

Tandridge District Council – Observations on GAL Issues Tracker

General observation on Issues Tracker:

1. The 4 spreadsheets comprising the Issues Tracker need to be amalgamated and have a set format that is consistent and easy to read/navigate.
2. The issues in the tracker need to be marked relevant to the submissions made by each authority. Whilst some of our representations seem to be covered by points made by other authorities, we need to know that the representation that we made has been noted as relevant to us in order to carry this through to the SoCG.
3. The tracker needs to be much more comprehensive rather than signpost to the ES documents. It needs to set out key dates of meetings and outcomes of those meetings to chart how/if the issue has been progressed and/or resolved. This will also help define the content of the PADSS.
4. There should be a separate meeting and consensus on the final tracker form and scope of content.

Specific observations on representations made to 2021 and 2022 consultation:

Transport:

1. Tracker does not seem to have picked up or addressed Tandridge's point on whether upgrades to East Croydon and Windmill Junction would support any train service viability for passenger increase.
2. Tracker does not appear to have picked up or addressed that Tandridge raised issues on capacity at Junction 6 of the M25, as well as J7 and J8.
3. Tracker does not appear to have picked up or addressed Tandridge comments on concerns about the impacts of increased traffic on the Felbridge junction of the A22.
4. Tracker does not appear to have picked up or addressed issues raised on off-airport parking and how these increase pressure on the LRN, which do not seem to have been listed.

Climate change:

5. Tracker does not appear to have included a climate change section to reflect comments made, amongst others, on climate change impacts from traffic and transport regarding levels of parking.
6. Tracker does not appear to have picked up or addressed comments made on there being no draft of the Climate Change and Emissions Plan, as also noted by other authorities.

Landscape:

7. Tracker does not appear to have picked up or addressed that we commented on the Surrey Hills AONB undertaking a review of its boundary at that time. The relevant chapter also made no reference to Tandridge.

Water/Flooding

8. Tracker does not appear to have picked up or addressed our comments on the Burstow Stream and potential for flooding.

Development:

9. Tracker does not appear to have picked up or addressed our comments made on phasing of development.