be attractive with green spaces.

2. General Support for new housing:

- Housing needs to be in keeping with the character of the other houses.

3. Transport:

- Support for the proposed walking and cycling routes.
- Need to recognise that private cars are still the main use of transport; therefore adequate parking needs to be provided.
- Transport Assessments are needed – some junction proposals are more from an urban design perspective rather than a transport perspective.
- Concerns over the extra traffic from new developments and will the demands be met.

4. Retail/Facilities:

- Needs for a new shopping centre and attract new retail to the area.
- Farnborough needs a better evening economy, including a cinema.

5. Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area:

- Concerns over how this area will be protected from the new development.

6. More research into plans:

- Some comments are subjective and open to interpretation.
- More research needs to be carried out and based on facts.

7. Action:

- Action needs to take place as soon as possible.
- Provision of dates when development will take place.

Appendix 4.2 Responses from the draft SPD questionnaire

Survey Responses – March 07

Section 1: Support for the objectives in the SPD

The majority of respondents strongly agree/agree with the following objectives:

- To encourage and facilitate the revitalisation of Farnborough Town centre by developing a robust retail core with a broad range of shops and services
- To create a high quality network of streets and spaces to provide a more attractive town centre environment
- To enhance accessibility into and within the town centre by all means of transport
- To ensure that the town centre meets the needs of all sectors of its community
- To support partnership working between the Council, potential developers and other key stakeholders
- To promote the town centre as a shopping and leisure destination

There is a mixture of responses for the following objectives:

- To encourage the development of the evening economy with restaurants, bars and cafes
- To create a unified and coherent civic quarter for the area around the current library, police station, leisure centre and Elles Hall community centre

But none of the responses were categorised as strongly disagreeing with any of the objectives.

Section 2: Support for the three priority areas in the SPD

Priority Area 1: Union Street/Station Environs: There is good support for the development of this area with majority of responses strongly agreeing or agreeing with the proposal.

Priority Area 2: Town Centre: The majority of the results fell in grade '0' suggesting there wasn't strong agreement or disagreement of the development.

Priority Area 3: Civic Quarter: This proposal gained a mixed response from strongly agreeing to strongly disagreeing. The majority strongly agreed but this was not a very high majority.

Section 3: Identification of the numbered proposals strongly supported and comments

There were a variety of proposals being supported, in particular proposal 1, 13 and 29, but these were not highly represented. The comments made by the respondents emphasised:

- Building new houses was a good idea as long as it is in keeping and good quality.
- There is a need for better transport systems, in particular in rail and bus, as well as better disabled access.
- The town centre needs to be a defined centre in need of shops and leisure facilities including a cinema.
- Action needs to take place quickly.

Section 4: Identification of the numbered proposals strongly disliked and comments

From the results there wasn't a definite dislike to a particular proposal as a mixture of disliked proposals were recorded. The comments made by the respondents emphasised:

- Concerns with the financial aspect of the development e.g. the cost of moving the Civic Centre, the moving of the recently renovated Library.
- There needs to be a defined town centre.
- There has been a lack of action so far.
- An issue with the blocking out of light to houses from new flats and shops, in particular to the houses on Union Street.
- Concerns with transport – will there be a new bus station, the SULZER roundabout needs to be fully assessed, and the accessibility of transport during rush hour.

Section 5: Other proposals that should be included in the Town Centre SPD

The comments made by the respondents emphasised:

- There needs to be better links to Farnborough North Station and the other two main stations.
- Need for more shops and leisure e.g. nightclub.
- The Farnborough Road and Prospect Avenue junction needs to be made safer.
- More green spaces.

Farnborough Town Centre SPD

Summary of comments received and proposed recommended changes

14 May 2007

This document has been prepared by Rushmoor Borough Council and Urban Practitioners. It provides a comprehensive list of the comments which were received during the statutory consultation period on the draft Farnborough Town Centre SPD which ran from 18 January 2007 – 28 February 2007.

For each of the comments made, a response has been drafted, and for ease of reference these are colour coded:

Red text indicates a recommendation that the proposed change **should** be incorporated in the document; and

Blue text indicates a recommendation that the proposed change **should not** be incorporated in the document.

	Name	Organisation	Comment	
1	Peter Edwards	Resident	Proposal 18 should refer to residential as well as retail	Disagree – residential use is not considered compatible with this location. Please refer to the response made in section 16 (comments received from Montague Evans)
2	Anonymous		Questionnaire	n/a
3	Maurice Aylett	Resident	Objects to moving the Council offices	This proposal would only be pursued in the event that it is cost-neutral to the Council.
4	Daniel Barney	Ham & Blackbird pub	Query regarding Ham and Blackbird site	Noted. The Ham and Blackbird public house would be affected by the proposals
5	Corinne	Local resident	Questionnaire	n/a
6	Les Coleman	Local resident	Questionnaire	n/a
7	Rod Dowden	Local resident	Questionnaire	n/a
8	Colin & Lynda Miller	Local resident	Just want to see a new shopping centre after such a long wait	Noted. The Delivery and Implementation section of the SPD is designed to facilitate this.
			More parking spaces required at the Farnborough Main Station	This is addressed in proposal 1
			Moving the Council offices will be expensive and they are already accessible	This proposal would only be pursued in the event that it is cost-neutral to the Council.
9	David Jones	Local resident	Looking for some actual progress on the ground from the proposed redevelopments rather than further grand plans.	Noted. The Delivery and Implementation section of the SPD is designed to facilitate this.
10	Anonymous		Questionnaire	n/a
11	Mrs B. Allday	Local resident	Library shut 3 years ago for improvements now looking to redevelop and likewise the Council offices being revamped and now being suggested for redevelopment	The proposals will only be undertaken on the basis that they are cost neutral to Rushmoor BC and Hampshire CC. This calculation will take into account the value of the existing

				buildings.
			Want a cinema in the town centre	Noted. This is promoted in the SPD
12	G.Steer	Slough Estates	Questionnaire	n/a
13	Chris Milsted	Local resident	Lack of bars and evening life is one of the biggest problems for Farnborough	Noted. This is promoted in the SPD
			Overall excited by the plans	Noted
			Move bus hub to the station, and possible a metro supermarket as well, idea of multi-storey car park at station is a good one	Disagree. The bus hub will remain split between the town centre and the station in order to provide an effective service for the various users. We are proposing an improved interchange. A metro-size food store is included in proposal 3, immediately adjacent to the station.
			Signage to Farnborough North station needs to be improved	Agreed. This is covered as part of proposal 5.
14	Mrs M James	Local resident	One more reason to save Concept 2000. Museum of Farnborough history could be housed there.	Noted. This comment falls beyond the scope of this document
			More development will mean more residents and accidents	The document does imply that there will be more residents. However, it recommends safe highways design principles and secure by design urban design to improve safety.
			Sympathetic planting and water features and extra seating will probably enhance town centre and encourage visitors.	Noted
			No public houses requiring bouncers	This comment is beyond the scope of this document.
15	Michael and Anna Forrest	Local residents	Do not wish to be negative and critical, but do have some adverse comments	n/a
			Report does fill an obvious need and agree with many of the points	Noted
			Most people will continue to use the car as the most common form of transport	Noted. The SPD maintains an appropriate level of parking within the town centre
			a) Some comments made are subjective, open to interpretation and	The analysis made within the document is based on professional

			need to be backed up by facts	research and in-depth stakeholder consultation.
			b) Seems to be uncertainty on whether Farnborough is seeking to rival Reading and Guildford, see para.2.1.3 and overview	Mistaken comment. Paragraph 2.1.3 clearly indicates that it is not the intention of the document to develop Farnborough to compete with Reading and Guildford.
			c) Doubt that many users of the station care about the approach to the town centre but more concerned about getting to where they want to quickly	Disagree. This was clearly identified through public consultation.
			d) Removal of roundabouts is discussed but not much evidence provided and we consider their removal will reduce the flow of the traffic. Removal of Farnborough Road / Meudon Ave gyratory will reduce pedestrian movement	The removal of the roundabouts has been part of a major transport study undertaken by Colin Buchanan, which demonstrates efficient performance. Signalised junctions generally perform better than roundabouts in easing congestion and also create a much better pedestrian environment. A new two-page section will be drafted for the final document to clarify the work which has been undertaken.
			e) Decked car parking – can be unpleasant environments, also concern about parking charges rising	Some decked parking is necessary to accommodate projected growth and development on some existing areas of car park. Recommended that changes be made to demonstrate the need for high quality design.
			f) Need to be convinced that demolishing existing building and replacing them with new is necessarily better, would be better to try and work with what we have; reluctant to take proposal of moving the Council offices seriously	This proposal would only be pursued in the event that it is cost-neutral to the Council.
			g) Appreciate efforts to ensure walking and cycling will be as pleasant and safe as possible but the car will still be needed for many journeys and we will need to provide adequate parking; need paths into the town centre on which motor traffic cannot come	Noted.
16	Peter Munnelly	Montagu Evans LLP for Standard Life Investments	Overview, para.2: Basingstoke should be included in the list of neighbouring towns; and reference should also be made to the increasing competition following developments being permitted in the nearby centres	Agreed. This change is recommended for inclusion in the final document.

			Area One (Union Street/ Station Environs): the current route from Farnborough Main station needs to be strengthened. Standard Life looking at the opportunities of improving the northern entrance to Princes Mead	Noted. This comment agrees with the draft SPD.
			Area Four (Princes Mead West): Standard Life welcomes the identification of Princes Mead West as an appropriate location for additional retail floorspace, providing a fully integrated extension of Princes Mead and allowing for enhancement of the existing space	Noted. This comment agrees with the SPD
			Para.2.1.3 & 2.2.1(ii): competition from Basingstoke should be recognised	Agreed. This changes is recommended for inclusion in the final document
			Para.2.2.1: Area Four Princes Mead West should be identified as the preferred location	Disagreed. Retail development should be concentrated in the town centre, including Queens Mead as the principal shopping street. Identification of Princes Mead West as a preferred location for development may limit investment in the core of the town centre.
			Para.2.2.1 (iv): important to enhance the pedestrian link between Farnborough Main Station and Princes Mead, this is the most direct route.	This route is clearly identified in the SPD as an important project. No change proposed.
			Strategic Objective 1: add additional item under Draft SPD Proposals to read: "Future enhancement of Farnborough town centre's retail offer through development of Princes Mead West.	Disagreed – this site does not merit additional prominence within the document.
			Strategic Objective 4: it should be ensured that the last two draft SPD proposals are consistent with adopted Farnborough Town Centre Access Plan outlined in the North Hampshire Transport Strategy	Agreed. The points will be reviewed to reflect the content of the Farnborough Town Access Plan
			Para.5.2.1(i): Standard Life considers this para. Should be clarified in light of national requirement for Design and Access Statements	Agreed. This paragraph will be revised accordingly.

			Para.6.2.4: Standard Life endorses the identification of land to the west of Princes Mead for retail development	Noted
			Para.6.2.9: Standard Life supports the general principal of residential and retail	Noted
			Para.6.3.5: reference should be Design and Access Statements	Agreed. This change will be incorporated.
			Para.6.3.7: mixed-use schemes in town centres are complex to deliver. It is preferable to assess the proportion of affordable housing through an open book appraisal	No change required – the drafted text reflects the Council’s existing policy.
			Para.6.4.1: support the principles while recognising the private car is an essential mode to the vitality of the town centre. Developers should be encouraged to provide adequate and appropriate level of parking combined with good accessibility to public transport facilities and for pedestrians and cyclists.	Noted
			Para.6.4.2: the maximum levels of parking identified in Figure 6.1 should not be literally adopted where there is an opportunity to rationalise the town centre parking, or where a reduced level of parking	No change required – the drafted text reflects the Council’s existing policy.
			Proposal No.15: development in this area cannot prejudice the servicing of Princes Mead and there will be inherent conflicts between servicing areas and residential uses	Proposal 15 is envisaged as a long-term opportunity and would only be permitted to come forward in the event that it satisfied normal practical issues such as servicing and the appropriate juxtaposition of uses. No change proposed.
			Proposal No.16: new north-south bus link is supported but any proposal should be carefully considered to ensure that it does not adversely affect access to servicing and customers to Princes Mead.	Noted

			Proposal No.18: retail development at Solartron Retail Park: should be Extension to Princes Mead rather Solartron Retail Park. Residential use would be inappropriate due to the relatively low massing of the existing building in this part of the town centre. Such a use would also compromise the urgently needed high-quality retail accommodation that can be provided in this location.	Agreed. The document will be changed to reflect this proposal.
			Proposal No.19: Decked parking structure, Asda car park: development on the existing car park will lead to the loss of spaces. The number of spaces to be delivered on this site should take account of the retail floor space to be provided on site 18, and the expansion of the town centre.	The number of parking spaces will be determined through the planning application, based on existing Council Policy. No change proposed.
			Proposal No.20: Westmead: site does not offer the same opportunity to fully integrate with Princes Mead, and in PPS6 terms is edge of centre. This proposal is dependent on car parking being delivered on Proposal 19, which is under a different ownership, therefore logical for it to be developed at a later stage as indicated in Fig.8.1	Noted
			Proposal No.21: replacement of Sulzer roundabout with signalised junction and enhanced access to the Invincible Road to industrial estate: developing such proposals consideration should be given to the loss of car parking within the roundabout	It is noted that car parking capacity may be lost through this scheme, but will be gained through developments elsewhere in the town centre. No change proposed
			Para.8.3.1: proposal sites 18 and 19 should be added as a priority area	The priority areas identified here are based on the results of stakeholder consultation and consultation with Councillors. No change proposed. It should be noted that the lack of priority would not preclude this site coming forward quickly.
			Fig.8.1: proposal sites 18 and 19: premature to determine the order of delivery of sites when the funding for 19 may be dependent on 18, wording should reflect joint implementation.	The loss of parking capacity within site 18 would require that site 19 be developed for decked parking in advance of development commencing on site 18 in order that overall town centre parking capacity is maintained. No change proposed.

17	Robert Lane	Local resident	Council to be congratulated on preparing the SPD and for involving a wide range of people. However, the current draft is at too early a stage to be acceptable, and there is a need for more research and verify that the plan is achievable.	The baseline report which is a supporting document to the SPD provides a comprehensive view of the research undertaken to support this SPD.
			Insufficient understanding of why the centre is what it is today. Neighbouring residential areas are restricted to the north and east and are at relatively low densities. Other features – airport and business park and light industry area to the west have effect of increasing distance from the centre, therefore people more likely to use cars compared to other towns. The geography of the area has made it more difficult to attract retailers. This to some extent is accepted in the SPD the emphasis is missing.	Please see above.
			Draft recognises there is limited market for offices but does not recognise how difficult the market is for retail. The strong market is likely to be for residential development. A deeper study of the various markets required ensuring proposals are realistic.	Please see above
			Transport assessment needs to be carried out, including a comprehensive parking study, as many of the proposals are dependent on major changes to the transport system.	A two-page section on the transport study and proposed changes will be prepared to provide further information on this mater within the SPD.
			Other proposals may not be feasible other than at a very high cost, which is likely to be borne by the public sector. The market studies may indicate what scope there may be for developer contributions.	This proposal would only be pursued in the event that it is cost-neutral to the Council. A new paragraph will be added to section 8 to confirm that this is the agreed approach.
			Limited information on outputs and incomes. Absence of scale to proposal drawings makes it difficult to understand developments envisaged.	The drawings are deliberately drafted so as to be illustrative rather than overly specific – it is important to be clear that a variety of different schemes may come forward which are acceptable, but which differ from these drawings.

			<p>Most of objectives are what might be expected but the following should be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Aim to provide at least 3,000 dwellings within 'x' distance of centre. b) Council should provide a community centre worthy of Farnborough's size. c) Aim to attract regional/sub-regional sports facilities to complement very good existing leisure centre. d) Proportion of retail units should be less than 'x' square metres to provide diversity and attract independent retailers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council's housing allocation is already established and cannot be changed through this document. • New community centre facility is including within site 30 • Disagreed. This is not a town centre aim. The existing sports facilities serve the local population. • This principal established but it is not possible to quantify the approach.
			Farnborough Road North – removal of gyratory would be welcome but no assessment has been made.	A two page section on the transport study and proposed changes will be prepared to provide further information on this mater within the SPD.
			Civic Quarter – presents best opportunities for improvement. A new focal point would make centre different to others. In the draft there is a small public space at southern end of Queensmead-this is considered inadequate.	Disagree. The new square proposed at the southern end of Queensmead is designed to provide a vibrant urban space. If this is too large it will not generate the critical concentration of activity to feel lively.
			The leisure centre has good facilities but divorced from the centre. It could become the focal point of the centre with a Town Square adjacent to it. This would provide a number of benefits such as a pedestrian friendly area, the Council Offices, new community centre and library could have a public face in the square, restaurants/cafes could be incorporated, large square would permit one or more focal tall buildings, a separate bus facility to bring passengers into centre.	Disagree – please see above.
			Consideration should be made for the IBM building becoming residential.	The IBM office is one of the few business premises in close proximity to the town. Its retention here should be encouraged.
18	Richard Shaw	Savills on behalf	Support the principle of regenerating Farnborough Town Centre,	Noted

		of Wilky Property Holdings.	providing it is approached comprehensively from a land use planning, urban design and transport perspective, and with collaboration with stake holders and present property owners.	
			Proposal 21: Traffic and general transport needs to be addressed. Current existing arrangements have serious peak traffic congestion but the amended junction proposals are from an urban design rather than transport perspective. A request for a wider transport study in SPD process.	A two-page section on the transport study and proposed changes will be prepared to provide further information on this mater within the SPD.
			Proposal 22: understand the reasoning for the insertion of residential into town centre land mix. However, very surprised there is a clear proposal to demolish their client's building without direct discussions taking place with Wilky. Wilky are eager to meet at the earliest opportunity to discuss, understand and explore the implications of the consultation proposals.	Members of Wilky Property Holdings attended the consultation meetings, and also liaised with the professional team during the drafting of the document. Subsequent meetings have also been held with the Council officers.
19	Anna Gillings	Rapleys on behalf of Wilky Property Holdings.	In general the underlying aspirations of the SPD are supported. Wilky strongly agrees with objectives 4 and 8. The importance of providing appropriate infrastructure should not be underestimated.	Noted
			The future of Invincible Road/Elles Road should be comprehensively addressed in both the Town Centre SPD and emerging proposals such as Area Action Plans. It should be addressed within the context of future employment at Farnborough Airfield and western corridor, and consider the future mix of uses for this area – better town centre pedestrian linkages, traffic management and other measures; fully informed by transport, urban design and land planning considerations.	An additional reference will be made to the role of the business park, highlighting the proposed new access and better pedestrian linkages.
			General transport effects produced by the SPD need further consideration. The amended junction proposals have been generated from urban design not a transport perspective.	A two-page section on the transport study and proposed changes will be prepared to provide further information on this mater within the SPD.
20	Neil Maud	Cliff Walsingham and Company	Welcome redevelopment and encourage Union Street/Station Environs location revitalisation. Addition of affordable hotel	The proposals for the roundabout junction are not mutually exclusive with a possible hotel development. It is advised that

		on behalf of Whitbread group plc.	accommodation beneficial, including construction of their Premier Travel Inn (PTI). However the new road layout may compromise their site. The proposed roundabout involves the loss of SE corner of current layout of Ham and Blackbird, affecting the proposal for a PTI development. No indication of what develop triggers the need for a roundabout, how it will be funded, what timescale might elapse before proposal comes to fruition, how their site will be accessed.	the Council and Hampshire CC undertake to meet with the correspondent.
21	Mr C. Tingey	Local Resident	Questionnaire.	
22	Linda Seabrook	Local Resident	Disagrees Surface Car Parking acts as barrier for pedestrians/cyclists. Multi-storey parking is intimidating. Any proposed on Union Street/Station Environs need to well lit and not more than 3 storeys.	The proposals are designed to create increased active frontage, and to reduce significant open area of parking.
			Connections for cyclists are weak.	Please refer to the Farnborough cycling strategy.
			Agrees there is a lack of evening economy.	Noted – this is dealt with at various levels in the draft SPD.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farnborough Road North: important to still have right turn to access Union Street. Princes Mead West: cheap '30 minute' parking should be available. Business Park (North): Civic Office Site could be converted to flats. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted – this is not ruled out in the current design. This is a detail beyond the scope of this report This proposal is including in the document
			Housing: general mix required. Character and in keeping with older properties.	Please refer to paragraphs 5.2.1.ii, 5.2.1.viii which already reflect the need to deal with this matter.
23	Carrie Temple	RSPB	Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area: concerns about Council's ability to fulfil this requirement without a clear strategy.	The Council has a SPA impact avoidance strategy through the strategy for Southwood Woodlands. The Council is also looking at ways additional new housing can be accommodated through further SANGs.
			Little detail in SPD on potential effects from new residential proposals on the integrity of the SPA and offers no guidance on the	The Council will look to include additional detail regarding the SPA and the mitigation of adverse impact

			emerging regional/sub-regional policy or the mitigation measures the Council will require as a result of these policies. Cross-reference should be made to Policy WCBV 9-Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.	upon it, particularly where residential development is referred to in the SPD.
			Article 6 Assessment concludes no likely significant effect on the SPA. However this doesn't represent a thorough assessment, as it doesn't present a robust and credible evidence base to support its conclusions.	Article 6 assessment will be revised in consultation with RSPB/ NE (Habitats Regulations Assessment) setting out how any new housing in the town centre could be mitigated. This will address the 'appropriate assessment' stage and the outcome will be agreed and 'signed off' by NE prior to adoption.
			The mitigation strategy for residential development needs an evidence base to demonstrate that e.g. sufficient open space and other mitigation measures can be delivered to offset the increased recreational pressure on the SPA and include no adverse effects.	The current mitigation strategy for Rushmoor is based solely on Southwood Woodlands and has been agreed with Natural England. Additional potential SANGs will be considered where appropriate in consultation with Natural England and RSPB.
24	Peter Edwards	Planning Perspectives LLP	Questionnaire	
25	Jackie and Roy Slater	Local Residents	Union Street used to have a Gasworks factory – there may be a chance that this land is contaminated.	This issue is beyond the scope of this SPD
26	Caroline Ford	Local Resident	Plans on Elmgrove Road – wishes to receive more information.	Noted
27	Patrick Blake	Highways Agency	Strategic Objectives: support initiatives to improve public transport hubs and provision. Need to reduce travel and reliance on private cars.	Noted
			6.3: higher density housing in town centre, support this policy. Recommend a mixed-use development approach is adopted to ensure developments are as sustainable as possible in transport terms and minimise the impact on trunk roads.	Noted
			6.3 provision of amenity space: clear policy advice needed for potential developers about the need to manage growth in traffic demand from proposed sites, and mitigate impacts where necessary.	This section of the SPD flags up relevant local planning policy and with the withdrawal of the Core Strategy DPD we will be relying on the transport policies in the

			Transport effects for each site should be considered as proactive input to the planning process to prevent detrimental effect on the TRN.	Rushmoor Local Plan Review for the point made.
			7.3 Farnborough Road North: concerns over impact of site on TRN, and should be mitigate as appropriate.	This comment is unclear.
			Recommend adding additional traffic related indicators including proportion of trips by non-car modes, proportion of new development meeting travel plan objectives; and level of growth of traffic on key routes.	Intensification of town centre would promote a better modal shift and fewer short car trips. It is recommended that the following phrase be incorporated: “developments requiring a transport assessment will require a travel plan”
28	David Clifford	Empress Ward Councillor	Needs to be more about cycling- encourage and provide safer routes.	Please refer to the Farnborough Cycling Strategy
			Need to preserve, enhance and protect Farnborough’s unique and distinctive heritage. Reflecting links with aviation and historical links.	Noted – this is already reflected in the document
			Need for a town corporate public art plan and budget.	Paragraph 5.3.1.vii already makes reference to this matter.
			Need for a more environmental emphasis – priority on reducing dependence on conventional energy.	Noted. However, this issue is primarily dealt with at Core Strategy level.
29	Barbara Touati-Evans	Local resident	The town centre needs to reflect the identity of Farnborough and its inhabitants, its culture and history. Greater emphasis on culture and arts – an annual cultural event in town centre.	New public spaces and civic buildings will contribute significantly to cultural and civic life. It is recommended that an addition should be made to highlight the need for town centre management to facilitate effective and active use of the public spaces.
			New design should offer sense of centrality, attractive and user friendly, with a focal point such as a market square or green, with more local shops not chains.	This point is addressed through the proposal for a new square at the southern end of Queensmead.
30	Clive Long	Primary Asset	Their 2 surgeries are located in the defined SPD area. Ready to move into shared practice within the SPD area.	Noted
			Support the visions and strategic objectives l), iv), v), vi), vii).	Noted

			5.2.1. v)vi) Support Pedestrian/cycle access and improved links to town centre.	Noted
			6.2.1 Support well balance community. Upper floors could have medical centre. 6.2.8. Community uses could include new medical centre. 6.3.3. Additional housing results in need for medical centre to meet population needs. 6.4.1. This will benefit health and convenience of patients.	Noted
			7.2 Support key principle of Union Street/Station-improve convenience/mobility of patients. 7.4. Support Key Principle 1 as town centre could incorporate new medical centre, 7.5.3. Support proposals 16&17-benefit accessibility of new medical centre. 7.6. Civic Quarter Key Principles, support in particular 1,2,4,5 – would provide better delivery of primary care services to community in suitable location and environment. 7.6.3. Support Proposal 27 and 33 – benefit convenience and safety of patients Support Proposals 28 and 31 – potential option for new medical centre. 7.7. Key principle 1 and Proposals 34 and 35 – benefit health, safety and convenience of present/existing patients.	New facilities would be possible in the civic quarter
			8.2. Support Partnership working – partnership working between stakeholders essential for new medical centre. 8.4. Indicative phasing – timescale – envisage short to mid term to develop new premises according to SPD definition. 8.5. Possible Planning Obligations – site acquisition price for new centre is determined by District Valuer. If SPD makes provision for new centre it will assist valuation process.	Noted

31	Jackie and Roy Slater	Local Residents	Concern over new homes – will they be in keeping and the tall apartments will block out light to their home.	Please refer to paragraph 5.2.1.viii that addresses this concern.
			Extra traffic to dwellings resulting in pollution and the difficulty in accessing Union Street from own drives.	Noted
			Overcrowding of dwellings/people/cars etc could increase crime.	The design of the buildings and spaces has been approached in a manner, that is designed to reduce crime and to improve safety.
			Need to create good first impression at Railway Station and Union Street. Possibly a few new shops opposite Union Street and a small green.	Noted
			Concern over health and hygiene of new dwellings between cemetery and railway embankment due to rat population.	Noted
32	Stephen Blythe	Hampshire County Council	Support the vision and key objectives for town centre and where they can be of assistance willing to work in partnership.	Noted
33	Anonymous		In need of a nightlife – bars/restaurants.	Noted – this is address in the draft SPD
			The website needs to state when planned developments will take place to prevent people moving away from the area.	The indicative phasing provided in section 8.1 provides this information. However, it is impossible to be precise about particular developments.
34	Dr Gilles Charbit	Local resident	Queen Elizabeth Park could be turned into a first-class park and give Farnborough a unique and distinctive character. Possible improvements: Clearing of dense foliage to enhance visibility; improving access to park, pathways and lighting, enhance children area, large pond, and improve safety.	This comment is beyond the scope of this SPD.
35	Anonymous		Need for some action.	Noted
36	Martin Wilson		Pleased the Council has an active interest in the redevelopment however thinks the Council needs to actually begin the work.	This document is an active part of the process of enabling development to proceed.

			Needs to be more 'select' retail outlets.	The SPD cannot dictate the standard of shops available. However, through seeking overall improvements to the town centre retail offer and general environmental improvements, it is hoped that more and better shops will be available in the town.
37	Peter Gardner		Appalled that time and rate-payers money can be spent with consultants to produce the SPD when the existing redevelopment plans have not been brought into action yet.	This document is designed to facilitate the process of development.
38	Vanessa Burley	Natural England	Pleased that the safeguarding of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA is considered in the SPD.	Welcome comment.
			The reference to SPD guiding development within Farnborough for next 5-10 years should be amended to refer to 20yrs for which the LDF is being developed.	The 20-year timeframe 2006-26 relates to the Core Strategy DPD and not necessarily all the LDDs within the LDF. Will change to 10-15
			Policy GSI does not offer any specific guidance or standards to be met.	The Council will be looking to re-submit a revised Core Strategy and will re-look at the SPA policy. The text of the SPD will be altered to reflect this.
			Recommend policy for Natura 2000 sites should be adopted: Zone A – additional residential development be refused planning permission unless, in exceptional circumstances demonstrates that it would not have a significant adverse effect on SPA. Zone B & C – additional residential development will be permitted subject to A) Development providing either adequate and suitable alternative natural green space or planning contribution to strategic provision of alternative natural green space by the planning authority. B) They're being no other reason why development would have impact on the SPA.	This is for the Core Strategy DPD and as mentioned above the Council will be looking to re-submit a revised Core Strategy.
			Evidence green spaces promote sense of well-being = better economic output. To achieve this minimum size of space per head of population could be given.	This is detail for the Core Strategy DPD or Open Space SPD.
			Core Strategy GSI – does not detail what measures are put into	The SPD will look to signpost developers to how they

		place to prevent increased risks to integrity of sites, therefore the policy does not provide for planning applicants to be able to demonstrate that their proposals have no adverse effect on integrity of the sites.	may be able to demonstrate their proposals have no adverse effect on the SPA but as Natural England is aware the SPA issue is still under consideration through the South East Plan. SPD will include details on possible avoidance obligations under section 8 ‘Delivery and implementation’.
		Strategy for dealing with requirement of Habitat Regulations is not evident and must be considered further.	More detail will be provided. Will include section in introduction (after 1.6 sustainability appraisal) about the SPD’s required Habitats Regulations Assessment and outcome of the assessment made.
		<i>Summary from Screening Matrix</i> – reference is made to guidance on Natura 2000 Sites being adhered to – what particular guidance this refers to must be made clear.	Agree. The Council’s avoidance strategy for delivering new homes will be made clear in the revised Habitats Regulations Assessment accompanying the final SPD.
		<i>Key Development Areas</i> – ‘residential development could have a significant adverse effect. It should be amended to ‘is likely to’.	In consultation with RSPB and NE, a revised Habitats Regulations Assessment will accompany the final SPD and include an ‘appropriate assessment’ stage to assess how all likely impacts will be avoided/ mitigated.
		Para 3.3 Article 6 Assessment – SPD includes measures to mitigate adverse effects – this sentence should refer the reader to where exactly these measures are written.	In consultation with RSPB and NE, a revised Habitats Regulations Assessment will accompany the final SPD and include an ‘appropriate assessment’ stage setting out how all likely impacts will be avoided/ mitigated.
		Advise that the conclusion that no impacts are identified is unjustified.	Article 6 assessment will be revised in consultation with RSPB/ NE (Habitats Regulations Assessment) setting out how any new housing in the town centre could be mitigated. This will address the ‘appropriate assessment’ stage and the outcome will be agreed and ‘signed off’ by NE prior to adoption.