

Summary of S106 obligation “Planning Gains” from the QE Park Development. Status as of August 2008.

01/P/00881 and 01/P/00882: Outline applications for redevelopment to provide 525 dwellings, employment, nursing home, community facilities, retail, health and fitness centre, open space and associated roads (For further details please see supporting statement, as amended 15 August 2001) (additional plans received 06/08/03). [Registered 10/05/2001]

02/P/001632: Local centre comprising: Children's nursery, A1 foodstore, D2 Health & Fitness Centre, mixed use building (to now include the provision for the whole building to be used for the purpose of a doctors surgery within Use Class D1), B1 employment & associated car parking, together with alterations to access arrangements (including the deletion of the Bus only route) from outline planning permission 01/P/0881 dated 30/10/01. (Amended plans received 24/09/2002 08/10/2002, 28/10/2002 and 12/11/02). [Registered 26/07/2002]

Total Planning gain is something over £4million for a development costing approx £54million. This report is a summary of all the planning gain resulting from the QE Park development. SCA takes no responsibility for any inaccuracies (see disclaimer on the SCA web-site). For more detail, please refer to the original S106 agreement dated Oct 2001 and amendment dated Nov 2002.

S106 section	Comment	
<p>16.1 (a) £300,000 towards the provision of environmental improvements predominantly in Stoughton.</p>	<p>Public consultation meeting on 16th December 2002 at Stoughton Youth & Community Centre. GBC finalised plans and allocated budgets – see Executive minutes 15th May 2003. The projects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * £20K Community Centre Fund – for fitting out and matched funding. * £20K Community Action Fund – an initial ‘community pot’ for small scale local projects. Who manages this yet to be defined. * £130K Worplesdon Road – greening, planting, paving and street furniture south of Stoughton Road down to Ardmore Way. <i>Completed.</i> * £80K Worplesdon Road – planting, new surface and street furniture along shopping parade north of Stoughton Road. <i>Completed.</i> * £50K Wooden Bridge footbridge across A3 – works to include lighting and improving the approaches. <i>Completed.</i> 	<p>£300,000 for Stoughton</p>
<p>16.1 (b) £1,650,000 towards the provision of Park & Ride facilities at a location(s) of the council’s choosing</p>	<p>Unknown location. Differing local opinion on whether north Guildford needs a P&R. SCC & GBC policy is that the ONLY method of traffic management is to have parking restrictions, P&R and bus schemes.</p> <p>This money has been allocated to fund the Merrow Park and Ride which has not yet been built, with delays apparently caused for a variety of reasons.</p> <p>Stoughton councillors have asked for this money to be re-allocated back to fund a Park and Ride in North Guildford. The council have said this issue should not hold up any decision for North Guildford.</p>	<p>For Stoughton?</p>

Summary of S106 obligation “Planning Gains” from the QE Park Development. Status as of August 2008.

S106 section	Comment	
<p>17 (i) £25,000 plus costs for Monument. Developers to organise competition</p> <p>(ii) GBC DEPS Arts Dev officer to decide timescales and location.</p>	<p>Competition involved 5 artists and one was been selected by a panel consisting of Linden Homes project director Ivan Ball, GBC arts representative (Ms George Longland), a member of STAG (Mrs M Bell), the first Linden resident, the three ward councillors and another councillor.</p> <p>No local communication or other residents involved, despite requests from STAG! No publicity from the developers.</p>	<p>£25,000 for Stoughton</p>
<p>18.1 one hundred and fifty (150) square metres of community meeting accommodation</p>	<p>S106 and its amendment dated Nov 2002 provide for a shell, not fitted out.</p> <p>STAG won an increase from 150sqm (Dec'01) to 390sqm (Nov'02) although a larger figure was originally promised.</p> <p>Was originally going to be part of the mixed-use building, but was never definite, but the mixed-use building was since re-allocated to the doctors –see next.</p> <p>First that many QEP residents heard of this was DEPS letter telling them a planning application had been made (04/P/00990) and local residents discussing it with each other. At least 50 letters of objection were lodged by QEP residents. Most, if not all objections said they did not want the building on the Village Green. Some are concerned about noise and other nuisance. Most are upset that the developers have imposed a requirement for QEP residents to pay for the buildings maintenance.</p> <p>The developers withdrew application 04/P/00990 on 28/01/05 and submitted a new one back in the mixed used building – see next.</p>	<p>390sqm for Stoughton</p>
<p>a medical and/or dental surgery</p>	<p>Mixed use building 627sqm. Not built but in the outline plan and 02/P/01632 commercial application.</p> <p>S106 amendment Nov'02 (for 02/P/01632) says developers can do what they want after 3 years if no doctor or similar can be found. Who is responsible for finding an occupant? STAG worried the developers did not bother pursuing this.</p> <p>The local Primary Care Trust (PCT) would not allow new doctors to setup and insist existing doctors would have to move, or split their practice. Allegedly, the Deer Barn Rd doctors declined because the asking price was too high.</p> <p>Developers then submitted plans to use the plot to put the community centre, a management office and six flats (05/P/00192). This was withdrawn in place of new plans for a community centre and offices (05/P/02467) which were approved in April 2006, but the developers chose not to proceed, and decided to revert to the original building approved with 02/P/01632. It is therefore the original plans approved in November 2002 that are being built.</p>	<p>Alternative not provided.</p>

Summary of S106 obligation “Planning Gains” from the QE Park Development. Status as of August 2008.

S106 section	Comment	
A Health & Fitness Centre	<p>Bigger than originally expected. Supposed to have been built in a dip but not. Opening hours, lighting and signage a concern. Not for general public use, typical sports club membership required, no special deals for local residents.</p> <p>Includes a small licensed bar with snacks.</p>	For Stoughton.
A crèche	This is actually an Academy private nursery. STAG are concerned about opening hours, parking and traffic congestion.	For Stoughton.
A nursing home	Built and open. STAG originally requested the home to have a central location within the site, but it was located at NE extremity.	For Stoughton.
Retail units	<p>Budgens Food Store. Opened Feb 2005.</p> <p>Originally promised as a restaurant (A3) as well as shops (A1). The commercial developers claimed a restaurant is not viable despite promises made by developers during the 2001 consultation period. If a restaurant is viable then it would now have to be in the mixed-use building.</p> <p>The Nov 2002 S106 amendment said the developers could do what they wanted with mixed-use building if it could not be used as a surgery, hence their current plans to use it for offices, apartments and/or community centre.</p>	For Stoughton, although no restaurant as originally expected.
A serviced recycling site	<p>Two bins to be situated next to TA in Village Square. Is this enough? Do Railton Road residents know? Will they be upset by late night noise?</p> <p>There is some talk about re-cycling bins being provided by Budgens.</p> <p>Not yet installed.</p>	Not provided, yet. Will they ever?
21.1 (1) New junction. Salt Box Road / Grange Road.	<p>Completed January 2004. Delayed because of subsidence problems. Regular subsidence occurs. SCC will continue to do temporary fixes until QEP complete.</p> <p>STAG did ask for roundabout but junction appears better than expected. Speed limits not implemented as requested. STAG and other residents asked for a 40mph limit along full length of Salt Box Road, but instead the 40mph limit stops at a point where people cross the road to/from Whitmoor Common.</p>	For Stoughton.
21.1 (2) New junction. Worplesdon Road / Johnston Walk.	Completed. Went through 5 designs none of which locals were happy with but is better than what was previously there. Left locals with the feeling SCC Highways does not listen. Although junction passed all the safety tests, some locals are waiting for an accident to happen because cars coming out of Johnston Walk cannot see past bus parked in bus-stop. See also 21.1(9).	For Stoughton.

Summary of S106 obligation “Planning Gains” from the QE Park Development. Status as of August 2008.

S106 section		Comment	
21.1 (3)	Signals Worplesdon Road / Stoughton Road.	No junction re-design but general improvements to pedestrian facilities and lighting. MOVA and SVD completed. Advanced cycle stop no longer planned.	For Stoughton.
21.1 (4)	Improved junction. Grange Road / Stoughton Road.	No junction re-design no longer planned. Advanced cycle stop no longer planned. MOVA and SVD in planning. Highways keep postponing this – see also 21.1(8).	For Stoughton.
21.1 (5)	Pedestrian/cycle crossing on Worplesdon Road, south of Johnston Walk.	Completed. Pelican crossing greatly appreciated by users. The planned siting of a safety barrier at the end of Snail Lane could not be completed because the <u>previous</u> owner of the house adjacent to the lane had planning permission to put in a driveway there.	For Stoughton.
21.1 (6)	Pedestrian/cycle crossing on Worplesdon Road, between Byrefield Rd and Sheepfold Rd.	Completed. Original plan was another Pelican crossing opposite the garage but local shops objected to the reduction of parking this would cause. Instead a mid-road crossing point has been installed opposite the working men’s club, Somertons Close (April 2004).	For Stoughton.
21.1 (7)	Grange Road footway along entire length of development. And formal parking.	Completed. Also, STAG campaigned and won a concession for Grange Road to be wider along this stretch.	For Stoughton.
21.1 (8)	Grange Road traffic management scheme: controlled parking, 20mph, safe crossing.	This is the south end of Grange Road south of the school entrances. SCC Highways have postponed planning this to avoid making it easier for construction vehicles to use the road. To be decided. See also 21.1(4).	For Stoughton.
21.1 (9)	£134,508 index linked for:	These are electronic traffic management controls for traffic lights to either allow buses to pass (MOVA) or ensure reduced traffic waiting (SVD).	
(a)	MOVA & SVD @ Worplesdon Road / Stoughton Road	MOVA and SVD completed.	For Stoughton.
(b)	MOVA & SVD @ Stoughton Road /Grange Road	MOVA and SVD in planning – see 21.1(4)	For Stoughton.
(c)	MOVA & SVD @ Stoughton Road Railway bridge.	MOVA and SVD completed along with new walkway bridge.	For Stoughton.

Summary of S106 obligation “Planning Gains” from the QE Park Development. Status as of August 2008.

S106 section	Comment	
(d) SVD @ A322/A323 junction	SVD completed. (Worplesdon Rd/Aldershot Rd)	For Stoughton.
(e) SVD @ A320/Moorfield Rd.	SVD completed. Slyfield	Not in Stoughton, but may benefit.
21.1 (10) £253,700 index linked for:		
(a) Bus lane A320 Woking Rd mainly south of A3.	Completed, but because of the changes to routes 26 & 37 these buses no longer use this bus lane so this is not a direct benefit to Stoughton Residents.	Not directly for Stoughton.
(b) Bus lane A322 from Wooden Bridge along Woodbridge Road to A246 York Road.	Implemented. Highways have further plans for bus lanes all the way back to Dennis roundabout.	Not directly for Stoughton.
21.1 (11) £53,454 index linked for bridge north of existing bridge over railway.	Walkway bridge completed in July 2005. See planning application 05/P/00400. Delays were caused by consultations with RailTrak who kept raising their price.	For Stoughton.
21.1 (12) £27,376 index linked towards Stoughton Road Traffic Calming Phase 2.	Completed. This is Belfield’s end of Stoughton Road. Not in Stoughton!	Not directly for Stoughton.

Summary of S106 obligation “Planning Gains” from the QE Park Development. Status as of August 2008.

S106 section	Comment	
<p>21.1 (13) £700,000 index linked_for enhancements to 26 and 27 OR provision of a shuttle bus service at 20 minute frequency for a period of at least 5 years or less if it becomes commercially viable within that time.</p>	<p>No shuttle or zip as originally ‘promised’ in 2001 public consultation meetings with developers. Instead there is an extra bus, so now three an hour. It is expected that this funding will subsidise the services for approx. 3 years during which time they should become sustainable.</p> <p>Route changes 26 & 27 mean buses no longer go to Bishop Reindorp (now called Christ’s College), Guildford (Stoke) College and Spectrum leisure centre. No consultation by Arriva although they did discuss the change with SCC Passenger Transport Group (Mr Laurie James, John Gaff).</p> <p>Railton Road and Henderson Avenue residents were upset about not being told about the bus route going along their roads and successfully persuaded the developers and councils for the bus service to continue along Grange Road without entering QE Park estate.</p> <p>The original masterplan had a bus-gate between Railton Road and Tylehost, which was abandoned on the insistence of Terrace Hill developers. A compromise traffic scheme was designed to prevent Tylehost becoming a rat-run.</p> <p>Part of the compromise is planting and bollards to force traffic round the commercial loop, and a planned no-right turn to force vehicles up to Henderson Ave instead of the quick way out along Railton Road.</p> <p>SCC Highways has implemented the bollards May 2004 to minimise construction traffic using Tylehost. The no-right turn is supposed to be implemented when site construction is complete to minimise construction traffic using Henderson Ave.</p> <p>There was provision in the November 2002 S106 amendment for £100K to replace the bollards with a bus gate, but only if a bus service wanted it within the next 5 years, time which is now up.</p>	<p>For Stoughton.</p>
<p>21.1 (14) £200 travel vouchers for each new household.</p>	<p>See developer’s literature for new owners. Two options are: named season ticket from Arriva bus station or daily un-named tickets available from developers (actually CBP).</p> <p>Plus extra £30 voucher for residents towards bike purchase or service from a specific bike shop. An ongoing 10% discount is available to residents who have redeemed their £30 vouchers and employees working on site.</p> <p>Bike scheme is not in S106 but appears to be a private initiative by Guildford Cycles (aka Walton), 89 Woodbridge Road.</p> <p>There was a delay until June 2004 for Housing Association residents received their vouchers apparently because the original GBC person responsible left.</p>	<p>For QEP.</p>

Summary of S106 obligation “Planning Gains” from the QE Park Development. Status as of August 2008.

S106 section	Comment	
21.1 (15) Pig Alley	<p>Completed. Developers spent approx. £70K on the improvements but refused to provide “the hanging gardens on Babylon”!</p> <p>STAG were concerned about difficulties of prams getting past ‘bike’ restrictions. Appears to be OK.</p> <p>There is concern over safety of fencing and electric cabling. Also dog mess on turf in Little Street. Fencing will come down when Linden Phase 7 is complete and the woodland pathway(s) put in – see plans.</p>	For Stoughton.
21.1 (16) “Safe Route” to Northmead School.	<p>Original thoughts were to have drop off points and/or paths along railway from playing field. Northmead were concerned about children’s safety. No plans currently being considered, but SCC open to ideas. There’s no money left in the SCC pot, so if we want the developers to pay for this we better be quick with new ideas.</p>	Not done.
21.1 (17) Pedestrian / cycle links from Fairborne Way.	<p>Started (see Pig Alley). Waiting for completion of Linden Phase 7.</p>	For Stoughton.
21.1 (18) Landscaping & environmental upgrading in Johnston Walk.	<p>Complete. A long story of poor contractor workmanship and unwanted speed-bumps.</p>	For Stoughton.
21.1 (19) Junction solution at Johnston Walk / Tylehost.	<p>Complete. See also 21.1(2).</p>	For Stoughton.
20 (d) £200,000 to SCC as 5 equal annual instalments, towards “improvement of education facilities, primarily to enhance and develop the building scheme at Stoughton Infants’ School.”	<p>Money was given to SCC LEA. The majority has gone towards the previously budgeted rebuilding of Stoughton Infants, so nothing new although the improvements would not have been nearly so good. E.g. the new boiler cost more than budgeted.</p> <p>£50,000 to Bishop Reindorp/Christ’s College in Bellfield’s.</p>	Part Stoughton, part Christ’s College.
16.1 © 16.3	<p>£30,000 towards Sports Provision in Surrey.</p> <p>payment to GBC within 28 days of work being done.</p> <p>S106 section 4.9 says this will be “sport development in the Stoughton Area, specifically the sports pavilion in the Stoughton recreation ground.”</p> <p>Have heard rumours that this money may be split up for various sporting purposes. GCBFC still assume that it is coming their way.</p>	For Stoughton.

Summary of S106 obligation “Planning Gains” from the QE Park Development. Status as of August 2008.

S106 section	Comment	
<p>20 (a) Guildford Barracks Travel Plan Report Volume 3 dated 16th May 2001.</p>	<p>According to Colin Buchanan & Partners “A Travel Plan is a set of incentives to encourage people to make short daily journeys by means other than by car. This can be achieved by improving the alternatives, publicising the benefits and, where these incentives fail, by making car travel less attractive (e.g. increased parking charges). The latter of these approaches is usually only adopted as a last resort.”</p> <p>The QE Park Travel Plan document identifies long list of possibilities, some of which are included elsewhere in S106:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Better cycle and pedestrian links (<i>included in masterplan but otherwise not contractual</i>). * School Travel Plans: Since 1985/86 the proportion of children travelling to school by car has increased from 16% to 29%. (?) * Surrey CC Safe Route to school launched in 1998, will reach every school by 2011. (?) * Appointment of a Sustainable Travel Manager (<i>see web site</i>). * Travel Options Leaflet (<i>done but not followed up</i>). * Car Sharing Scheme (<i>see below</i>) * Secure and sheltered cycle parking (<i>not sure where these are, included on <u>some</u> phase plans</i>) * Teleworking – IT friendly homes (<i>few houses if any are wired up as promised</i>). * Marketing / Branding / Monitoring (<i>see Travel Plan web site</i>). * 15-minute frequency shuttle bus between Stoughton and town centre (to include Sunday services) – report contradicts itself saying 10-min frequency is required. (<i>not delivered, extra bus for 26/27 provided instead – see above</i>) 	<p>For Stoughton.</p>
<p>20 (b) £2,000 to SCC towards monitoring the plan.</p>	<p>SCC Highways are supposedly monitoring.</p> <p>CBP have only issued one newsletter, back in 2002 when the first residents were moving in, and set up a web-site.</p> <p>Few people are aware of the Travel Plan, or of the QE234 car sharing scheme. This is supposedly unique because it provides for employees sharing lifts to site <u>and</u> off-site. Off-site sharing is only available to residents of QEP. On-site sharing is only available to people working on-site. All commercial users will be required to sign up to the scheme.</p>	<p>For Stoughton.</p>

Summary of S106 obligation “Planning Gains” from the QE Park Development. Status as of August 2008.

S106 section	Comment	
<p>Play areas - not part of the S106 but part of the outline plan and masterplan.</p>	<p>During public meetings, residents were told there would be “seven equipped play areas for toddlers and one larger equipped play space for teenagers will be provided, along with an all weather playing surface capable of housing either two tennis courts, a hockey pitch, a five-a-side pitch, basket ball and net ball courts or a general open space for mixed play and socialising.” These are shown on the 2002 masterplan included in the approved outline plan.</p> <p>Seven play areas - technically known as Local Area of Play (LAP) – completed not to NPFA standard with rudimentary play equipment.</p> <p>One playground - technically known as Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP). The developers said this would have 6 items of play equipment and would be the NPFA standard 400sqm size shown on the masterplan as a pink semi-circle on the Village Green. This has not been built because of its relationship with the ‘all weather sports area’ and the ‘community centre’.</p> <p>‘All weather sports area’ is the term originally used by the developers, and is referred to as ‘all weather sports pitch’ in the council conditions (#30). The developers subsequently referred to this as ‘kickabout’ and ‘hardcourt’ sometimes with the word ‘teenager’ added. It is shown on the masterplan as the pink area on the village green, and is the official NPFA size for two tennis courts 42mx34m (1428sqm). QE Park residents do not want this for a number of reasons and are worried they will have to pay to maintain it.</p> <p>The relationship with the ‘community centre’ arose because of the developers’ original proposal to build the larger 390sqm building on the village green alongside a ‘kickabout’. There was insufficient space because the developers had already built Phase 1 on part of the village green.</p>	<p>For Stoughton.</p>