

Ms G. Hillage,
Planning Dept,
Surrey Heath Borough Council,
Knoll Road,
Camberley,
Surrey GU15 3HD

Kevin Daley
125, Mytchett Road
Mytchett,
Camberley,
Surrey GU16 6ES

15th November 2011

Dear Ms Hillage,

RE: MFGDS Response to the PRB Deepcut EIA Scoping Report

I am responding on behalf of the Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut Society to the Scoping Report.

2: The Proposed Development.

2.2: Surrounding Land Uses.

Given the importance that has been given to the Basingstoke Canal in the Deepcut SPD, we are surprised to find that there is no mention of it in this section nor do we feel that throughout this document is enough weight given to its importance as a benefit to the local area.

The transformation of the Blackdown Road playing field into allotments is unlikely to be met with enthusiasm from local residents and the 0.08 hectares set aside for retained children's play area seems completely inadequate considering the population it might be expected to serve

2.3.6: Site layout alternatives.

The suitability of several areas designated as SANG's, was questioned by CPRE at the EiP of the SHBC Core Strategy earlier this year, it would be useful to see evidence that the designated SANG's areas do in fact comply with the statutory requirements.

2.4.6: Substructure.

This section of the scoping report seems oblivious to the fact that for such a development, extensive improvements would be need to be made to the existing road network in order to provide adequate access to the site from the surrounding areas.

2.4.12: Construction traffic.

When the existing access roads to the proposed site are taken into consideration the statement that "Construction traffic would be routed to avoid roads where sensitive receptors, such as houses and schools are located" offers little solace to local residents.

A separate section examining the long term impact of such a development on the local community should be considered. Such an examination should look at the impact on the surrounding road network, Deepcut Bridge Road, The Maultway, Lake Road, Wharf Road, Mytchett Road, Sturt Road and Guildford Road. These would seem to be the roads most likely to be affected by construction traffic entering or leaving the development.

3: Scope of the Assessment.

3.1: Traffic and Transport.

The whole of this section seems to be predicated on traffic flows over a twelve-hour period when The greatest impact suffered by local residents is usually centred around what is generally seen to

be “Peak Hours (0800-0900, and 1700-1800)” I also find the data provided in Appendix B to be questionable when assessing the impact of such traffic increases at the most sensitive times.

The “*TRANSPORT EVALUATION FOR SURREY HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL'S CORE STRATEGY*” shows that if the PRB development goes ahead the calculated increase in traffic above the baseline at “AM Peak Hours” would be a 29.69% for traffic departing zone 365 (Mytchett/Deepcut) and 20.88% for traffic arriving into zone 365. These figures do not take notice of trips which originate and also terminate within zone 365.

This scoping report also seems to dismiss the impact that increased traffic flows are likely to have on the access routes of Lake Road/Wharf Road and Mytchett Road/Sturt Road.

Also to claim at para. 3.1.17 that, “*as construction flows are likely to be lower than operational traffic flows and will be routed to avoid sensitive routes the effects from construction flows on these routes is unlikely to be significant and therefore will also not be assessed any further*” seems to fly in the face of reason when related to paras. 2.4.3 thru 2.4.12.

3.2: Air Quality.

The Air Quality Impacts due to dust from construction work and increased pollutants caused by operational and construction traffic should be considered by the Scoping Report even where it is felt that the relevant AQO's are unlikely to be exceeded.

3.4: Community and Socio-Economics.

3.4.8: Health.

Mention is made of the GP Surgeries in Frimley Green and Frimley, what discussions if any have been had with the partners to establish what they feel is needed to further the proposed development.

3.4.14: Factors influencing Baseline.

It comes as a surprise that DIO feel that the influx of such a number of elderly and potentially frail residents as the result of the proposed care home on the site of the former MOD fire station is unlikely to place any constraints on local services. There must surely be an increase in demands for medical services.

3.4.16: Potential Effects not requiring further assessment.

The fact that it is felt that the “*increased demand for local services/facilities (education, Healthcare, community facilities play spaces and open spaces) by the residents of the new Development*” can safely be ignored in this scoping report and can be dealt with via deals between the developers and SHBC and/or SCC without any apparent reference to the local community is in my view unacceptable.

Provision of Secondary Education and increased medical services will I would suggest of great importance to both new and existing local residents.

For the DIO to conclude that “*Therefore the existing local community is unlikely to experience a significant effect in terms of the services to which they have access*” frankly beggars belief.

3.5: Landscape and Visual.

3.5.18: Potential Effects not requiring further assessment.

How can this paragraph have any validity when the ZVTI has not been established,

3.7: Biodiversity.

3.7.10: Potential Effects requiring further assessment.

It is our view that the effects on the Basingstoke Canal need to be specifically addressed in this scoping report. It should be noted that it is a designated SSSI and is recognised as containing the largest variety of aquatic plants, dragonflies and damselflies in the U.K. It also supports a wide range of other wildlife.

3.8: Water Environment.

3.8.9: Water use and infrastructure.

Specific consideration should be given, in our view, to the possible use of the Basingstoke Canal as a receptor for surface water from the new development site. This matter has been discussed in the past – including the provision of a new water reservoir to accept surface water – but the Scoping Report makes no mention of these possibilities.

3.9: Land Quality.

3.9.3: Baseline considerations.

This section claims that “Widespread Contamination at the proposed development is unlikely” it then goes on to list numerous point sources of contamination both historical and current.

These sources include spilt fuel/oil, chemicals, herbicides, PCBs and even potential radiological contamination. There is even the risk of discarded or lost ordnance on the former firing ranges and ammunition dumps for which no clearance certificate is available.

In view of the above We feel that a full scale contamination survey should be carried out and the results (In plain english) made available to existing residents and prospective purchasers.

I hope these points will be fully considered as part of the consultation on the Deepcut EIA Scoping Report and perhaps you would be kind enough to briefly acknowledge receipt of this letter by email at info@mfgdsociety.org.uk

Yours sincerely,

Kevin Daley (chair, MFGD Society)

Tel: 01252 513042

Email: info@mfgdsociety.org.uk