

Ashford Common			
Cllr Marian Bushnell	SIP		
Cllr Nick Gething	Con	Planning	
Cllr Frank Ayers	SIP	Party leader	My understanding was that originally The Jockey Club were looking only to develop the existing old buildings within Kempton Park. They have now moved the goalpost and that being the case I would not be in favour of any proposals that would be in breach of Green Belt policies. Therefore any such proposal would not receive my support. Albeit I am not on the Planning Committee I would certainly make my views on this matter known.
Ashford East			
Cllr Asif Ayub	Con		
Cllr Chris Frazer	Con	Planning Deputy Chair	As you know, I'm on the Planning Committee so cannot comment on any applications which may or may not come up, but as a Council we have a very clear policy on and commitment to the Green Belt; I understand that the Leader of the Council is replying to you in more detail, and I am sure that this will reassure you about the Council's position.
Cllr Tony Mitchell	Con	Cabinet - Environment	
Ashford North & Stanwell South			
Cllr Sam Budd	SIP	Planning	
Cllr Matian Rough	Con		
Cllr Joanne Sexton	Con		
Ashford Town			
Cllr Gerald Forsbrey	SIP	Planning	I am sorry, I as a member of the planning committee cannot give an opinion on this as it may well stop me from debating or voting this if it ever came before the planning committee. I do not think that's in the best interest of Kempton Park or yourselves.
Cllr Denise Grant	SIP		
Cllr Caroline Spencer	Ind	Planning	
Halliford & Sunbury West			
Cllr Sandra Dunn	LD	Planning	See B below
Cllr Tim Evans	Con		

Cllr Daxa Patel	Con		
Laleham & Shepperton Green			
Cllr Richard Dunn	LD		See B below
Cllr Mary Madams	Con		
Cllr Richard Smith-Ainsley	Con	Planning Chair	
Riverside & Laleham			
Cllr Philippa Broom	Con		
Cllr Tony Harman	Con	Planning	
Cllr Denise Saliagopoulos	Con	Planning	
Shepperton Town			
Cllr Vivienne Leighton	Con	Planning, Cabinet - Planning	
Cllr Robin Sider	Con	Planning	As a member of the planning committee, and under the planning code of conduct I am not permitted to offer an opinion on any issue which may eventually come before the planning committee in the form of a planning application. Hence I am unable to answer the question that you pose regarding the subject heading.
Cllr Robert Watts	Con	Council Leader	See A below
Staines			
Cllr Christine Bannister	SIP		
Cllr Mark Francis	Con	Planning	
Cllr Alan Patterson	SIP		Green belt land should be protected. It is the lungs of any location in which it is located. Spelthorne has a known air quality issue and green belt land helps towards this becoming more prevalent.
Staines South			
Cllr Colin Davis	Con		
Cllr Penny Forbes-Forsyth	Con		
Cllr Jean Pinkerton OBE	Con		
Stanwell North			
Cllr Judy Dale	Con		
Cllr Dipak Gohil	Con		
Cllr Spencer Taylor	Con	Planning	
Sunbury Common			
Cllr Ian Beardsmore	LD	Party Leader, Planning	See B below
Cllr Bernie Spoor	LD		See B below
Cllr Colin Strong	Ind		I support retaining the Green Belt

			status of all Green Belt sites within Spelthorne including Kempton Park. I wish to see Kempton Park maintained for leisure activity and a "green lung" between Sunbury and Greater London.
Sunbury East			
Cllr Alfred Friday	Con	Planning	
Cllr Ian Harvey	Con		For the record I am personally NOT in favour of developing Kempton in any shape or form, but as you know the decision is not in my (or even ultimately SBC's) mandate.
Cllr Suzy Webb	Con		

A. The position is very simple. The site is designated as Green Belt and has been since 1956. That designation is formally shown on the Council's 'Proposals Map - Development Plan Document' and there is a copy on the Council's web site.

Council policy on the Green Belt is set out in a document called 'Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001 – Saved Policies and Proposals' – updated December 2009 and Policy GB1 states specifically:

“ The Green Belt on the Proposals Map will be permanent and within it development will not be permitted which would conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt and maintaining its openness”. The policy goes on to identify such development that would be allowed but this does not include housing.

The policy is entirely consistent with national planning policy guidance and provides the starting point for considering any proposal on any Green Belt site in the Borough. Any changes to a designated Green Belt can only be made through a formal review of a Council's Local Plan.

My views are entirely consistent with the Council's policy. I appreciate my answer is not as short as you invited but I hope the detail provides added assurance on how any proposal for this Green Belt site must be approached.

B. In simple terms this Liberal Democrat Group does not believe in building on ANY of our Green Belt which of course includes Kempton Park. This is our existing policy. At the moment we see no need to change it. Indeed we have just reviewed and re-affirmed it.

Given that Housing on Green Belt is under consideration it is important to note that planning is based on evidence, the evidence which leads us to this conclusion is:

NATIONAL

1. There is a real disquiet about how the official numbers are compiled and how they appear to mix Aspiration/Demand/Need. Ask 100 people if they want to live in a big house in the country and 50 will say yes. This is no reason to go and dig up large amounts of Green Belt in order to achieve this. Yet there appears to be a real element of this in the way the numbers are being compiled.

2. Currently there are more than 400K Grants of unbuilt planning permissions. Many see this as a cynical instrument to throttle supply and thus increase demand. This in turn increases the calls to release Green Belt. If a local authority has kept up with its housing supply in terms of Granting Planning Permissions then why should it - or more importantly why should its residents - be made to sacrifice precious Green belt because 3rd parties have refused to implement those permissions.

It is difficult to quantify just what effect these two have on Spelthorne. But presumably they have some effect.

LOCAL

1. Spelthorne's housing requirement 2006-2026 is 3320 dwellings which annualised is 166 per year. Spelthorne is already about 100 in front of this target to date and is currently predicting that the over build 2006 – 2026 will be 885 All without using Green Belt land (Source: Spelthorne PMR (Planning Monitoring Report) 2013 p22). I need to point out these are NOT my numbers but Spelthorne's own submission to government.

Even this is not the full picture because there was a huge over build of 432 in the years 2001-2005. Thus the over build (actual + projected) 2001 -2026 is in excess of 1300. (approx 30% over target).

The 2001-2005 figures are relevant since not only do they put demands on our infra structure but also consumed land which cannot now be used to meet current targets. If there is extra demand out there we are already meeting it and are on course to continue doing so. All without any recourse to Green Belt land.

2. Spelthorne has an appalling record of allowing loopholes in its Local Development Plan (LDF- Local Development Framework) to be exploited by developers. Some types of housing are grossly under provided despite the total number being way over target. Thus in 6 years 2007 -2012 we did not net complete a single 3 bed family house! (In fact we lost 0.07%).

There is a similar dismal tale to tell in respect of undersupplying social housing. There are two solutions to this which do NOT entail destroying Green belt. Stop allowing the repeated use of these loopholes or close them all together. Both are quite possible, are much quicker to achieve than reviewing Green Belt. In our view these must be tried before the Green Belt is sacrificed.

In the light of this we currently see no evidence base that would necessitate the building of houses (or anything else inappropriate) on any of our Green Belt.

There is a very real warning in respect of social housing. Unfortunately many residents take it as a victory when an application is passed without its social housing element. Besides being a very mean victory it is not actually a victory but a defeat. Where is that social housing to go? It is a simple equation that the more of a backlog of social housing is created, the greater the call for the release of Green Belt to deal with it. Once released for social housing then it might as well be released for even more housing. It is a strange kind of 'Victory' that fuels the very thing that people say they do not want. But maybe creating this 'fuel' is the very reason why Spelthorne is so willing to roll over and play dead when it comes to letting developers off, providing that social housing element.