Main Statement of Case Appendix 7- Part 1 of 3

TRANSPORT STATEMENT OF CASE BY TPP

Jockey Club Racecourses Limited

Sandown Park Racecourse
Transport Statement of Case

March 2020

transport planning practice

TPP
transport planning practice

Contents

Tables

Figures

Drawings

Appendices

A	Sandown Park Racecourse Masterplan layout
B	Bus timetables
C	Draft Racecourse Travel Plan
D	Indicative traffic flow diagrams
E	Draft Residential Travel Plan
F	Draft Hotel Travel Plan

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 Transport Planning Practice (TPP) has been working with Jockey Club Racecourses Limited (JCR), on the transport and travel planning aspects of the proposed development at Sandown Park, since 2016. Figure 1 shows the location of the Racecourse which is close to Esher town centre and the Station.

1.1.2 Sandown Park requires significant upgrades and enhancements of the existing Racecourse infrastructure, facilities and venues. This is to secure premier racecourse status and its long term future, as well as to improve the guest experience and community provision. A review of the potential enhancements and rationalisation of the Racecourse has led to the identification of a number of sites for residential development to facilitate the Racecourse enhancements. These residential development sites make up a small proportion of Sandown Park, without having a detrimental impact on racing operations or Green Belt.

1.1.3 The proposals including Racecourse enhancements, facilitating residential development, a hotel and centre of course developments are to be delivered through a single masterplan-led hybrid planning application. The details of the Masterplan are summarised in Chapter 2 of this document. A plan of the Sandown Park Racecourse Masterplan is contained within Appendix A.

1.1.4 This Statement of Case has been prepared to support the appeal against a refusal of planning permission for the Racecourse proposals. These proposals were refused by the planning committee at Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) in October 2019 despite:

- A recommendation to approve the application by officers of EBC; and
- The County Highway Authority (Surrey County Council) having no objections to the proposals subject to the agreed transport measures to encourage the use of sustainable transport.

1.1.5 This Statement of Case outlines the proposed development, the technical work undertaken to date, traffic surveys, relevant transport policies and discussions with Surrey County Council (SCC) and EBC.

1.1.6 The conclusion of this report is that the proposed development complies with and indeed supports national transport policy as set out in the National Planning Policy framework (Feb 2019) (Core Document CD2.1), regional transport policies

as set out in Surrey County Council's Transport Plan (Core Document CD1.3) and local transport policies contained in the Elmbridge Core strategy 2011 (Core Document CD1.1) and Development Management Plan 2015 (Core Document CD1.2). The Transport Assessment (Core Document CD5.45) that was submitted as part of the planning application has identified that there would be no noticeable impacts on the walking, cycling, public transport or highway networks as a result of the development.

1.1.7 The proposed development is located in a sustainable location where residents would have access to a range of sustainable modes of transport. In addition, it also provides numerous transport measures to make it more attractive for both the future and existing residents to walk, travel by bus and make train journeys in place of car trips. These measures would not only reduce the number of car trips made by future residents but should also make it more attractive for existing residents to use non-car modes.

1.1.8 The development also includes a range of transport measures which would improve safety, particularly for pedestrians, with the provision of additional pedestrian crossing points at a number of locations. The proposed site access junctions meet the required visibility standards and in a number of cases provide improved safety when compared with the existing situation.

1.1.9 Therefore the proposed development, including the associated transport improvements, would have a significant positive benefit for the local area by:

- Improving access by sustainable modes of transport for residents of the development, visitors to the Racecourse and existing residents and
- Improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers on the local road network.

1.1.10 This supports the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (Core Document DC2.1) which focuses on a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

1.1.11 The remainder this report is structured as follows:

Chapter 2 Existing situation and proposed development

1.1.12 Chapter 2 provides details with regard to the existing accessibility of the

Racecourse development sites, particularly their sustainable location and access by non-car modes. It also reviews the proposed development in terms of car parking and access for vehicles.

Chapter 3 Transport Impacts

1.1.13 Chapter 3 summarises the findings of the Transport Assessment, transport impacts and our discussions with SCC including:

- The trip generation of the development proposals based on a worst case that was agreed with SCC and analysed in the Transport Assessment;
- The impact of the proposals on the local road network and analysis of the site's access junctions;
- A summary of existing public transport services in the area and the impact of the proposed development on their capacity;
- The impact of the proposed development on walking, cycling and rail services; and
- The conclusions of the Transport Assessment which found that the proposed development will not have a noticeable impact on the local transport network.

1.1.14 SCC has concluded that the proposed development is acceptable subject to a number of measures to improve access by sustainable modes of transport that would be provided as part of the proposals.

Chapter 4 Sustainable transport measures

1.1.15 Chapter 4 summarises the proposed wide range of transport measures to improve conditions for those using public transport, pedestrians and cyclists that have been agreed with SCC and EBC. These measures were set out in the EBC committee report. The other benefits of the Racecourse development proposals for non-car modes are considered at the end of the chapter.

Chapter 5 Car parking strategy

1.1.16 Chapter 5 summarises the car parking strategy for the Racecourse, hotel and residential sites.

Chapter 6 Policy context

1.1.17 Chapter 6 considers how the development proposals support national, regional and local transport policy.

Chapter 7 Committee Meeting and reasons for refusal

1.1.18 Chapter 7 reviews the concerns of members at the committee meeting and the transport reasons for refusal given by members at the meeting, and responds as appropriate with reference to the committee report which recommended approval. This chapter also considers representations made by residents in relation to the proposed development.

Chapter 8 Summary and conclusions

1.1.19 Chapter 8 provides a summary and the conclusions for this Statement of Case. It confirms that there is no sound Reason for Refusal as the development:

- Would not have a noticeable impact on the highway and transport network,
- That all the sites have acceptable access, and
- The proposed transport measures would have a significant positive benefit for the local area by improving access by sustainable modes of transport for residents of the development, visitors to the Racecourse and existing residents, and improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers on the local road network.

1.1.20 It also confirms that the Council officers have concluded that the development is acceptable subject to the proposed sustainable transport measures and that the development complies with national, regional and local transport policies.

1.1.21 The Reasons for Refusal concerning impact of the proposed development on highways, traffic and transport are rebutted. There would be no harm caused by the proposed development as a result of its traffic generation or otherwise, and in particular no harmful impact on transport (highway and public transport capacity) as alleged in Reason for Refusal 1. The Appellant will enter into a legal agreement to secure improvements at Esher Railway Station, thereby bringing about substantial transportation benefits as a result and overcoming Reason for

Refusal 5. Therefore, there is no sound reason why the appeal should not be allowed and why planning permission should not be granted.

2 EXISTING SITUATION AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

2.1.1 This chapter of the Statement of Case describes the existing accessibility of the Racecourse, the situation on each of the Racecourse regeneration sites and the development proposals for the Racecourse.

2.2 Walking

2.2.1 The Racecourse site is well located for pedestrian and cycle access to Esher town centre which is an approximately 500m from the main Grandstand. In addition, the Racecourse is within a reasonable walking distance of public transport nodes including Esher Station with footways linking to them.

2.2.2 There are a number of bus stops which are located on the A307 Portsmouth Road to the south of the Racecourse, Esher Green to the south west, More Lane to the west and in Esher town centre. The Racecourse Grandstand is approximately a 1.3km walk from Esher Station via the A307 Portsmouth Road and B3379 Station Road. On race days, a pedestrian route directly from both Station platforms linked by an underpass provides access to the Racecourse via a footpath and the turnstiles on Lower Green Road. This route is approximately 1.0km from the Station to the Grandstand.

2.2.1 All of the proposed development sites are within walking distance of local schools, Esher town centre and the station. Table 2.1 below provides a summary of the mean and 85th percentile walking distances for the UK from a paper titled "How Far Do People Walk" (Core Document CD3.38). This paper was presented at the PTRC Transport Practitioners meeting in July 2015 and is based on information from the National Travel Survey which is a large scale travel diary that provides data on a wide range of transport matters including walking distances.

Table 2.1 Mean and 85th percentile walking distances

Journey purpose	Education	Shopping	Bus stops	Stations	Main mode
Mean walking distance	1,000m	1,000m	580m	1,010m	1,150m
85th percentile walking distance	1,600m	1,600m	800m	1,610m	1,950m

Note: Based on Tables on page 2 and table 2.3 of "How Far Do People Walk"

2.2.2 The walking distances in Table 2.1 do not set a limit on how far people are prepared to walk but rather are a measure of typical walking distances. There are many factors that influence how far people are prepared to walk including the attractiveness of the walk, convenience, safety and the length of time they would be spending at the destination (the longer they will be at the destination the greater the distance they are prepared to walk). A guide to what Parliament regards as appropriate maximum walking distance expected for school children is contained in Section 444(5) of the Education Act 1996 (in excess of which the Local Authority is under a duty to provide travel arrangements) is up to two miles (3,200m) for children under eight years old, and three miles (4,800m) for those over eight. The Charted Institution of Highways and Transportation states in their document *Planning for Walking* (April 2015) (Core Document CD3.39) that in 2012 walkers accounted for 79 per cent of all journeys shorter than one mile (1,600m). For journeys of one to two miles 26 per cent are walking.

2.2.3 Walking distances to and from the individual development sites are considered later in this chapter. Figure 2 shows some of the facilities within walking distance of the Racecourse including schools, the town centre and Esher station. It should also be noted that the development will be providing a range of measures such as new crossing facilities to improve the safety of pedestrians and make walking more attractive. This would be in line with the SCC and EBC transport policies which are set out in chapter 6 of this Statement of Case.

2.3 Cycling

2.3.1 All of the proposed development sites are within a reasonable cycling distance of Esher town centre, Esher Railway Station and primary and secondary schools. The proposed development is also within cycling distance of local towns such as Surbiton, Walton on Thames, Kingston Upon Thames, Weybridge and Twickenham. There are a number of towns within 10 miles of the Racecourse, and journey times and distances based on Google Maps are summarised in Table 2.2 below. Figure 3 shows the wider road network including some of the towns within cycling distance.

Table 2.2 Cycle times and distances to nearby towns

Town	Distance	Cycle time
Walton on Thames	2.9 miles	17 minutes
Oxshott	3.0 miles	19 minutes
Surbiton	3.3 miles	17 minutes
Chessington	3.7 miles	23 minutes
Kingston Upon Thames	4.0 miles	19 minutes
Hampton	4.4 miles	22 minutes
Cobham	4.6 miles	27 minutes
Weybridge	5.0 miles	28 minutes
Shepperton	5.7 miles	32 minutes
Epsom	6.4 miles	36 minutes
Twickenham	6.5 miles	35 minutes
Sunbury	6.9 miles	34 minutes
Leatherhead	6.1 miles	34 minutes

2.3.2 The proposed development would make a Community Infrastructure Levy contribution in the order of £4.5 million. The regulations that govern CIL require that this payment be used to fund the provision of infrastructure to support the development of the charging authority's area. The definition of infrastructure includes transport improvements and therefore there is money available from this development for the council to improve cycle infrastructure in the area. We understand that SCC would expect to submit bids for additional measures to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclist in the area when the CIL funding from the Racecourse becomes available.

2.3.3 Intermittent advisory cycle lanes run along the A307 Portsmouth Road to the south of the Racecourse which helps to prevent cars passing too close to cyclists. Figure 4 shows the TfL cycle routes in the area.

2.3.4 The proposed development will provide cycle parking in accordance with the council standards giving future residents a secure and covered place to store their bicycle.

2.3.5 Taking account of the facilities close to the Racecourse and the nearby towns, it is apparent that there is significant potential to encourage cycling in the area both by future residents of the development and existing residents in the area. This would be in line with the SCC and EBC transport policies which are set out in chapter 6 of this Statement of Case.

2.4 Bus services

2.4.1 The nearest bus stops to the Racecourse are located on the A307 Portsmouth Road, Esher Green, More Lane and in Esher town centre. The bus stop locations are shown on Figure 2 and Figure 5 shows a plan of the local bus services and some of the destinations served. Table 2.3 summarises the bus services stopping at these bus stops. Appendix B provides the timetables for the relevant bus routes.

Table 2.3: Summary of bus services (excluding school services)

Bus route	Direction towards	Hourly frequency				
		Mon – Fri			Sat	Sun
		AM	Inter-peak	PM		
513	Downside	0	1	0	0	0
	Kingston	0	1	0	0	0
514	Weybridge	1	0	0	0	0
	Kingston	0	1	0	0	0
515	Kingston	1	1	1	1	0
	Addlestone	1	1	1	1	0
715	Kingston	1	1	1	1	1 every 2 hours
	Guildford	0	1	1	1	1 every 2 hours
458	Staines	1	1	1	1	1
	Kingston	1	1	1	1	1
K3	Roehampton Vale	4	4	4	4	3
	Esher	4	4	4	4	3

Source: Surrey County Council's website (https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/buses-and-other-transport/bus-timetables/staines-chertsey-and-walton)

2.4.2 It is apparent from Table 2.3 that there are a range of bus services available to residents of the area. These provide access to a wide range of destinations across the area including Kingston, Walton on Thames, Hersham, Thames Ditton, Addleston, Byfleet, Surbiton, Guildford and Staines.

2.4.3 The bus services also provide interchange with railway stations in the area and other bus routes, further increasing the range of destinations that can be reached and providing alternative routes. For instance a journey from Esher town centre to Wimbledon could be made by using the 515 to Kingston upon Thames Station and then South Western Trains to Wimbledon or walking and catching the 515/715 towards Esher Station and then South Western Trains to Wimbledon. Kingston can be reached using the K3, 458, 715, 513, 514 or 515 bus routes. Many of the services also provide mobility and pushchair access and this will be improved by the measures proposed as part of the Racecourse

development.

2.4.4 Taking account of the destinations served by the local bus services close to the Racecourse it is apparent that there is significant potential to encourage bus travel both by future residents of the development and existing residents in the area. The development proposals would fund a number of improvements to bus stops adjacent to the development as set out in chapter 4 of this report. This would be in line with the SCC and EBC transport policies which are set out in chapter 6 of this Statement of Case and would encourage greater use of existing bus services.

2.5 Rail services

2.5.1 Esher Station is approximately 1.3km walking distance from the Racecourse Grandstand via Portsmouth Road and Station Road. The station is served by South Western Railway and has services towards London Waterloo and Clapham Junction stations to the east and Woking to the west.

2.5.2 On race days, the Racecourse operates a free of charge shuttle mini-bus between the Station and the main entrance to the Racecourse behind the Grandstand. Alternatively visitors can also walk directly from the Station platforms to the turnstiles at the north of Racecourse being directed by signage on the Station platforms. Table 2.4 summarises the rail services stopping at Esher Station. Figure 6 shows the destinations served by rail services from Esher Station.

Table 2.4: Summary of rail services

Direction	Hourly frequency					Journey times Minutes
	Mon – Fri			Sat	Sun	
	AM	Inter-peak	PM			
To London Waterloo	6	2	2	2	2	23-30
From London Waterloo	2	2	4	2	2	20-28
To Woking	2	2	4	2	2	20-25
From Woking	5	2	2	2	2	19-25

2.5.3 Table 2.4 shows that there are frequent rail services available at Esher Station. These provide services eastbound towards Surbiton, Wimbledon, Clapham Junction and London Waterloo and westbound towards Walton on Thames, Hesham, Weybridge, Woking and Guilford. The services from Esher also provide connections to the rest of the rail network and London underground services.

2.5.4 It should be noted that the proposed development will be funding measures to improve pedestrian access to the Station as well as making a S106 contribution of £300,000 (to be match funded by external funding sources) towards measures to improve accessibility and step free access at the station. The match funding would take the total amount available for improvements at the Station to £3 million This would fund measures such as two new lifts and ramps for disabled access and a covered pedestrian bridge linking the east and westbound platforms.

2.5.5 Taking account of the destinations served by the local rail services from Esher Station and the ability to interchange to other services, it is apparent that there is significant potential to encourage rail travel both by future residents of the development and existing residents in the area. The development proposals would fund a number of improvements that would improve access to Esher Station and measures for the mobility impaired as set out in Chapter 4 of this report. This would be in line with the SCC and EBC transport policies which are set out in Chapter 6 of this Statement of Case and would encourage greater use of existing rail services.

2.6 Local highway network

2.6.1 The Racecourse main site access is located on the A307 Portsmouth Road. Figure 7 shows the local highway network. To the west of the access, Portsmouth Road links to Esher town centre and the A3 Esher Bypass via the A244. The A3 then links to the M25 at junction 10. To the east of the access, Portsmouth Road links to the B3379 Station Road via a signal controlled junction and to the A309 Kingston Bypass via the 'Scilly Isles' junction which links with the A3 and central London.

At the 'Scilly Isles' junction, the A309 Hampton Court Way links the Racecourse to the M3 Motorway via the A308. The M3 Motorway provides access to the M25 to the north via junction 12. Locally, the A307 Portsmouth Road links to Kingston upon Thames to the east.

2.7 Proposed development

2.7.1 The proposals comprising the Racecourse enhancements, facilitating residential development, hotel and centre of course developments are to be delivered through a single Masterplan-led hybrid planning application across a series of

individual sites as follows:

- Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved except for access to the development) is sought for:
    - Enhancement and rationalisation of existing Racecourse facilities / infrastructure and car parking;
    - Re-location of an upgraded children's nursery (Use Class D1);
    - Development of a circa 150 room hotel (Use Class C1): and
    - Demolition of existing buildings / structures and residential development of approximately 318 dwellings (Use Class C3) across five sites.
- Full planning permission is sought for:
    - Racetrack widening to the southwest and east sections of the existing Racecourse track, including associated groundworks to the southwest section, and re-positioning of fencing, alterations to the existing internal access road from More Lane and anew bell mouth accesses serving the development.

Site 1: Mews

2.7.2 The site has an area of circa 2,400m^2 and currently consists of a proportion of the Racecourse overflow stables and associated facilities. The site is currently accessed from the Racecourse's main site access on the A307 Portsmouth Road via the Sandown Park Lodge car park. There is an emergency vehicle access directly onto More Lane.

2.7.3 The demolition of the existing stables which will be relocated within Site A, as part of the enhancement of the operational facilities, will facilitate residential development on Site 1. The proposals are to provide approximately 15 residential units and 21 car parking spaces. The proposals comprise:

Table 2.5: Site 1 – Mews development proposals

Unit type	Number of units
1 bedroom	5
2 bedroom	10
3 bedroom	0
Total	**15**

2.7.4 The access to Site 1 would be onto More Lane as shown on drawing 30918/AC/026_B. This is an existing access junction currently used as an emergency access to and from the Racecourse. The existing junction would be improved to enhance visibility and the ability to use the junction for emergency access would be retained while also providing access to the proposed residential development. Therefore, as well as providing access to the Site 1 development, the proposals would also improve the Racecourse emergency access by providing visibility splays which meet the required standards.

2.7.5 The accessibility of Site 1 to the town centre, nearest bus stop, Esher Station and local schools is set out in Table 2.6, the walking distances are measured from the site entrance. The walking times have been based on 80m per minute which represents a typical walking speed and 100m per minute which would represent a faster walking speed.

Table 2.6: Site 1 – Accessibility

Location	Distance (m)	Walking Time		Details	Comment
		(80m/ min)	(100m/ min)		
Town centre	250	3	2	Via Esher Green / Church Street	Within easy walking distance
Nearest bus stop	150	2	1	Esher Green Stops E and F	Within easy walking distance
Esher Station	1,700	21	17	Via Lower Green Road / Racecourse footpath	Within acceptable walking distance
Primary School	1,300	16	13	Cranmere Primary School	Within acceptable walking distance
Secondary School	350	4	3	Esher C of E School	Within easy walking distance
convenience shop	350	4	3	McColls on Portsmouth Road	Within easy walking distance

2.7.6 It can be seen from Table 2.6 that Site 1 is within walking distance of a range of local facilities. For instance the town centre is approximately a 250m walk which compares favourably with a typical mean walking distance of 1000m for shopping as set out in Table 2.1. The nearest bus stop is 150m compared with a typical mean walking distance of 580m. With regards to local schools the nearest primary school is 1,300m and the nearest secondary school is around 350m which compares with average and 85th percentile walking distances of 1,000m and 1,600m for education. Esher Station 1,700 m from the site which is just outside the 85th percentile walking distance of 1,600m. Therefore it is apparent from Table 2.6 that walking to local amenities and transport nodes is a viable alternative for future residents of Site 1.

Site 2: Urban Frontage

2.7.7 The site has an area of circa 4,600m^2 and currently comprises a proportion of the Racecourse stables and associated facilities, and two car parks. The proposals are to provide approximately 49 residential units and 72 car parking spaces. The proposals comprise:

Table 2.7: Site 2 – Urban Frontage development proposals

Unit type	Number of units
1 bedroom	4
2 bedroom	26
3 bedroom	19
Total	**49**

2.7.8 Access to Site 2 would continue to be from Portsmouth Road via the secondary Racecourse entrance as per the existing situation. The proposed access into the residential development is shown on drawing 30918/AC/027_B. These access proposals could include a new pedestrian crossing with central refuge which will make it easier and safer for pedestrians to cross the road and improve pedestrian permeability. The provision of housing on this site would provide natural surveillance for pedestrians with the new properties overlooking Portsmouth Road.

2.7.9 The accessibility of Site 2 to the town centre, nearest bus stops, Esher Station and local schools is set out in Table 2.8. The walking distances for Site 2 have been measured from the secondary access point on Portsmouth Road.

Table 2.8: Site 2 – Accessibility

Location	Distance (m)	Walking Time		Details	Comment
		(80m/ min)	(100m/ min)		
Town centre	200	3	2	Via Portsmouth Road	Within easy walking distance
Bus stop	150	2	2	Council Office Stop A and B on Portsmouth Road	Within easy walking distance
Esher Station	1,100	14	11	Via Portsmouth Road and Station Road	Within acceptable walking distance
Primary School	1,500	19	15	Esher Church School	Within acceptable walking distance
Secondary School	950	12	10	Esher C of E School	Within acceptable walking distance
Convenience shop	300	4	3	McColls on Portsmouth Road	Within easy walking distance

2.7.10 It can be seen from Table 2.8 that Site 2 is within walking distance of a range of local facilities. For instance the town centre is approximately 200m which compares favourably with a typical mean walking distance of 1,000m for shopping as set out in Table 2.1Table 2.1. The nearest bus stop is approximately 150 m compared with a typical mean walking distance of 580 metres. With regards to local schools the nearest primary school is 1,500m and the nearest secondary school is around 950m which compares with average and 85th percentile walking distances of 1,000m and 1,600m for education. Esher Station is 1,100m from the site which is within the 85th percentile walking distance of 1,600m. Therefore it is apparent from Table 2.8 that walking is a viable alternative to local amenities and transport nodes for future residents of Site 2.

2.7.11 In addition it is worth noting that the new flats overlooking Portsmouth Road would provide natural surveillance in this location for pedestrians and the existing bus stop. This should make this part of the route between the town centre and the Station feel safer and more secure.

Site 3: Villas

2.7.12 Site 3 is located in the northwest corner of Sandown Park Racecourse and has an area of circa 17,600m^2. It is currently developed with eight residential units that provide Racecourse staff accommodation.

2.7.13 Access to Site 3 is from Lower Green Road. The site is connected to the rest of the Racecourse via an internal road that runs from the Centre of Course access on More Lane through to the turnstiles located next to the railway bridge that crosses Lower Green Road.

2.7.14 Reconfiguration of the maintenance compounds and facilities provides an opportunity to develop a linear arrangement of south facing apartments, the majority of which will have excellent views over the Racecourse. The proposals are to provide approximately 114 residential units and 158 car parking spaces. The proposals comprise:

Table 2.9: Site 3 - Villas development proposals

Unit type	Number of units
1 bedroom	27
2 bedroom	87
3 bedroom	0
Total	**114**

2.7.15 With the development proposals access to Site 3 would continue to be from Lower Green Road. However, as shown on drawing 30918/AC/028_B a new access junction would be constructed approximately 45m to the east of the existing access which would be removed. The new access would provide improved visibility compared with the existing situation by locating it away from the bend on More Lane so that the entire junction visibility splay falls within a straight section of carriageway. Also locating the new access junction further east increases the distance between the site access and the More Lane junctions. In addition, the development includes proposals to cut back the vegetation on the corner of More Lane and Lower Green Road which would improve visibility both at the access and for drivers using this part of the road network.

2.7.16 As well as providing access to the proposed residential development the relocated junction would continue to provide emergency access to the Racecourse and an exit for cars leaving at peak times on race days and other event days.

2.7.17 The accessibility of Site 3 to the town centre, nearest bus stops, Esher Station and local schools is set out in Table 2.10.

Table 2.10: Site 3 – Accessibility

Location	Distance (m)	Walking Time		Details	Comment
		(80m/ min)	(100m/ min)		
Town centre	1,100	14	11	Via Lower Green Road and Esher Green	Within acceptable walking distance
Bus stops	200	3	2	Lower Green stop on More Lane	Within easy walking distance
Esher Station	1,000	12	10	Via Lower Green Road and the Racecourse Footpath	Within acceptable walking distance
Nearest Primary School	400	5	4	Cranmere Primary School	Within easy walking distance
Secondary School	550	7	6	Esher C of E School	Within easy walking distance
Convenience shop	300	4	3	The Corner Shop on Farm Lane	Within easy walking distance

2.7.18 It can be seen from Table 2.10 that Site 3 is within walking distance of a range of local facilities. For instance the town centre is a 1,100 m walk which compares with an 85th percentile walking distance of 1,600m for shopping. In addition, the nearest bus stop is approximately 200m compared with a typical mean walking distance of 580m. With regards to local schools the nearest primary school is around 400m and the nearest secondary school is around 550m which compares favourably with the average and 85th percentile walking distances of 1,000m and 1,600m for education. Esher Station is approximately 1,000m from the site which is less than the mean walking distance of 1,000m. Therefore it is apparent from Table 2.10 that walking to local amenities and transport nodes is a viable alternative for future residents of Site 3.

Site 4: Crescent

2.7.19 The site has an area of circa 5,700m^2 and is currently an infill site to the north of Café Rouge on Station Road. The site is currently accessed from Station Road via a large gated access. The proposals are to provide approximately 72 residential

units and 117 car parking spaces. The proposals comprise:

Table 2.11: Site 4 - Crescent development proposals

Unit type	Number of units
1 bedroom	2 (studios)
2 bedroom	39
3 bedroom	31
Total	**72**

2.7.20 A new access located to the north of the existing site access would be provided from Station Road for Site 4 as shown on drawing 30918/AC/029_B. The proposed access would be located approximately 15m further away from the signal controlled junction with Portsmouth Road than the existing site access which would be closed. In addition, the proposed location of the site access increases its distance from the Café Rouge car park entrance. The proposed new location of the site entrance enhances highway safety within this location by providing increased decision time for drivers approaching the access from both directions.

2.7.21 The accessibility of Site 4 to the town centre, nearest bus stop, Esher Station and local schools is set out in Table 2.12.

Table 2.12: Site 4 – Accessibility

Location	Distance (m)	Walking Time		Details	Comment
		(80m/ min)	(100m/ min)		
Town centre	1,100	14	11	Via Station Road and Portsmouth Road	Within acceptable walking distance
Bus stop	150	2	1	Littleworth Common Stop on Portsmouth Road	Within easy walking distance
Esher Station	250	3	3	Via Station Road	Within easy walking distance
Primary School	1,400	18	14	Cramere Primary School	Within acceptable walking distance
Secondary School	1,800	23	18	Esher C of E school	Within acceptable walking distance
Convenience shop	1,200	15	12	McColls on Portsmouth Road	Within acceptable walking distance

2.7.22 It can be seen from Table 2.12 that Site 4 is within walking distance of a range of local facilities. For instance the town centre is a 1,100m walk which compares with an 85th percentile walking distance of 1,600m for shopping. In addition, the nearest bus stop is approximately 150m compared with a typical mean walking distance of 580m. With regards to local schools the nearest primary school is 1,400m which compares with the 85th percentile walking distances of 1,600m for education. The nearest secondary school is around 1,800m from the site which compares with the 85th percentile walking distance of 1,600m for education. Esher Station in the order of 250m from the site which is less than the mean walking distance of 1,000m. Therefore it is apparent from Table 2.12 that walking is a viable alternative for future residents of Site 4.

2.7.23 In addition it is worth noting that the new flats overlooking Station Road would provide natural surveillance for existing pedestrians. This should make this part of the route between the town centre and the Station feel safer and more secure.

Site 5: Villas & Nursery

2.7.24 This site is currently developed with two buildings that are used as a Nursery. The site has an area of 7,700m^2 and is accessed from the Racecourse's main site access on the A307 Portsmouth Road. There is a Grade II Listed post located on the highway near the south east corner of the site.

2.7.25 Demolition of the existing nursery buildings provides the opportunity for new high quality apartments as a continuation of the existing streetscape from the east. Furthermore, respecting the existing landscape and mature trees will allow the development of new apartment blocks overlooking the Racecourse to the north. The proposals are to provide a replacement class D1 nursery, approximately 68 residential units and 87 car parking spaces. The proposed residential development would comprise:

Table 2.13: Site 5 – Villas and Nursery site development proposals

Unit type	Number of units
1 bedroom	36
2 bedroom	24
3 bedroom	8
Total	**68**

2.7.26 Access to Site 5 would be from a new purpose built junction on Portsmouth Road

as shown on drawing 30918/AC/030_B. SCC requested that a ghost island right-turn facility with an informal pedestrian crossing is provided for this access. Drawing 30918/AC/0043_A shows the proposed arrangement with an additional crossing facility for pedestrians which should help improve safety for pedestrians crossing in this location to gain access to the Station and Racecourse. These proposals would also provide visibility splays which meet the required standards.

2.7.27 The accessibility of Site 5 to the town centre, nearest bus stops, Esher Station and local schools is set out in Table 2.14.

Table 2.14: Site 5 – Accessibility

Location	Distance (m)	Walking Time		Details	Comment
		(80m/ min)	(100m/ min)		
Town centre	700	9	7	Via Portsmouth Road	Within acceptable walking distance
Bus stops	200	3	2	Sandown Park on Portsmouth Road	Within easy walking distance
Esher Station	650	8	7	Station Road into the main entrance	Within acceptable walking distance
Primary School	1,800	23	18	Cranmere Primary School	Within acceptable walking distance
Secondary School	1,400	18	14	Esher C of E School	Within acceptable walking distance
Convenience shop	750	10	8	McColls on Portsmouth Road	Within acceptable walking distance

2.7.28 It can be seen from Table 2.14 that Site 3 is within walking distance of a range of local facilities. For instance the town centre is approximately 700m walk which compares favourably with a mean walking distance of 1,000m for shopping. The nearest bus stop is around 200m compared with a typical mean walking distance of 580m. The nearest primary school is around 1,800m from the site which compares with the 85th percentile walking distance of 1,600m for education. The nearest secondary school is around 1,400m which compares with

the 85th percentile walking distance of 1,600m for education. Esher Station is around 650m from the site which is less than the mean walking distance of 1000m. Therefore it is apparent from Table 2.14 that walking to local amenities and transport nodes is a viable alternative for future residents of Site 5.

2.7.29 It is also worth noting that the new flats will provide overlooking onto Portsmouth Road and the close boarded fence would be removed and replaced with railings providing natural surveillance for existing pedestrians. This should help make this part of the route between the town centre and the Station feel safer and more secure.

2.7.30 The replacement nursery will be provided to the west of the site. The nursery access would continue to be from the Racecourse main access as per the existing situation. The replacement nursery will be similar in size and operation to the existing situation.

Site A: Racecourse Operational Facilities

2.7.31 Site A currently comprises a proportion of the Racecourse stables and associated facilities, the pre-parade ring and the 21-bedroom Sandown Park Lodge hotel.

2.7.32 Site A would re-provide the entire Racecourse stables and associated facilities, the pre-parade ring, horsebox parking including horse ramps for loading and unloading horses, and a replacement Lodge and associated facilities for stable staff. The horseboxes would access the site from Portsmouth Road via the secondary Racecourse entrance as per the existing situation. Drawing 30918/AC/031_B shows the horsebox access road swept path analysis.

2.7.33 Access would be from the Racecourse secondary entrance point which could be improved to include new pedestrian crossings which will make it safer for pedestrians to cross the road and improve pedestrian permeability.

2.7.34 The area around Site A also includes new footpaths through landscaped areas to improve accessibility to and from the Racecourse. Adjacent to Site 2 on Portsmouth Road a new footpath route would be introduced that could be used by those accessing Site 2 and facilities on the Racecourse including the grandstand and hotel. This route could be extended to the nursery site or a new route introduced along the frontage of Portsmouth Road providing access to the nursery site. These measures together with a new landscape entrance and

pedestrian signage would improve access between Esher and the Racecourse.

2.7.35 Significant measures for the mobility impaired are also proposed as part of the Racecourse development. These include DDA compliant access to the grandstand and suitable routes for the mobility impaired as part of the redeveloped areas of the Racecourse.

2.7.36 For cyclists additional cycle parking will be provided for those attending the Racecourse. The current view is that this will be provided on Site F.

Site B: Hotel site

2.7.37 The site is located to east of the Racecourse Grandstand. This site comprises an area of hard standing and green space used for parking on race days. The proposals are for a circa 150-bedroom hotel. The hotel would not have any conferencing facilities so that those located within the Grandstand are not displaced.

2.7.38 The hotel car parking will be determined based on the operator's requirements and the predicted demand. An area of the existing Racecourse general admission parking provision will be made available to the hotel and managed on race days and large events. The likely level of parking made available to the hotel has been based on one space per bedroom which equates to 150 parking spaces but given the proximity of the site to Esher Station, the hotel operator may not require this amount. Accessibility to the proposed hotel site is set out in Table 2.15. The walking distances for Site B have been estimated from the proposed hotel site.

Table 2.15: Hotel – Accessibility

Location	Distance (m)	Walking Time		Details	Comment
		(80m/ min)	(100m/min)		
Town centre	450	6	4	Via Portsmouth Road	Within acceptable walking distance
Bus stops	400	5	4	Sandown Park on Portsmouth Road	Within acceptable walking distance
Esher Station	1,200	15	12	Portsmouth Road and Station Road into the main entrance	Within acceptable walking distance

2.7.39 It can be seen from Table 2.15 that the hotel site is within walking distance of a range of local facilities. For instance the town centre is approximately 450m walk which compares favourably with the mean walking distance of 1,000m for shopping. In addition, the nearest bus stop is 400m compared with a typical mean walking distance of 580m. Esher Station is 1,200m from the site which is less than the 85th percentile walking distance of 1,600m. Therefore it is apparent from Table 2.15 that walking to local amenities and transport nodes is a viable alternative for the future hotel site.

Site C: Family/Community Zone

2.7.40 The site is located in the centre of the Racecourse and at present contains a Go-kart track, hard surfaced parking area and associated facilities. The site adjoins the golf course and driving range structure to the north.

2.7.41 The current and proposed access to Site C is via More Lane using the existing Centre of Course access junction. This also provides access to the Racecourse car parking (Site D) in the centre of the course, the ski slope, health club and golf club.

2.7.42 The proposals comprise replacing the existing Go-kart track and café with a new family/community zone which includes a recreational cycle track, an indoor soft play area with ancillary café, children's adventure playgrounds and a picnic area.

2.7.43 The existing access will be improved and an indicative arrangement is shown on drawing 30918/AC/032_B. This arrangement shows a widened vehicle access to allow two-way flow and a pedestrian entrance with a new footway linking to the existing footways on More Lane.

2.7.44 Accessibility to the site is summarised in Table 2.16 The walking distances for Site C have been estimated from the western end of the site.

Table 2.16: Family/Community Zone – Accessibility

Location	Distance (m)	Walking Time		Details
		(80m/ min)	(100m/ min)	
Town centre	950	12	9	Via More Lane and Church Street
Bus stops	500	6	5	Esher High School stops on More Lane

2.7.45 The Site C proposals will result in the loss of 113 parking spaces within the Centre of Racecourse. However sufficient car parking would remain available for the Racecourse even at peak times for major races. Further details on the current Racecourse parking arrangements and the improvement proposals are set out below and in Chapter 5.

Site D: Improvements to the Racecourse Car Parking – Centre of Course

2.7.46 Site D is located in the Centre of the Racecourse adjacent to Site C. The area contains hard surfaced parking for the golf course to the north, with a grassed area which is used as parking for race meetings. However, during the winter months parking on the grassed area can become difficult when the ground becomes soft. Therefore, the proposals include a number of measures to improve Site D so that it can be used in its entirety for parking throughout the year.

2.7.47 The measures to improve the centre of Racecourse parking include the provision of a resin bound gravel car park for the use of the Racecourse on race and event days, and at all other times by Site C; and areas treated with improved drainage and reinforced grass. The proposed resin bound gravel car park area would be the same size as that removed for the Go-kart track.

2.7.48 Further details on the current Racecourse parking arrangements and the improvement proposals as part of the works are set out in Chapter 5 of this report.

2.7.49 The current and proposed access to Site D is via More Lane using the existing Centre of Course access junction. This also provides access to the Centre of Course facilities, the ski slope, health club and golf club.

2.7.50 An indicative improved access arrangement is shown on drawing 30918/AC/032_B. This arrangement shows a widened vehicle access to allow two-way flow and a pedestrian entrance with a new footway linking to the existing footways on More Lane.

Site E: Racetrack widening

2.7.51 Site E includes widening of the racetrack at the south west and eastern corners of the Racecourse.

Site F: Improvements to the Racecourse Car Parking – Portsmouth Road

2.7.52 Site F is located adjacent to Portsmouth Road and contains a mixture of parking surfaces including 'Type 1' hardstanding, gravel bound tarmac and grass. The site is accessed from Portsmouth Road via the Racecourse's main entrance and secondary entrance, and via two gates located within the Listed Fence.

2.7.53 The proposed hotel on Site B will require some realignment of one of the site's internal access road's to serve the hotel, replacement nursery and the Racecourse car parking. It is proposed to relocate the existing broadcasting compound and turnstiles/kiosk elsewhere within Site F and install a new ring main unit.

2.7.54 As part of the reserved matters application for the hotel, the existing car park arrangements on Portsmouth Road will be rationalised and improved. The improvements will also include improved drainage, landscaping and surfacing as certain areas of the car parks currently flood

2.7.55 Further details on the current Racecourse parking arrangements and the improvement proposals as part of the works are set out in Chapter 5.

2.7.56 The proposals for the Portsmouth Road car parking could also include a new pedestrian crossing at the main access. This will make it safer for pedestrians to cross the road and improve pedestrian permeability.

2.7.57 The Racecourse website already includes information on how to access the site by train and a complimentary mini bus service is provided between the Station and the site on race days. However in addition to measures at the Racecourse access junctions that would improve pedestrian safety the proposed Racecourse improvements would also have other associated measures that would benefit the local area and encourage sustainable modes of transport. These include:

- Racecourse Event Plan to manage traffic at major events and reduce the impact on the road network and residential streets when compared with the existing situation.

- Racecourse Travel Plan which would include measures to encourage staff and visitors to the Racecourse to travel by sustainable modes of transport. This should reduce the number arriving by car at the

Racecourse when compared with the existing situation.

2.7.58 The Draft Racecourse Travel Plan is included in Appendix C of this Statement of Case.

2.8 Delivery & Servicing

2.8.1 All the residential sites will have access junctions with appropriate geometry to allow access by service vehicles. In addition, the refuse stores will be located to ensure that refuse collection vehicles can stop with their rear loading points within 10m of the store access doors.

All development sites will incorporate turning heads to allow service vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward gear.

2.9 Development Site Summary

2.9.1 In summary all of the proposed development sites are in within walking distance of Esher town centre, local schools and the Station as well as being accessible to public transport. Further, the access proposals also include measures to improve visibility when compared with the existing situation and provide additional crossing points improving pedestrian permeability and safety for pedestrians crossing the road and other road users. An initial safety review has indicated that the access proposals would contribute to improving safety on the surrounding road network.

2.9.2 In addition there are a range of improvements for the mobility impaired that would be implemented as part of the development proposals including access to the grandstand. Access between Esher and the Racecourse would also be improved with the introduction of new pedestrian routes.

3 TRANSPORT IMPACTS

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This chapter of the Statement of Case reviews the trip generation of the proposed development and then considers what if any impacts this will have on the various modes of travel available to existing and future residents. The scope of the transport work, analysis and sustainable transport measures was agreed with SCC through extensive discussions during the application process. This has resulted in SCC having no objections to the proposed development.

3.2 Trip Generation

Residential development

3.2.1 The TRICS database has been interrogated to obtain suitable comparator sites for the proposed residential development trip generation. The trip rates

3.2.2 that have been derived are set out within Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Residential Apartments, person trip rates all modes per unit

	0800-0900			1700-1800		
	In	**Out**	**Total**	**In**	**Out**	**Total**
Trip rates all modes	0.108	0.473	0.581	0.341	0.223	0.564

3.2.3 These trip rates have been agreed with SCC Highways and were included in the draft Transport Assessment and discussed during a pre-application meeting with SCC on 30th January 2019.

3.2.4 The 2011 *Census* data 'method of travel to work' for Elmbridge 013 Middle Layer Super Output Area (MSOA) (Core Document CD3.40) has been used to calculate mode share for the residential development. The modal share is summarised in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Census Residential mode of travel to work

Mode	Modal Split
Underground	1%
Train	29%
Bus	2%
Taxi	0%
Motorcycle, Scooter or Moped	1%
Driving a Car or Van	54%
Passenger in a Car or Van	2%
Bicycle	3%
On Foot	6%
Other	2%
Total	**100%**

3.2.5 The 2011 Census 'method of travel to work' data indicates that car driver journeys account for 54% of the trips made to and from existing residential development in Esher. The number of vehicle trips for each of the residential sites has been calculated by multiplying the person trip rate by the number of residential units and then by the mode share of 54%.

Sensitivity test

3.2.6 At the request of SCC a sensitivity test of the Census mode share has been undertaken using the mode share data from the TRICS comparator sites used for the residential trip generation calculations. The TRICS residential modal share for the peak hours is summarised in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: TRICS Residential mode of travel peak hours

Mode	Modal Split	
	AM	**PM**
Underground	0%	0%
Train	21%	8%
Bus	17%	10%
Taxi	1%	3%
Motorcycle, Scooter or Moped	0%	0%
Driving a Car or Van	21%	33%
Passenger in a Car or Van	4%	14%
Bicycle	3%	2%
On Foot	33%	30%
Other	0%	0%
Total	**100%**	**100%**

3.2.7 The sensitivity test shows that the car mode share from the TRICS data is lower than the Census mode share. Therefore, the Census data provides a robust assessment of the level of vehicle trip generation and has been used in assessing the impact on the road network to represent a worst case.

3.2.8 It should be noted that one of the reasons for the difference between the Census data and TRICS is that the Census only considers journeys to work and therefore excludes journeys such as those to local schools which are often to destinations that are nearby and more likely to involve walking and bus trips. Therefore in practice the number of vehicles generated by the proposed development could be significantly fewer than that tested and more in line with TRICS where the numbers for vehicle driver are around half of that predicted from the Census.

Hotel development

3.2.9 The TRICS database has been interrogated to obtain suitable comparator sites for the proposed Hotel development vehicle trip generation. Trip rates for vehicles have been derived and are set out within Table 3.4.

Table 3.4: Hotel trip rate per bedroom

	0800-0900			1700-1800		
	In	**Out**	**Total**	**In**	**Out**	**Total**
Vehicle trips rates	0.12	0.21	0.33	0.15	0.08	0.23

3.2.10 The above trip rates have been applied to the 150 hotel rooms that will be provided as a result of the proposed hotel development.

3.2.11 These trip rates have been agreed with SCC Highways. The trip rates were included in the draft Transport Assessment and discussed during a pre-application meeting with SCC on 30th January 2019.

Residential and hotel vehicle trip generation summary

3.2.12 The vehicle trips have been calculated for each site based on the mode share obtained from Census data for the residential development and the trip rates obtained from TRICS for the Hotel development. Table 3.5 to Table 3.8 show the vehicle trips for each site grouped together based on which road they access onto.

Table 3.5: Vehicle trips, access onto More Lane

Site	0800-0900			1700-1800		
	In	**Out**	**Total**	**In**	**Out**	**Total**
Site 1	1	4	5	3	2	5

Table 3.6: Vehicle trips, access onto Lower Green Road

Site	0800-0900			1700-1800		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Site 3	7	29	36	21	14	35

Table 3.7: Vehicle trips, access onto Station Road

Site	0800-0900			1700-1800		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Site 4	4	18	22	13	9	22

Table 3.8: Vehicle trips, access onto A307 Portsmouth Road

Site	0800-0900			1700-1800		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Site 2	3	13	16	9	6	15
Site 5	4	17	21	13	8	21
Site B (Hotel)	18	31	49	22	12	34
Total	**25**	**61**	**86**	**44**	**26**	**70**

3.3 Traffic impacts residential and hotel

3.3.1 The development will be located over a number of sites around the Racecourse. This means that the car driver trips will access the road network at a number of different points over a wide area. This has the effect of spreading the traffic around the road network reducing the traffic impact at any particular point.

3.3.2 Traffic flows for Portsmouth Road, Station Road, Lower Green Road and More Lane were obtained using Automatic Traffic Counters (ATCs) for a period of seven days. The traffic flows that have been assessed as part of this document account for a Virtual Weekday (i.e. the average flows of the five weekdays that were surveyed). These flows have been uplifted for the development completion year of 2027 with growth factors obtained from the DfT using Tempro. The proposed development flows have then been distributed based on the ATC data and the predicted origin/destinations of traffic using the local road network. Table 3.9 summarises the traffic flows on each road link with and without the development. The ATCs were placed at the following locations:

- To the east of the access point to Site 3 on Lower Green Road
- To the north of the access point to Site 4 on Station Road
- To the east of the access points to Sites 2, A, B and F on Portsmouth Road

- To the north of the access point to Site 1 on Moore Lane

3.3.3 Figures 8 and 9 summarise the worst case increases in traffic as a result of the development. Appendix D contains the traffic flow diagrams.

Table 3.9: Week day Traffic Flows – 2018 base, 2027 future base and 2027 with development (Virtual Weekday)

Link	2018 Base		2027 Base		2027 with Development	
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Lower Green Road	742	536	805	585	826 (+21)	604 (+19)
Station Road	690	576	748	629	772 (+22)	648 (+19)
Portsmouth Road	1,656	1,528	1,790	1,663	1,843 (+53)	1,707 (+44)
More Lane	1,021	806	1,107	880	1,126 (+19)	901 (+21)

3.3.4 Table 3.10 summarises the percentage increase in traffic flow on each road link as a result of the proposed development.

Table 3.10: Increase due to proposed development

Link	Increase	
	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Weekday PM Peak Hour
Lower Green Road	+21 cars or 2.6%	+19 cars or 3.2 %
Station Road	+22 cars or 2.9%	+19 cars or 3.0%
Portsmouth Road	+ 53 cars or 3.0%	+44 cars or 2.6%
More Lane	+19 cards or 1.7%	+21 cars or 2.4%

3.3.5 As can be seen from Table 3.10 the increase in traffic would be minimal on the local road network. The additional development trips on Portsmouth Road would travel in both directions and therefore the increase on any one section is less than one vehicle every minute which is expected to have a negligible impact on this road. The additional development trips on Lower Green Road, Station Road and More Lane would travel in both directions and therefore the increase on any one section would equate to approximately one vehicle every three minutes on each road. This is not expected to have a noticeable impact on these roads.

3.3.6 It is also worth noting the increase in traffic as a result of the development is well within typical daily variations which can range from 5% to 10%.

3.3.7 In practice the increase in vehicle trips resulting from the proposed development could be significantly lower than that estimated above. The reasons for this are

because 1) the sensitivity test has probably overestimated car trip generation of the development, 2) the proposed measures to promote sustainable transport which would reduce car trip generation and 3) the existing traffic conditions which can be expected to deter short car trips. This is explored further below.

Census compared with TRICS sensitivity test mode split

3.3.8 As previously noted, the number of vehicle trips generated by the proposed development could be significantly fewer than that tested. The TRICS data predicted around 60% fewer vehicle trips in the AM peak and 40% fewer in the PM Peak. Therefore in practice the increase the number of vehicle trips could be around half of that tested.

Measures to encourage non car modes

3.3.9 The proposed development includes a wide range measures to make walking and use of public transport more feasible and attractive as summarised in chapter 4 of this report. These measures should reduce the number of car trips by residents of the development and should also make it more attractive for existing residents to use non car modes.

3.3.10 The proposed development would have approximately 800 to 900 residents. This compares with a local population of approximately 5,000 that we estimate could benefit from the proposed improvements for walking and public transport, this excludes any wider measures for cycling that Elmbridge might choose to fund from the £4.5 million CIL payment for the development

Existing congestion

3.3.11 It is accepted that the local road network can become congested at peak times. In these conditions, it might be quicker and more convenient for residents to walk or cycle for short journeys, particularly because all of the development sites are within easy walking distance of the station, Esher town centre and local schools. In addition if the road network is congested this might also result in residents not making journeys or making them at different times of the day.

3.4 Traffic impacts of Racecourse improvements

3.4.1 There are around 25 major events per year at the Racecourse and many of these occur on weekends or during school or bank holidays. Also the events tend to

begin after the morning peak and end after the evening peak on the road network. The Racecourse is proposed to operate at the same level as in the existing situation and the number of major events will not change. Therefore, there will be no net uplift in the number of visitors and the trip generation associated with the proposed Racecourse improvements.

3.4.2 Overall it is anticipated the Racecourse improvements would have a positive impact on the road network. The reasons for this are that the proposals for the Racecourse include a Racecourse Travel Plan and a Racecourse Event Management Plan. These would manage traffic at major events and encourage staff and visitors to travel to the site by sustainable modes of transport to reduce the number arriving by car.

3.4.3 The Racecourse proposals would also have a positive impact for the mobility impaired. The grandstand access would become DDA compliant and surfaces around the Racecourse would be improved which will make them easier to use for those that are mobility impaired.

3.4.4 Site A will operate the same as the existing situation. Site C will be used as part of the general race day meet activities. During non-race days, it is expected to have a comparable trip generation and operating times as the existing situation during peak times. The peak trip generation for the centre of course is expected to be outside of the local highway network peak hours.

3.4.5 The proposed access arrangements have been agreed with Surrey County Council and meet the required standards in terms of visibility and geometry. It is also worth noting that we have undertaken a preliminary safety review of the proposed access junctions and a number of these improve safety when compared with the existing situation. A more detailed safety review is currently being undertaken.

3.5 Junction capacity assessment

3.5.1 Junction capacity assessments have been undertaken for the proposed residential site accesses on Portsmouth Road, Station Road, Lower Green Road and More Lane using the traffic modelling tool Junctions 9. It was agreed with SCC that the worst case peak hour would be modelled for each of the junctions at the pre-application meeting of 30th January 2019.

3.5.2 The worst case peak hour has been established as the AM peak and the scenario modelled in Junctions 9 was the development completion year of 2027 with proposed development. Table 3.11 summarises the results.

Table 3.11: Summary of junction capacity assessment for residential site access

Access	Arm	RFC	Queue length (vehicles)
Site 1 – junction with More Lane	More Lane (right turn)	0.00	0.0
	Site Access	0.00	0.0
Site 2 – junction with Portsmouth Road	Portsmouth Road (right turn)	0.01	0.0
	Site Access (left turn)	0.02	0.0
	Site Access (right turn)	0.06	0.1
Site 3 – junction with Lower Green Road	Lower Green Road (right turn)	0.01	0.0
	Site Access (left turn)	0.02	0.0
	Site Access (right turn)	0.05	0.1
Site 4 – junction with Station Road	Station Road (right turn)	0.01	0.0
	Site Access (left turn)	0.01	0.0
	Site Access (right turn)	0.03	0.0
Site 5 – junction with Portsmouth Road	Portsmouth Road (right turn)	0.01	0.0
	Site Access (left turn)	0.02	0.0
	Site Access (right turn)	0.08	0.1

3.5.3 A Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) of 0.85 is regarded as the threshold at which junctions are reaching capacity. The modelling assessment demonstrates that the new site accesses will operate well within capacity with RFC's well below 0.85 and queues lengths of no more than one vehicle.

3.6 Multi-modal trip generation assessment

3.6.1 An assessment of the facilitating residential development and proposed hotel on non-car modes has been undertaken by applying the mode share obtained from 2011 Census data. Table 3.12 shows the person trips per mode.

Table 3.12: Non-car Residential and Hotel trips

Mode	Resi	Hotel	AM	Resi	Hotel	PM
Underground	2	1	3	2	1	3
Train	54	29	83	52	20	72
Bus	4	2	6	4	2	6
Taxi	0	0	0	0	0	0
Motorcycle, Scooter or Moped	2	1	3	2	1	3
Bicycle	6	3	9	6	3	9
On Foot	12	6	18	11	5	16
Other	2	1	3	2	1	3
Total	**82**	**43**	**125**	**79**	**33**	**112**

Note: The AM peak is 2 non-car trips higher and the PM is 3 non-car trips higher than in the TA due to rounding errors.

3.7 Rail Network

3.7.1 As can be seen from Table 3.12, train has the highest non-car person trip generation. This equates to 82 and 72 person trips in the AM and PM peak hours respectively. There are 8 rail services that stop at Esher Station in the AM peak hour and therefore the development equates to approximately 10 additional person trips per train. This is not expected to have an adverse impact on the rail services and amounts to approximately 1 passenger per carriage on a 12 carriage train.

3.7.2 If the TRICS mode split rates were applied there would be fewer rail trips in the order of 40 in the AM peak and 15 in the PM Peak hour. This would reduce the number of additional rail trips per train in the morning peak hour to around 5 and in the evening peak hour it would be less than this.

3.7.3 The above assumes that all passengers are travelling to or from London. The number of additional passengers per train would be less if we assumed that a proportion of the passengers were travelling westbound.

3.7.4 Overall the development is expected to have a positive impact on the railway network. This is because it would also be providing measures to improve pedestrian access to Esher Station and contributing towards measures to improve access for the mobility impaired. These measures are described in section 4.

3.8 Walking

3.8.1 The number of additional walking trips is around 15 to 20 in the peak hour. If the TRICS mode share was applied the total number of walking trips would amount to approximately 60 in the peak hours. If trips to the Station were also assumed to be walking trips then the total number of walking trips would be around 150. These would distribute around the footpath network and have a very limited impact on the existing footways and could be considered to improve the situation by creating more activity.

3.8.2 The overall impact of the development proposals on walking is expected to be positive. This is because the development includes a range of measures such as new crossing locations and improved access to Esher Station that will benefit pedestrians. These measures are described in further details in Section 4 of this Statement of Case.

3.9 Cycling

3.9.1 There around 10 additional cycling trips predicted. These are not expected to have a noticeable impact on the cycle network.

3.9.2 Overall the development has the potential to have a positive impact on cycling in the area. This is because it is making a contribution of £4.5 million towards the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for the area. The local authorities could choose to spend this money on cycle and other transport improvements in the immediate area.

3.9.3 We understand that SCC would expect to submit bids for additional measures to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclist in the area when the CIL funding from the Racecourse becomes available.

3.10 Buses

3.10.1 There around 6 additional bus trips predicted by the Census data at peak times. If the TRICs data is used the number of additional bus trips would be around 30 in the AM peak and 20 in the PM peak. This would have a very limited impact on the existing bus services and may make some services more viable.

3.10.2 The overall impact of the development proposals on bus travel are expected to be positive. This is because the development includes a range of measures to improve bus stops that will benefit both the mobility impaired and other

passengers. These measures are described in further detail in Section 4 of this Statement of Case.

3.11 Conclusions and mitigation measures

3.11.1 It is apparent from the above analysis that the proposed development will not have a noticeable impact on the transport network. However, it is recognised that the existing local road network is already congested and that, from a planning policy perspective, the development should seek to encourage sustainable modes of transport. Therefore a range of measures to improve conditions for non-car modes will also be provided as part of the proposed development. These measures have been agreed with Surrey County Council and are outlined in chapter 4 of this report.

3.11.2 When the associated sustainable transport improvements are taken into account it is anticipated that the proposed development would have a positive impact on the local area by encouraging walking and public transport journeys in place of car journeys, improving safety and assisting the mobility impaired. This supports the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (Core Document CD2.1) which focuses on a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

4 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT MEASURES

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 It has been shown from the analysis in the Transport Assessment (Core Document CD5.45) that the proposed development will not have a noticeable impact on the local transport network. However, it is recognised that the existing local road network is already congested at peak times and that, from a planning policy perspective, the development should seek to encourage sustainable modes of transport. Therefore a range of measures to improve conditions for those using public transport and pedestrians have been agreed with SCC and EBC. These measures were set out in the EBC committee report and are shown on Figure 10 and summarised below.

4.2 Sustainable improvement measures agreed with EBC and SCC

4.2.1 The Racecourse has agreed with EBC and SCC that the following improvements, to encourage non-car modes of transport, will be provided as part of the proposed development. SCC's requests are set out in italics.

i) Widening of Lower Green Road

The Widening of the carriageway of Lower Green Road between 58 and 130 Lower Green Road and the provision of full on street parking bays.

4.2.2 This is proposed to allow residents cars to be parked on the carriageway and to prevent vehicles blocking the footway. At present cars currently park partly on the pavement restricting the route for pedestrians. This improvement would make it easier for pedestrians to use the existing footpath including for journeys to and from Esher Station.

ii) Bus stops More Lane, Esher Green and Portsmouth Road

The improvement of bus stops located at More Lane, Esher Green and Portsmouth Road to include Real Time Passenger Information Systems, access for all compatible kerbing, shelters, lighting and power.

4.2.3 This will provide better facilities for existing and future residents using local bus services and is intended to make the services more accessible and attractive to use.

iii) Bus stops at Lower Green Road

The improvement of the bus stops located at Lower Green Road to include access for all compatible kerbing.

4.2.4 This will provide better facilities for existing and future residents using the Lower Green Road bus services and is intended to make the services more attractive and accessible.

iv) Station access from Lower Green Road

Assessment of the need for and subsequent provision of additional lighting and resurfacing along the footway access to Esher Railway Station from the Lower Green Road.

4.2.5 The assessment will identify what measures are required to improve the quality of access to and from Esher Station in this location and make it more attractive for people to access the Station from Lower Green Road.

v) Pedestrian crossing Portsmouth Road

Provision of informal pedestrian crossing points and central refuges on either side of the right hand turn lane of the primary access to the Site from Portsmouth Road with additional right hand turn lane on the access to Site 5.

4.2.6 This will make it easier for both existing and future residents to cross Portsmouth Road in this location and protect right turning vehicles from oncoming traffic. The crossing points will also improve pedestrian permeability across Portsmouth Road at a number of locations.

vi) Station access Station Road

Provision of a crossing point that is accessible for all between Station Road and Esher Railway Station.

4.2.7 This should significantly improve pedestrian access to Esher Station on Station Road in terms of both its safety and convenience. It should also reduce the ambiguity of who is giving way to who with regard to vehicle and pedestrian movements at the station entrance.

vii) Footway improvements More Lane

Footway improvements to the More Lane footway on the Site side that leads to the existing bus stop opposite 19 More Lane, to include informal crossing point.

4.2.8 The footway improvements on the Site side of More Lane will improve access to the Racecourse and the adjacent bus stop.

viii) Pedestrian route Station Road and Portsmouth Road

Assessment of the pedestrian route between Sites 2, 4, and 5 and provision of improvements such as improved pedestrian signage, cleaning the drains at the corner of Station Road and Portsmouth Road, improvements to the footway surface and new bus stops.

4.2.9 This will identify and implement improvements that are required for pedestrians between the residential sites and Esher Station. These measures would also improve the pedestrian route between Esher town centre and Station and encourage visitors to the area to walk through the provision of pedestrian signage.

ix) £300,000 contribution to improve Esher Station access

£300,000 contribution towards improvements to Esher Railway station to improve accessibility and step free access. To be match funded by external funding sources.

4.2.10 This contribution, proposed as part of the development, is being provided to allow accessibility and step free access to be improved at Esher Station. The contribution would release match funding that would not be available without the proposed development and would take the total amount available for improvements at the Station to £3 million This would fund measures such as two new lifts and ramps for disabled access and a covered pedestrian bridge linking the east and westbound platforms, thereby improving the sustainability of the area.

x) Travel Plan auditing fee.

£6,150 Travel Plan auditing fee.

4.2.11 This will allow SCC to audit the Travel Plans that will be implemented as part of the proposed development and suggest new measures to encourage non-car

modes if the travel surveys show that the mode shift to sustainable modes targets have not been met. The Draft Residential Travel Pan is attached as Appendix E and the Draft Hotel and Draft Racecourse Travel Plans are in Appendix F and Appendix C respectively.

xi) Construction management Plan

A Construction Management Plan to minimise the impact of the proposed development during the construction phase.

4.2.12 The Construction Management Plan will minimise the impact of the proposed development during construction. This would include controlling the timing of vehicle arrival and departures and setting out routes which will be used by construction vehicles.

xii) Travel Plans

Travel Plans for the residential sites, hotel and Racecourse.

4.2.13 Travel plans will be prepared for the residential sites, hotel and Racecourse. These will encourage people to travel to and from these uses by non-car modes.

xiii) Management Plans.

Car parking and Event Management Plans.

4.2.14 The Car Parking and Event Management Plans will contain measures to reduce the impact of race days and events at the Racecourse on the local road network and on local residents. Such measures would include the prevention of cars associated with race and event days parking within residential streets.

xiv) Electric vehicle charging points

The provision of electric vehicle charging to promote the use of low emissions cars.

4.2.15 The provision of electric charging points will encourage people to use and own low emission cars.

xv) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) of £4.5 million

4.2.16 At paragraph 9.10.4 of the committee report EBC confirm that a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) of £4,553,176.34 will be charged against the proposed development. The regulations that govern CIL require that it be used to fund the provision of infrastructure to support the development of the charging authority's area. The definition of infrastructure includes:

- roads and other transport infrastructure;
- flood defences;
- schools and other educational facilities;
- medical facilities;
- sporting and recreational facilities; and
- open spaces.

4.2.17 The Community Infrastructure Levy of £4.5 million resulting from the proposed development is a substantial sum and a proportion of it could be used to fund additional sustainable transport improvements such as further improvements to the pedestrian network, additional measures to encourage public transport and additional cycle parking, cycle lanes and routes. This could be used to fund measures currently proposed in Esher to improve conditions for pedestrians. In addition we understand that SCC would expect to submit bids for additional measures to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclist in the area when the CIL funding from the Racecourse becomes available.

4.3 Other sustainable transport improvements resulting from the development

4.3.1 The construction of the proposed Racecourse development will provide a number of further improvements to encourage non-car modes of transport. These are as follows.

xvi) Overlooking and Security

4.3.2 The route between Esher Station, the Racecourse and town centre has a lack of natural surveillance and openness on parts of Station Road and Portsmouth Road. Therefore, the development proposals have been designed to address this matter as follows.

- **Site 4.** The residential development on Site 4 at the southern end of Station Road will provide overlooking of Station Road. This will provide natural surveillance and improve security for pedestrians on a section of footway that has very limited overlooking. This should make pedestrians feel more comfortable and safer when using the route, particularly at night and on dark evenings in the winter. This improvement should encourage more residents to walk to and from the station rather than drive.

- **Site 5.** The residential development on the existing nursery site (Site 5) and removal of the close boarded fencing will provide overlooking on this section of Portsmouth Road. This will provide natural surveillance, improve security for pedestrians and make them feel safer and more comfortable when using this route, particularly at night and on dark evenings in the winter. This improvement should encourage more residents to walk to and from the Station and town centre rather than drive.

- **Racecourse.** It is proposed to remove the existing close boarded fencing where this currently forms the boundary between the Racecourse and Portsmouth Road and replace this with more open fencing. This will provide overlooking from the Racecourse and a much more open and pleasant environment for pedestrians. Again this will improve security for pedestrians and make them feel safer and more comfortable when using this route particularly at night and on dark evenings in the winter. This should encourage more residents to walk to and from the Station and town centre rather than drive.

- **Site 2.** The provision of residential development on Site 2 at the western end of the Racecourse close to the town centre will provide natural surveillance on Portsmouth Road and a more open environment. As in the other locations this will improve security for pedestrians and make them feel safer and more comfortable when using this route, particularly at night and on dark evenings in the winter. This should encourage more residents to walk to and from the Station and town centre rather than drive.

xvii) Provision of a new landscaped entrance

4.3.3 There would be a new landscaped entrance area to the Racecourse on Portsmouth Road. This would provide a more attractive environment and point of interest for pedestrians walking along this route.

xviii) Crossing Portsmouth Road

- **Site 5.** The provision of an informal pedestrian crossing point with a central refuge at the primary access to Site 5 will provide an additional crossing point for pedestrians on Portsmouth Road. This will make it easier for residents who live on the southern side of Portsmouth Road to cross to the northern side to access the Station and the Racecourse.

- **Racecourse main and secondary access.** The provision of informal pedestrian crossing points with a central refuge at the main and secondary access to the Racecourse will provide additional crossing points for pedestrians on Portsmouth Road. This will make it easier for residents who live on the southern side of Portsmouth Road to cross to the northern side to access the Station and the Racecourse.

4.3.4 It is clear from the list of measures above, both those agreed with EBC and SCC, and the improvements that result from construction of the proposed development, that there are extensive measures to encourage non-car modes associated with the development. These measures should not only encourage future residents of the proposed development to make fewer car trips but they will also have the potential to reduce the number of car journeys made by existing residents by making it easier and more attractive to walk and use public transport. This supports the transport policies in NPPF and the policies of the local Councils.

5 CAR PARKING STRATEGY

5.1.1 The Racecourse has vehicle parking areas located near the Grandstand and in the Centre of Course.

5.1.2 Data for the number of cars, coaches and mini-buses parked on the Racecourse has been obtained for 21 race meetings. The busiest day recorded was on Wednesday 1st August 2018. This was for a Flat evening race and the total parking demand was 3,221 cars.

5.1.3 The Racecourse has a total on-site race day equivalent car parking capacity of 3,823 spaces i.e. not including the parking areas for horseboxes. A further 800 car parking spaces are available for large events at Esher C of E High School. This brings the total car parking available to the Racecourse to 4,623 spaces.

5.1.4 The development proposals for Site 2, Site B and Site 5 would result in the loss of 692 car parking spaces. This is based on the loss of 190 spaces for Site 2, 132 spaces for Site B and 220 spaces for Site 5, plus the possible provision of 150 existing spaces for Site B the Hotel. In addition, as a result of the centre of course proposals, a further 113 spaces would be lost. Therefore, the total on-site race day car parking capacity would reduce to 3,018 spaces. Therefore, with the 800 spaces available off-site there would still be more than sufficient car parking to meet the maximum demand.

5.1.5 Also it should be noted that many of the hotel guests could be attending the Racecourse during major events. Therefore, in practice the possible 150 spaces for the hotel may be occupied by people attending the races.

5.1.6 As part of the Racecourse improvements there are proposals to improve the existing on-site car parking. These include establishing a reinforced grass surface or similar in the centre of the course to provide year round parking capacity yet maintain good drainage and a rural appearance. The reinforced grass surface will only be used when large events are taking place. There will also be improvements to the car and coach parking at the front of the course.

5.1.7 In addition to the above a Racecourse Event Management Plan and Racecourse Travel Plan would be prepared and implemented as part of the proposed development.

5.1.8 The Event Management Plan would manage traffic at major events and reduce

the impact on the road network and residential streets when compared with the existing situation. This could include measures to prevent overspill car parking on to the surrounding residential streets, ensure the smooth entry and exit of vehicles to Racecourse site and adjustments to traffic signal junctions on race days. A preliminary version of the Event Management Plan is proposed to be available for the Inquiry.

5.1.9 The Travel Plan would include measures to encourage staff and visitors to the Racecourse to travel by sustainable modes of transport. This should reduce the number arriving by car at the Racecourse when compared with the existing situation. The Draft Racecourse Travel Plan is included in appendix C and a more detailed document is currently being developed which will include additional measures. For instance to encourage car sharing trials have been undertaken in the past where groups of four or more adults travelling in one car receive priority parking and free soft drink for the driver.

6 POLICY CONTEXT

6.1.1 This chapter sets out the national, regional and local policy.

6.2 National

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

6.2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Core Document CD2.1) was published on the 24th July 2018 (and updated in February 2019) and replaces the first National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012. It focuses on a presumption in favour of sustainable development. One of the core planning principles relates to actively managing patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and focusing significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

6.2.2 The NPPF recognises that the transport system should be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes so that people are given a real choice about how they travel. It encourages solutions which support reductions in both greenhouse gas emissions and congestion.

6.2.3 Developments which generate significant movement should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. All developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or a Transport Assessment and required to provide a Travel Plan. Planning decisions should then consider whether opportunities for sustainable travel modes have been taken up, whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people and whether improvements can be undertaken within the transport network, which effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

6.2.4 Developments should be located and designed where practical to:

- Accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies, and access by emergency vehicles;
- Give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities;
- Create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians;

- Consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.

6.2.5 In respect of parking standards, the NPPF states that local planning authorities should take into account the following:

- the accessibility of the development;
- the type, mix and use of development;
- the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
- local car ownership levels;
- the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.

6.2.6 Chapter 9 – Promoting sustainable transport states that "Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:

- the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;
- opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;
- opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;
- the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and
- patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places".

6.3 Regional

Surrey Transport Plan: LTP3 (2012)

6.3.1 The Surrey Transport Plan (Core Document CD1.3) is a statutory document that sets out the strategy to help people to meet their transport and travel needs effectively, reliably, safely and sustainably within Surrey. The Plan is made up of strategies, sections on the overarching vision and objectives, transport problems in Surrey, the indicators and targets, implementation programmes and the statutory assessments.

6.3.2 Strategies within the Transport Plan include Cycling, Local Bus, Rail, Travel Planning and Parking. Each of these form separate documents produced and updated to different timescales. The current Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (Core Document CD3.41) was published in January 2018.

Surrey County Council Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance January 2018

6.3.3 This guidance (Core Document CD3.41) recognises the differing demands across Surrey for travel and car parking and so applies a flexible approach to try and achieve balance at the local level. Table 6.1 sets out the recommended guidance for residential vehicles.

Table 6.1: Surrey recommended guidance for residential parking

Unit type	Edge of Centre	Suburban
1 & 2 bed flats	1 space per unit	1 space per unit
1 & 2 bed houses	1 space per unit	1+ space per unit (note 1)
3 bed houses	1+ space per unit (note 1)	2+ space per unit (note 1)
4 + bed houses	2+ spaces per unit (note 1)	2+ spaces per unit (note 1)

Note 1: Where space permits, it may be appropriate to consider increased provision.

6.3.4 Electric vehicle charging should be provided for houses and apartments at 20% of overall provision with a further 20% passive provision provided. The charge points should be fitted with a fast charge socket.

6.3.5 Table 6.2 sets out the maximum vehicular parking levels for C1 use Hotels.

Table 6.2: Surrey maximum vehicle parking levels for Hotels

C1 Hotels	MAXIMUM per m² GFA
Hotels, boarding and guest houses where no significant care is provided	1.5 car spaces per bedroom plus 1 coach space per 100 bedrooms OR Individual assessment/justification

6.3.6 The minimum cycle parking standards for the development proposals are set out within Table 6.3.

Table 6.3: Surrey minimum cycle parking levels

Use class	MINIMUM Standard
C1 Hotels	Individual assessment
C3 Houses	Flats/houses without garages or gardens: 1 and 2 bedroom unit = 1 space 3 or more bedroom unit = 2 spaces

6.4 Local

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011

6.4.1 The Elmbridge Core Strategy (Core Document CD1.1) is the main document in the Local Development Framework (LDF). It sets out a plan for the future development of the Borough in the period 2011 to 2026. Its role is to provide a delivery strategy to deal with particular challenges and issues that have been identified as being of local importance.

6.4.2 Policy CS9 covers the area of Esher. It states that Esher will continue to fulfil a diverse range of important roles as a centre for residential, employment, leisure, recreational and tourism uses. Additional residential development will be provided across the area, primarily through redevelopment of previously developed land, taking account of relative flood risk. All new development will be expected to enhance local character. Specific attention will need to be given to areas of high heritage value, including West End and Esher Conservation Areas.

6.4.3 Esher has relatively good accessibility and higher density residential / mixed use developments could be appropriate within and around the town centre, provided that they take account of its historic context and support the town centre's vitality and viability, contributing to the diversity of uses available to local people.

6.4.4 The Council will work in partnership with landowners and Surrey County Council to implement appropriate measures that could address traffic congestion through the town centre and reduce the negative impact of lorry movements through

residential areas. The Council will also promote improved access to and within the area for pedestrians and cyclists and public transport users. The Council will continue to work in partnership with Surrey County Council, in order to take a coherent approach to on and off-street parking. The Council will promote the provision of hotel accommodation in order to support the tourist venues at Sandown Park Racecourse and Claremont Landscape Gardens.

6.4.5 Policy CS25 refers to Travel and Accessibility. It states that the Council will promote improvements to sustainable travel and accessibility to services by:

- Directing high trip generating developments to sustainable locations with good public transport accessibility.
- Applying maximum parking standards to all uses.
- Requiring a transport assessment and travel plan for major proposals to promote use of sustainable transport.
- Protecting existing footpaths, cycleways and bridleways; delivering new cycling and walking schemes.
- Improving transport infrastructure.
- Improving the environmental impact of transport.

Elmbridge Borough Council's Development Management Plan 2015

6.4.6 The Development Management Plan (Core Document CD1.2) contains the day-to-day policies against which planning applications and enforcement action will be assessed. These policies will ensure that development contributes to the wider, strategic aims of the Core Strategy, providing further detail where necessary in order to deliver the long-term spatial vision for Elmbridge.

Policy DM7 – Access and Parking

Access:

- The layout and sitting of accesses should be acceptable in terms of amenity, capacity, safety, pollution, noise and visual impact
- Access to and from the highway should be safe and convenient for

pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

- Provisions for loading, unloading and the turning of service vehicles are expected to be designed into the scheme ensuring highway and pedestrian safety.

- The proposal should minimise the impact of vehicles and traffic nuisance, particularly in residential areas and other sensitive areas.

Parking:

- The proposed parking provision should be appropriate to the development and not result in an increase in on-street parking stress that would be detrimental to the amenities of local residents. In such instances, a minimum provision of one space per residential unit will be required.

- Garaging, cycle stores and car parking designs should be integrated into the scheme and respect the character of the area.

- Provision of car, cycle and disabled parking should accord with the Elmbridge Parking Standards at Appendix 1.

6.4.7 The Elmbridge Parking Standards are set out in Appendix 1 of the Development Management Plan (Core Document CD1.2). Table 6.4 shows the Elmbridge car parking standards for residential development.

Table 6.4: Elmbridge parking standards for residential development

Unit type	Town Centre/ Edge of Centre	Suburban*
1 bed residential unit	1 space per unit	1 space per unit
2 bed residential unit	1.5 space per unit	1.5 space per unit
3 bed residential unit	2 space per unit	2 space per unit
4 + bed residential unit	2 space per unit	2 space per unit

6.4.8 As set out in policy DM7 - Access and Parking, in areas of parking stress the Council would expect a minimum of 1 space per residential unit.

*Where space permits, it may be appropriate to consider provision for visitors in suburban areas

For all residential development:

- Allocated or unallocated parking may be acceptable where appropriate.

- Where parking is not allocated it should only be available to residents in the proposed development.

- Garages, open carports and/or car barns will be considered as parking spaces subject to good design. It is acknowledged that in certain locations garages may be used for purposes other than parking.

6.4.9 Electric vehicle charging should be provided for apartments at 20% of overall provision. The charge points would be trickle charging points, i.e. a standardised plug.

6.4.10 The minimum cycle parking standards for the development proposals are the same as those for Surrey as set out in Table 6.3.

6.5 Summary and conclusions with regard to policy

6.5.1 It is clear from the work that has been undertaken by TPP, with the officers at SCC and EBC that the proposed development complies with and indeed supports and promotes the national, regional and local transport policies.

6.5.2 The development:

- Is located in a sustainable location where residents will have access to a range of alternatives to the car;

- Provides a wide range of measures to promote walking, cycling, bus and rail use. These will not only encourage residents of the development to use non-car modes but also make these modes more attractive to existing residents;

- Through the provision of the development, provides natural surveillance for pedestrian routes to and from the Station and improves the pedestrian environment on Portsmouth Road with the removal of the existing close boarded fencing and a new landscaped entrance for Racecourse visitors;

- Provides additional pedestrian crossing points on Portsmouth Road which will benefit both existing and future residents;

- Includes residential, Racecourse and hotel Travel Plans to encourage non-car modes;

- Will provide Car Parking and Event Management Plans with measures to improve existing conditions in the area during race days and when events occur at the Racecourse;
- Provides safe access to all of the development sites and indeed in a number of areas improves on the existing conditions;
- Includes car and cycle parking in accordance with the standards; and
- Allows service vehicles to enter and exit the sites in a forward gear.

7 COMMITTEE MEETING AND REASONS FOR REFUSAL

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 This section of the Statement of Case considers the EBC committee report (Core Document CD7.3) which was prepared by officers and recommended that the development is approved. However despite this recommendation members decided to refuse planning permission at the committee meeting on the 1st of October 2019. The reasons for refusal proposed by members are also reviewed in this chapter and the conclusion is that there is no sound reason for refusal as the development will not have a noticeable impact on the highway and transport network, that all the sites have acceptable access and that the proposed transport measures will encourage travel by non-car modes.

7.2 Committee Report

7.2.1 A Transport Assessment, draft Travel Plans and other supporting information on transport matters was submitted to EBC and SCC before the officers made their decision to recommend that the development be approved by members. There were extensive discussions with SCC and EBC, as part of the process for establishing the traffic and transport impacts of the proposed development. This cumulated in an agreed package of transport measures to encourage travel by non-car modes, these are reviewed in chapter 4 of this report.

7.2.2 As a result of the work that was undertaken and extensive review by the officers at SCC and the EBC they had no objections to the transport aspects of the proposed development. This was reflected in the committee report which recommended approval.

7.2.3 At paragraph 9.8.1.24, the committee report (Core Document CD7.3) sets out the response from the County Highway Authority, SCC.

The County Highway Authority (CHA) reviewed the development proposals and the supporting documentation on safety, capacity and policy grounds and provided their professional opinion on the potential impact of the scheme in the surrounding area of the Site.

The Applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (TA) that provides an assessment of the location in terms of transport links, accessibility to services and opportunities for sustainable travel. The CHA

considers the site to be located within a relatively sustainable location close to Esher town centre. Esher provides a range of services including retail, leisure, employment, education and healthcare within walking and cycling distance of the Site. The Site is relatively well served by public transport with several bus stops close to the existing and proposed accesses and Esher Railway Station within a short distance of much of the developed areas. In this respect, the CHA considers that opportunities for future occupiers and visitors to the Site will not be constrained in their transport choice to private motor vehicle transport but will have the option of utilising one of several alternative modes.

The CHA is aware of residents' concerns regarding the local highway network and the possible impact of a development of this scale on the local roads. Central Esher is a known congestion blackspot and historically has been for a number of reasons, while it is not the responsibility of developers to tackle existing problems, it is recognised that mitigation can offer ancillary benefits to the local population while mitigating the impacts of the development. Therefore, in considering the application, the CHA recognises that there is significant potential for any transport related impacts to be mitigated through the use of alternative modes. In addition, it is noted that the site borders an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and recognizes that supporting sustainable transport options can offer improvements in other areas, particularly in relation to minimising the negative effects of private motor vehicle transport. The provision of good quality cycling, walking, public transport and electric vehicles options will contribute to improved air quality within the locality.

7.2.4 The above paragraph 9.8.1.24 from the Committee Report confirms that SCC has reviewed the accessibility of the proposed development sites and the Transport Assessment submitted with the planning application. It has concluded that the development is in a sustainable location close to Esher town centre with several bus stops nearby and that Esher Railway Station is within walking distance. Therefore future residents of development will have the opportunity to use a range of non-car modes.

7.2.5 The later sections of the SCC response also confirm that access to the individual development sites has been reviewed and notes various points all of which are addressed in the conditions and will be included as part of the detailed design. With regards to traffic impact, the SCC response notes that a sensitivity test was

undertaken with regards to trip rates and the more robust data (that with the highest car use) was used in the Transport Assessment analysis.

7.2.6 At section 7 the committee report summarises the Consultations and Representations. With regards to SCC, the report notes that no objections are raised subject to conditions and a financial contribution to be secured by a legal agreement.

7.3 Consultations and Representations

7.3.1 At paragraph 7.2 the committee report summarises the representations, from residents and other interested parties. The points raised have all been addressed in the work undertaken by SCC and EBC and the reports submitted by the Racecourse. The representations are set out below in italics with the applicants response in normal text.

- Increased traffic volumes and parking implications particularly along Portsmouth Road, More Lane and lower Green Road.

7.3.2 With regards to increases in traffic volumes the Transport Assessment (Core Document CD5.45) shows that these are very small and there will not be a noticeable impact on the highway network. The Councils are satisfied that subject to the proposed measures to improve sustainable transport the increases in traffic would be mitigated.

7.3.3 Car parking for the development is close to or at the maximum standards with the on-site parking provision. Therefore there would be sufficient provision on site for residents cars and no need for residents to leave their cars on the adjacent road network.

- Highway safety issues (e.g. proximity of the school)

7.3.4 As indicated in chapter 4 of this report the development includes many measures that would improve safety on the adjacent road network. With regards to the proximity to the school an additional section of footway is being provided on More Lane providing a continuous footway link between the town centre, Centre of Course pedestrian access and southbound bus stop together with an additional pedestrian crossing point. Improvements are also proposed to the existing bus stop opposite the school on More Lane.

- The impact on public transport, particularly with regards to the rail network. (trains are already full)

7.3.5 The impact on public transport has been reviewed in the Transport Assessment (Core Document CD5.45) and is considered to be negligible. The development will include a range of measures which benefit public transport including access to the station and improvements to existing bus stops. The Councils have reviewed the transport work and raised no objections on transport grounds.

7.3.6 The committee report (Core Document CD7.3) conclusions with regards to transport matters are summarised in paragraph 9.8.1.28 which is reproduced below.

The County Highway Authority accepts that with the transport measures in place, the proposals would comply with Policy CS25, which seeks to promote improvements to sustainable travel and improve transport infrastructure. It is also considered that the proposed development offers appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes; provides safe and suitable access to all sites; and the identified adverse impacts on the transport network could be mitigated to an acceptable level, all of which are in accordance with paragraph 108 of the NPPF. Paragraph 109 states that 'development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.' Paragraph 54 of the NPPF states that 'local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition.' Based on the assessment of the potential transport implications, it is considered that the highway impacts arising from the proposed development can be mitigated by the requirements to be secured through the suggested conditions and the legal agreement under the Section 106.

7.3.7 It is clear that subject to a range of measures to promote sustainable travel both officers at EBC and SCC believe that the development is acceptable from a transport perspective. The Racecourse has agreed to provide these measures to promote sustainable transport as set out in chapter 4 of this report. These measures include a range of improvements' for walking and public transport

which could also encourage existing residents to make more use of non-car modes.

7.4 Reasons for refusal

7.4.1 The Racecourse development proposals were considered at committee on 1st October, 2019. The committee report (Core Document CD7.3) recommended approval, subject to a number of conditions and a satisfactory legal agreement within six months of the committee resolution. However despite this recommendation to approve the development, and the views of SCC that the proposed development was acceptable subject to agreed sustainable transport improvements, committee members decided to refuse planning permission.

7.4.2 There were a total of five reasons for refusal given by members, two of these relate to transport matters and are considered below.

First reason for refusal

7.4.3 The first transport reason for refusal from the committee meeting includes the impact of the development on highway and public transport capacity. This reason for refusal is reproduced by below.

The proposed development represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would result in definitional harm and actual harm to the openness of the Green Belt and it is not considered that the very special circumstances required to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm, including impact on transport (highway and public transport capacity), air quality and insufficient affordable housing provision, have been demonstrated in this case. The proposed development by reason of its prominent location would be detrimental to the character and openness of the Green Belt contrary to the requirements of the NPPF, Policies CS21 and CS25 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, Policies DM5, DM7 and DM17 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.

7.4.4 The impact of the development was considered in the associated Transport Assessment, the contents of which were agreed in extensive discussions with SCC and EBC. The Transport Assessment (Core Document CD5.45) demonstrated that the proposed development would not have a noticeable impact on highway capacity or the transport network. SCC concluded that the

development is in a sustainable location and is acceptable subject to a number of measures to improve access by sustainable modes of transport. These measures are considered in chapter 4 of this document.

7.4.5 The officers at EBC were also involved in discussions on the transport work and concluded in the committee report that the development should be approved and that from a transport perspective the proposed development is acceptable subject to the same improvements for sustainable modes of transport as those required by SCC.

7.4.6 With regards to the policies listed in the reasons for refusal the proposed development together with the related sustainable transport improvements supports these policies by.

- Providing development in a location that is accessible to a range of modes of transport.
- Encouraging sustainable modes of transport.
- Improving conditions for walking, bus and rail passengers in the local area. This will benefit both residents of the proposed development and existing residents, thereby encouraging travel by sustainable modes and reducing car use.
- Improving safety on the road network.
- Providing sufficient levels of car parking in accordance with the standards.
- Allowing for safe access for vehicles and those walking to and from the developments.

Fifth reason for refusal

7.4.7 The fifth reason for refusal and second transport reason from the committee meeting includes the lack of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards accessibility improvements at Esher Station and the Travel Plan monitoring fee. This reason for refusal is reproduced by below.

Due to the lack of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards the accessibility improvements at Esher Railway Station and monitoring fee

associated with the Travel Plans, the proposed development would result in adverse highway and transport implications in the local area of Esher. As such, the proposed development is contrary to the aims of Policy CS25 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, the requirements of the NPPF 2019 and the Developer Contributions SPD 2012.

7.4.8 The heads of terms for the Section 106 measures and contributions including towards Esher Railway Station improvements and the Travel Plan monitoring fee associated with the proposed development are included in the planning evidence. The intention is to agree these before the public inquiry.

7.4.9 Members also raised concerns about the proposed access to the development sites at the committee meeting. However the proposed access junctions meet all of the relevant standards and in some instances improve on the existing situation. The preliminary access designs have been developed through discussions with SCC who have confirmed that these are acceptable and meet the relevant standards. The access junctions will be developed in more detail when planning permission has been granted.

7.4.10 A preliminary safety review of the access junctions indicates that in some instances these improve on the safety of the existing situation. A more detailed review is currently being undertaken.

7.5 Conclusion

7.5.1 It is apparent from the transport work has been undertaken in association with the planning application that the proposed development is acceptable from a highway and transport perspective and that this is a view shared by officers at SCC and EBC. Therefore there is no sound Reason for Refusal as the development will not have a noticeable impact on the highway and transport network, that all the sites have acceptable access and that the proposed transport measures will encourage travel by non-car modes. Therefore there is no sound reason why the appeal should not be allowed and why planning permission should be refused.

8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

8.1.1 TPP have been working with JCR on the transport and travel planning aspects of the proposed development at Sandown Park Racecourse since 2016. Figure 1 shows the location of the Racecourse.

8.1.2 Sandown Park requires significant upgrades and enhancements of the existing Racecourse infrastructure, facilities and venues to secure premier racecourse status and its long term future, as well as to improve the guest experience and community provision. A review of the potential enhancements and rationalisation of the Racecourse has led to the identification of a number of sites for residential development to facilitate the Racecourse enhancements, on a small proportion of Sandown Park, without having a detrimental impact on racing operations or Green Belt.

8.1.3 The development will be located over a number of sites around the Racecourse. This means that the car driver trips will access the road network at a number of different points over a wide area. This has the effect of spreading the traffic around the road network reducing the traffic impact at any particular point.

8.1.4 The proposed Racecourse enhancements and the facilitating residential development, proposed hotel and centre of course developments are to be delivered through a single Masterplan-led hybrid planning application. The details of this masterplan are summarised in Chapter 2 of this document.

8.1.5 This Statement of Case has been prepared to support the appeal against refusal of planning permission for the Racecourse proposals. These have been refused by the planning committee at Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) despite:

- A recommendation to approve the application by officers of EBC, and
- The County Highway Authority (Surrey County Council) having no objections to the proposals subject to the agreed transport measures to encourage the use of sustainable transport.

8.1.6 The committee report (Core Document CD7.3) conclusions with regards to transport matters are summarised in paragraph 9.8.1.28 which is reproduced below.

The County Highway Authority accepts that with the transport measures in

place, the proposals would comply with Policy CS25, which seeks to promote improvements to sustainable travel and improve transport infrastructure. It is also considered that the proposed development offers appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes; provides safe and suitable access to all sites; and the identified adverse impacts on the transport network could be mitigated to an acceptable level, all of which are in accordance with paragraph 108 of the NPPF. Paragraph 109 states that 'development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.' Paragraph 54 of the NPPF states that 'local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition.' Based on the assessment of the potential transport implications, it is considered that the highway impacts arising from the proposed development can be mitigated by the requirements to be secured through the suggested conditions and the legal agreement under the Section 106.

8.1.7 The Racecourse has agreed to provide the mitigation measures requested by SCC as part of the proposed development. These measures in particular when considered as a package bring about significant public benefits as a result of the proposals. They are considered in paragraph 9.8.1.25 of the committee report (Core Document CD7.3) and include.

- Widening of the carriageway of Lower Green Road between 58 and 130 Lower Green Road and the provision of full on street parking bays.
- Improvement of bus stops located at More Lane, Esher Green and Portsmouth Road to include Real Time Passenger Information Systems, access for all compatible kerbing, shelters, lighting and power.
- The improvement of the bus stops located at Lower Green Road to include access for all compatible kerbing.
- Assessment of the need for and subsequent provision of additional lighting and resurfacing along the footway access to Esher Railway Station from the Lower Green Road.

- Provision of informal pedestrian crossing points and central refuges on either side of the right hand turn lane of the primary access to the Site from Portsmouth Road with additional right hand turn lane on the access to Site 5.

- Provision of a crossing point that is accessible for all between Station Road and Esher Railway Station.

- Footway improvements to the More Lane footway on the Site side that leads to the existing bus stop opposite 19 More Lane, to include informal crossing point.

- Assessment of the pedestrian route between Sites 2, 4, and 5 to implement improvements such as improved pedestrian signage, cleaning the drains at the corner of Station Road and Portsmouth Road, improvements to the footway surface and new bus stops.

- A Construction Management Plan to minimise the impact of the proposed development during the construction phase.

- Travel plans, car parking and event management plans.

- A provision of electric vehicle charging to promote the use of low emissions cars.

- £300,000 contribution towards improvements to Esher Railway station to improve accessibility and step free access. To be match funded by external funding sources.

- £6,150 Travel Plan auditing fee.

8.1.8 Further at 9.10.4 of the committee report EBC confirm that a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) of £4,553,176.34 will be charged against the proposed development. The regulations that govern CIL require that it be used to fund the provision of infrastructure to support the development of the charging authority's area. The definition of infrastructure includes roads and other transport infrastructure.

8.1.9 In summary the proposed development will provide an extensive number of measures to encourage non car modes of transport. The Racecourse has agreed

to provide the requested measures and the development will provide further benefits for non-car modes as set out in chapter 7 of this document. The measures will not just benefit residents of the proposed development but will also improve conditions for existing residents and as a package provide significant benefits which should reduce car use by encouraging the use of non-car modes.

8.1.10 It is apparent from the transport work has been undertaken in association with the planning application that the proposed development is acceptable from a highway and transport perspective and that this is a view shared by officers at SCC and EBC. Therefore there is no sound Reason for Refusal as the development will not have a noticeable impact on the highway and transport network, that all the sites have acceptable access and that the proposed transport measures will encourage travel by non-car modes. Therefore there is no sound reason why the appeal should not be allowed and why conditional planning permission should not be granted.