

From: [Tambini, Roberto](#)
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2015 7:58 AM
To: ['Alan & Ali Doyle'](#) ; [Watts, Robert \(Councillor\)](#)
c: [Helen Robson](#) ; [KNIGHT, Sarah](#) ; [Tim Evans](#) ; [David McNulty](#) ; [Brooks, John](#) ; [Morgan, Heather](#) ; [Leighton, Vivienne \(Councillor\)](#) ; [Friday, Alfred \(Councillor\)](#) ; [Harvey Ian \(Councillor\)](#) ; [Graham, Michael](#) ; xxxx xxxx
Subject: RE: Kempton park

Good Morning Alan, and thanks for your email of late last night.

In answer to the question in your last paragraph – I repeat what we have stated many times - that a plan of the Sunbury Cross potential road improvements was shown to us at a meeting in my office but that it was not left with us, nor was a copy subsequently received by us at Spelthorne.

Regards

Roberto

From: Alan & Ali Doyle
Sent: 09 February 2015 23:52
To: Tambini, Roberto; Watts, Robert (Councillor)
Cc: Helen Robson; KNIGHT, Sarah; Tim Evans; David McNulty; Brooks, John; Morgan, Heather; Leighton, Vivienne (Councillor); Friday, Alfred (Councillor); Harvey Ian (Councillor); Graham, Michael; xxxx xxxx
Subject: Re: Kempton park

Mr Tambini, Cllr Watts

Mr Tambini: You copied me into an email exchange with a Lower Sunbury resident subsequent to the Kempton Park Public Meeting on Tuesday 3 February. Your part of the exchange was endorsed by both you and Cllr Watts. Cllr Watts was not one of the addressees of your message, but, since he endorsed the text, I have included him in this correspondence.

In the text is the following:

“All present at the meeting will remember me saying quite categorically that the Council had never received the report from Mouchel. The same point was made by the Head of Planning. Mr Doyle did not dispute this during the meeting although he expressed surprise that this was the case. He volunteered to send a copy of the document to the Council which I received from him after the meeting. That was the first time that we had received this document.”

Immediately I got home after that Public Meeting on the evening of 3 February I sent an email to Messrs Brooks and Tambini, attached to which were five documents. These documents contained traffic analysis conducted by Mouchel on behalf of The Jockey Club. In particular the documents were concerned with the Sunbury Cross roundabout, the “Triangle” at Hampton, the roundabout at Hampton Court Bridge, and the traffic impact of the proposed residential development of 1500 dwellings plus commercial units more generally on Spelthorne and the LB of Richmond. These documents have been in the public domain for more than a year.

I was - to put it mildly – unconvinced during the meeting itself by the statement that no-one at Spelthorne BC had received any traffic analysis by Mouchel over the considerable period of time during which the meetings between Spelthorne BC and The Jockey Club and its consultants took place. No-one who was at that meeting could have been in any doubt that I disputed that statement. My purpose in promising at the meeting to send these documents to Mr Brooks was to emphasise that even residents had seen them, never mind all the other government and private sector bodies and agencies who had seen and discussed them.

However, I will go no further with that particular issue (of whether I disputed the statement) at this particular time and in this particular piece of correspondence. I rather draw your attention to the following:

On the morning of 4 February, I received the following reply from Mr Tambini to my email of the previous evening containing the documents. I reproduce it here in its entirety:

From: Tambini, Roberto
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2015 7:52 AM
To: 'Alan & Ali Doyle' ; Brooks, John
Subject: Mouchel traffic documents

Alan,

Thanks for sending these to us, which is much appreciated. Councillor Watts in particular will be pleased to be able to review them again.

Regards

Roberto

Perhaps one or other of you can explain: If (as you both said on 6 February) neither of you, nor anyone else from Spelthorne BC, had set eyes on these documents until I sent them to Mr Brooks and Mr Tambini on the evening of 3 February, then how can it be the case (as Mr Tambini said on 4 February) that “Councillor Watts in particular will be pleased to be able to review them again”?

Alan Doyle
for Keep Kempton Green

From: Tambini, Roberto
Sent: Friday, February 06, 2015 1:11 PM
To: xxxx xxxx
Cc: Helen Robson ; KNIGHT, Sarah ; Tim Evans ; David McNulty ; Brooks, John ; Morgan, Heather ; 'Alan & Ali Doyle' ; Leighton, Vivienne (Councillor) ; Friday, Alfred (Councillor) ; Harvey Ian (Councillor) ; Graham, Michael
Subject: RE: Kempton park

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for your note. Both the Council Leader and I are very frustrated with the KKG article which you attach. As it happens it was drawn to my attention during Thursday afternoon and we were considering whether to respond.

All present at the meeting will remember me saying quite categorically that the Council had never received the report from Mouchel. The same point was made by the Head of Planning. Mr Doyle did not dispute this during the meeting although he expressed surprise that this was the case. He volunteered to send a copy of the document to the Council which I received from him after the meeting. That was the first time that we had received this document.

We are astonished by the implication in this article that the Head of Planning and me were lying about this matter. We gave a clear unequivocal response to Mr Doyle's question and yet this article appears to suggest that somehow it was a contrived and convenient position.

We have copied this exchange to Mr Doyle as we believe he is the author of this website.

We trust that from this response you will understand that the information we gave in the meeting is the accurate statement of the events. We cannot speculate on what motivates Mr Doyle (if it is he) to publish such material, but it is far from helpful when the purpose of the meeting was to dispel misleading information which is circulating in the community. It appears that there are those who wish, for their own purposes, to perpetuate that misinformation. We cannot see how this benefits the Spelthorne community to spread conspiracy theories and raise unnecessary alarm. It also undermines public confidence in local democracy which we view as an extremely serious matter.

Yours faithfully

Roberto Tambini
Chief Executive

Councillor Robert Watts
Leader of the Council

From: xxxx xxxx

Sent: 05 February 2015 15:02

To: Chief Executive;

Cc: Helen Robson; KNIGHT, Sarah; Tim Evans; David McNulty; Brooks, John; Morgan, Heather

Subject: Kempton park

Hi Roberto

I attended the meeting on Monday night as did most of you.

Unless I was hearing things you said you knew nothing about any proposals , neither had you seen any plans for housing at Kempton Park and these stories that we had heard were conspiracy theories.

Mr Brooks said the land at Kempton Park is Green Belt. This is the end of the story or it should be but more facts keep emerging.

Spelthorne Council need to act.

Roberto you said the council would be more transparent . How do you respond to the information below from the Keep kempton Green website?

Sarah – Please could you pass on this information to Mr. Kwarteng as he asked if I would keep him up to date with any developments.

Kind regards
Resident in xxxx xxxx, Lower Sunbury.

Subject: The new friend of a friend

Dear Neighbour

At one stage during the public meeting yesterday evening, Spelthorne's Chief Executive said that the information KKG has made public (see <http://keepkemptongreen.com/2015/02/03/timeline-background-documents/>) was flawed because it didn't tell the whole story. A whole lot of information couldn't be released to us mortals, he was implying, as it was protected by commercial confidentiality. Only the Supreme Beings at the Council could be privy to that information. That information, if only they could release it, would show the complete innocence of the Council. (We paraphrase. We'll get his actual words when the audio recording of the meeting is released.)

Let's leave aside for the moment that there is sufficient information in the unredacted portions of the FOI documents to give the total lie to the Council's claim that The Jockey Club never told them any detail about the 1500 dwellings plus commercial units they are planning to build on the Kempton Park estate. Never mind that they were encouraging The Jockey Club to do it.

(The Council claimed last night – ludicrously – that they had not been given any of the traffic/highway work that Mouchel had done, which mentioned the proposed size of the development. Bear in mind that Surrey CC Highways knew, the Highways Agency knew, the Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage knew. TfL knew, as did the Borough of Richmond, SW Trains, and about a dozen consultants to The Jockey Club. They even told LOSRA, and showed them the worked-up plans for the redevelopment of Sunbury Cross and the Hampton Triangle. But somehow they forgot to tell Spelthorne Council, from whom they would be seeking planning permission? That's way up there with "the cheque's in the post" and "the dog ate my homework".)

By way of example take a brief look at the two documents attached.

Documents 53 and 53a, are, respectively, the presentation given by The Jockey Club's development consultants at a meeting on 10 April 2013, and the then Head of Planning's notes from that meeting. The Council didn't quote, as they are required to, the Regulatory justification for the blacked out sections. But look at what are the only bits blacked out in Document 53. One is a map titled **Site Capacity Analysis**. The other is a map, which appears

from the Contents slide to be the **Proposed Vehicular Access Routes Plan**. Very convenient detail which "can't" be shown to the plebs, and we use that term advisedly.

Not the full picture? We don't think so. In fact, the fact that information is covered up tends to give a fuller picture of what happened than if we didn't know it existed at all.

By the way. The Jockey Club's new friend, (friend of the new friend Redrow actually), (see <http://keepkemptongreen.com/2015/01/22/just-friends/>) who replaced the recently unfriended Mouchel as transport consultant, is Amey. Watch this space.

Thanks for signing the petition in increasing numbers. Please do so if you haven't already, at: <http://www.petitionbuzz.com/petitions/keepkemptongreen>
And please contribute if you are able to the KKG Fighting Fund. <http://keepkemptongreen.com/fighting-fund/>
Details for both the petition and the Fighting Fund can be found at <http://www.keepkemptongreen.com>