

The Civic Society for Reigate, Redhill and Merstham

President: Nicholas Owen

Chairman: Alan Mortlock, 3 Gatton Close, Reigate, RH2 OHG Tel: 01737 244407 Hon. Secretary: Michael Hellings, 53 West Street, Reigate, RH2 9BZ Tel: 01737 245342 Hon. Treasurer: Charles Wragg, 3 Weald Way, Reigate, RH2 7RG Tel: 01737 210640

Dear Sirs

15.

02.2012

REPORT No. 28 b

Reigate Society (RS) Transport / Logistics Committee.

REIGATE & BANSTEAD draft Core strategy - consultation.

EU leaders state that;- Structural reform is necessary to improve Nations' competitiveness.

UK leaders state that;- Low cost export led growth is now needed.

Preamble;- Whether we like it or not Reigate and Redhill are situated at the junction of North /South and East /West major and growing trade routes. Colonel Young of the Canadian Army found our Highway routes unacceptable and constructed the Redhill and Reigate Bypass together with Young Street. We still have Young Street, Leatherhead but the Eastern section of our 20 foot wide concrete and asphalt Bypass has been abandoned for various reasons.

Gatwick, the new towns of Crawley and other expanded towns to the South combined with the growth of the London Boroughs has resulted in the daily commute through the area.

We are now faced with the need to plan for a population expansion of nearly 30,000 persons by 2027 and presumably more thereafter. In addition there is a need to consider the transport needs of the planned population growth within our LEP area of Croydon, Surrey and West Sussex. Located at this cross roads there is also a need to consider and plan for the transport demands of our adjacent LEP's within Kent and Hampshire.

The issue of Ring Roads and park and ride need to be resolved by the Ministry for Transport (see the ORBIT Report), the Highway Authority and the BOROUGH to European competitiveness standards before low cost options are lost to development. .

CORE Structure Questions and RS response

Q 1 Priorities;- It has been argued in the past that the A23 through Redhill should become a living street. This may be necessary with the population density proposed. But the problem of traffic and alternative routes needs to be resolved , all as discussed at length in the Reports previously submitted by the RS.

Q 2 It is suggested that development priority be given to brown field sites.

Q 5 RS Questions;- Will all the void offices, business facilities, new work places and low cost homes produce a people generated traffic problem within the Borough?

Will the new European longer Bus / coach, haulage vehicle and recycling transport be accommodated satisfactorily on our urban streets without damage, pollution or congestion?

Will provision be made for improved off street parking?(see RS Report No. 11)

Q 6 Are the proposed areas for development in the right place for the national objective of **Low cost export led growth**? For example what sustainable energy sources are proposed within the Borough or LEP area? Please see RS Reports Nos 5, 6, 7, 24 and 25 previously submitted.

THE GREEN BELT and reasons for its preservation

Proposed Change 2 The proposed need for change to the **Green Belt is opposed** ;-

2.1 To prevent inordinate urban growth of London and other towns

2.2 To check the growing together of towns

2.3 To provide a recreational area for Greater London and other Urban residents

2.4 To provide London residents with an area for the provision of fresh vegetables assuming that the long distance Air Freighting of perishable foods will prove to be unsustainable.

2.5 Attention is drawn to the attached drawing of Protected Land and the amount of White land available close to a **port for the export growth objective.**

Proposed Change 3 With reference to page 24 It is suggested that an item be added;-

“Review the transport Infrastructure long term needs and various funding methods that are available here and used within Europe -see RS Reports No 1.1 , 27,32 -”.

Proposed Change 5 R & B and the Gatwick Diamond (RS Report 27)

It is noted that many of our local Industries have been taken over and or closed during past decades and work sites redeveloped for housing making it necessary for the new residents to travel to a work place. It is also noted the provision is to be made for warehousing even though the potential employment levels are low.

Proposed Change 7 Ref the A217 at Banstead Crossroads;-

It is suggested that the improvement and increased capacity of the crossroads by the Surrey County Council as Highway Authority may prove to be unnecessary if the **M** for **T** can arrange for the long term completion of the cancelled section of the M 23 Motorway into the South London Boroughs. This measure combined with an access to the Motorway south of Redhill may ease the commuting traffic flow through the area.

Proposed Change 10 **It is suggested that the following paragraph be added;-**

“That the SE of England needs an overall structural review of Sustainable

energy and water resources needed for the proposed Population growth within the LEP areas, and that the review take into account wind and tide energy, Ports and Transport Systems needed to secure the UK Governments long term objectives of low cost export growth.

THE RISK ;- Low cost housing & residents without employment: an inadequate social, parking and transport infrastructure for residents wishing to travel to work and the export of goods.

Yours Faithfully,

J.M.Chittenden
Chairman of the Reigate Society Transport Committee

T H E R E I G A T E S O C I E T Y