

---

LOCAL AREAS    HAMPTON AND HAMPTON HILL

**Proposal**                    **H01**  
**Modification ref**    **D/H01/1**

**Hampton waterworks**

**Inspector's note**

The Hampton Waterworks site was also the subject of objections to Policy ENV 2 in Chapter 4 of this report.

**Issues**

- (i)      The wording of the proposed modification requires clarification to avoid confusion and misinterpretation.
- (ii)     There should be a pedestrian and cycle crossing of the River Thames from Sunnyside Reservoir.

**Inspector's appraisal and conclusions**

The wording of modification D/H01/1

11.28.    Proposed modification D/H01/1 is as recommended in the Inspector's Report on the previous inquiry (para 12.132) in response to the objectors' contention that the transport objectives of the UDP would not be met by the proposals for the site. A development brief is to be prepared for the site within the current financial year (2004/5). However, while I sympathise with the objector's view that the proposed modification weakens the original mandatory tone of the reference to public transport, cycle and pedestrian links I bear in mind that their efficacy would depend on provisions external to the site. I shall suggest an alternative and supportive, but not mandatory, wording.

A pedestrian and cycle crossing of the River Thames.

11.29.    There is no bridge crossing the Thames between Hampton Court and Walton on Thames. In the interest of sustainable modes of movement the provision of a pedestrian/cyclist crossing in the Hampton locality could both improve general connectivity across the river and enhance the recreational attraction of the riparian areas. The objector's preferred site in the Plan area is at the western end of the waterworks curtilage, remote from the land identified in modification D/H1/1. The LPA has reservations about a crossing at that point on the grounds of its potential level of use, personal security in winter conditions, and whether alternative crossing points would offer better value and therefore merit higher priority. A location nearer the centre of Hampton village and more convenient for pedestrians to reach Hampton station would be preferable.

11.30.    While I discern no objection in principle to a crossing in the Hampton locality I am mindful that the specific site the objectors seek to identify in the UDP is essentially a new proposal which is not appropriate to introduce at this stage in the emergence of the UDP Review. Furthermore, it would not bear directly on the implementation of the proposed modification D/H1/1 and no progress has been made regarding the landfall of the bridge on the Surrey bank. In these circumstances I find no justification to include a crossing in the UDP Review.

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**11.31. I recommend that the UDP be modified by:**

**(i) D/H01/1**

**(ii) the penultimate sentence of the justification for Policy H 1 be changed to read:**

**Proposals should have regard to the improvement of links to the riverside, the creation of a public riverside walkway, and the improvement of pedestrian and cycle links to the site.**

---

**Proposal: H26**  
**Modification ref: D/H18/1**

**Former Council Depot, Oldfield Road**

### **Issue**

The disposal of the site should be deferred for a few weeks to take advantage of the new General Disposal Consent Regulations 2003, enabling renewable energy requirements to be imposed as a condition of sale.

### **Inspector's appraisal and conclusions**

11.32. The purpose of the modification is to indicate a preferred use. I consider that such fine-tuned timing of the disposal of redundant property is not a matter appropriate to the UDP.

## RECOMMENDATION

**11.33. I recommend that the Plan be modified by D/H18/1.**

---